United States of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 113th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 159 WASHINGTON, WEDNESDAY, JULY 17, 2013 No. 102

House of Representatives

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

DESIGNATION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

WASHINGTON, DC,
July 17, 2013.

I hereby appoint the Honorable THOMAS MASSIE to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

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

MORNING-HOUR DEBATE

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

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

EFFECTS OF SEQUESTRATION

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

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, for civilian defense employees at Pax River Naval Air Station, Webster Field, and the Naval Surface Warfare Center at Indian Head, all of which I represent—and Mr. JONES, who is on the floor, represents a substantial number as well in his district—sequestration hit home last week as furloughs began. The same is true of 650,000 civilian defense workers throughout our country.

The furloughs brought on by the irrational policy of sequestration are harming our national security and putting our military readiness at risk. At the same time, they also represent a severe 20 percent pay cut in the form of days when they are forced to stay home without pay, forbidden even from volunteering to continue performing their important tasks.

Federal employees, including those in civilian defense positions, have already contributed $114 billion over the last 3 years for the next 7 years toward deficit reduction from pay freezes and changes in retirement benefits. These are hardworking, dedicated men and women who only want to serve their country and make a difference.

As I said on this floor last week, I went to Pax River 2 weeks ago to meet with many of those preparing to be furloughed. I heard their concerns about the sequester's effects on the missions of our men and women in uniform whom these civilian employees support.

We have men and women at the point of this spear, but we have a lot of men and women who are making sure that they can be as effective and as safe as possible at the point of that spear. And I heard from them about how the sequester is affecting morale on and off base.

What I did not hear much at all from those employees was concern for themselves, about how furloughs will impact their own families. That's because their number one concern, even facing an undeserved 20 percent pay cut, is still their ability to serve and get the job done for our troops and all of us who depend on a strong national defense.

After my meeting with civilian defense employees from Maryland's Fifth District, I received an email message from an employee at Webster Field. He wrote this:

> We pride ourselves in not only delivering a quality product but on being responsive to the emergent needs of our soldiers and sailors around the world.

He went on to say:

> If our dedicated folks are told to turn the lights off and lock the doors at 4 p.m. on a Thursday, then who will provide that level of responsiveness our military counterparts have so desperately come to expect and rely on when no one is here to respond to the call on Friday? What message does that send to the civilians and contractors who have made it their mission to ensure our military never goes without critical equipment, data, and training they need?

He goes on to say:

> I genuinely worry that it devalues the level of effort that our employees have put forth. And when you're losing your pay and your work appears to be less important, it will become much harder to retain a lot of these very talented folk.

Not my words, Mr. Speaker, but the words of one of America's many selfless public servants who are concerned about this dangerous sequester.

What will it take for Congress to act?

We've also seen air combat units grounded, and some classes at the Naval Academy this fall could be canceled if sequester continues. The only way to reverse these effects, Mr. Speaker, on our military readiness and training is to replace the sequester with a big and balanced alternative.

Budget Committee Ranking Member CHRIS VAN HOLLEN has proposed a balanced alternative seven times, but the majority has not allowed us to consider a balanced plan on this floor. If we had, on this floor, an alternative to the sequester that achieves real deficit reduction—which we know we need—through a balance of revenues and targeted spending cuts, Mr. Speaker, I believe that the majority of us, Republican and Democrat, would come together and would support it. It's time for Speaker BOEHNER to appoint budget conferees so that House and Senate negotiators can begin to reach agreement on a balanced compromise.

I will continue, Mr. Speaker, to call on both parties to listen to the men and women of Pax River, of Webster

Printed on recycled paper.

Field, of Indian Head, Quantico, the folks in North Carolina that Mr. JONES represents, the folks in Maryland that I represent, the folks in Connecticut that Mr. COURTNEY represents, the folks in Massachusetts that my good friend, the ranking member—almost ranking member on the Rules Committee represents, and the gentleman from Illinois represents. They and I will continue, in both parties, to act, to act on a balanced, rational, reasonable alternative that brings the deficit down but maintains our national security and the morale of the people who every day work to protect our great land.

AFGHANISTAN

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

Mr. JONES. Mr. Speaker, I must say that it is very disappointing that the last time the House of Representatives officially remembered the men and women who have died in Afghanistan was February of this year. Since then, we've lost a total of 79 members of our Armed Forces: 15 were killed in March, 14 were killed in April, 22 killed in May, and 18 killed in June.

Why do we continue to send our young men and women to risk their life and limb in a country that will never change?

In addition to this tragic waste of life, I am amazed at the lack of oversight of the taxpayers' money. After listening to the Special Inspector General for Afghanistan Reconstruction speak on the C–SPAN program, Washington Journal, on Monday, I will give you two examples of fraud and abuse that particularly stood out to me.

We have countless buildings in Afghanistan constructed with taxpayers' dollars that remain unused or, even worse, falling apart. Mr. John Sopko, the Inspector General, referenced one building made of brick that he said is literally melting due to poor construction. How in the world can we continue to fund these programs in Afghanistan with very little oversight and, quite frankly, a waste of the taxpayers' money?

Mr. Sopko further stated that we have $20 billion in the pipeline to be spent in Afghanistan while we are dealing with the ill effects of sequestration that Mr. HOYER just spoke about, and cutting crucial programs for our military personnel right here at home.

In particular, our mental health programs for our veterans are suffering because we are furloughing the civilian workers who help our veterans who are suffering from PTSD and TBI. Those people that are the professionals that help them are being cut. This is why this waste of money in Afghanistan is absolutely, Mr. Speaker, unacceptable.

Congress is not listening to the American taxpayer. The taxpayer is fed up and tired of wasting money and life and limb in Afghanistan. History has said no nation has ever changed Afghanistan and no nation will ever change Afghanistan. We need to listen to the American people and stop this spending. And more importantly than the spending is the waste of life in Afghanistan.

I ask my colleagues on both sides to come together and work together. Let's start reducing the amount of money that we are spending in Afghanistan, and let's also reduce the number of troops that have to go back and forth to Afghanistan.

Sequestration and furloughs are creating one of the worst situations for our military that they have faced in many, many years. And again, we are looking at furloughing the professional doctors and nurses and mental health providers.

Mr. Speaker, beside me is really what I say speaks better than my words. It is a photograph of a full-dressed Army contingency walking behind a caisson. Apparently, the wife of the soldier in the caisson is standing there with her little girl holding the mother's hand, and the little girl is wondering: Why is daddy in that flag-draped coffin?

That is what's missing here in Congress, quite frankly, is there is no debate on the waste of life and the waste of money in Afghanistan. I ask the American people to put pressure on Members of Congress to stop this waste of life and money in Afghanistan.

With that, Mr. Speaker, I will close by asking God to please bless our men and women in uniform, to please bless the families of our men and women in uniform, and in His arms, to hold the families who have given a child dying for freedom in Afghanistan and Iraq.

And I ask God to bless the House and Senate, that we will do what is right in the eyes of God for God's people. And I will ask God to please give strength and courage to the President of the United States, that he will do what is right in the eyes of God for God's people. And three times: God, please, God, please, God, please continue to bless America.

YOU'VE GOT TO BE CAREFULLY TAUGHT

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

Mr. QUIGLEY. Mr. Speaker, I don't believe that anyone is born with an inclination to hate, but sometimes, even in the year 2013, it's easy to forget.

Not one of us begins this life hating that which is different. Not one of us begins this life fearing those who are different from ourselves. As children, we recognize differences; we wonder about them and question why. But as children, we don't hate or fear. People must learn to hate. You've got to be taught to hate and fear, carefully taught.

In the second act of the great musical ''South Pacific,'' Lieutenant Joe Cable sings a song about racial prejudice, entitled, ''You've Got to Be Carefully Taught.'' The lyrics of the song confront prejudice at its core, explaining the simple truth that discrimination is not inherent; it's imposed—imposed by others who once had it imposed upon them in the vicious cycle of prejudice and fear.

One isn't born with an inherent aversion to those of a different skin tone. One has to be taught to fear a young, unarmed black man in a hoodie. One has to be taught to fear minorities voting. You've got to be carefully taught.

I also believe discrimination plays a role in opposition to same-sex marriage. One isn't born thinking gay people should be treated differently than straight people. One has to be taught to fear equality for all. You've got to be carefully taught.

Discrimination has played a role in our immigration policy from the late 19th century to today. But people aren't naturally hostile to those who speak a different language or come from a different place. They had to be taught to fear the dreamers who are American in all but citizenship or their parents who risked their lives to make a better life for their children. You've got to be carefully taught.

When ''South Pacific'' debuted in 1949, the song ''You've Got to Be Carefully Taught'' almost didn't make the cut. Rodgers and Hammerstein were told the song was too controversial, too preachy, too inappropriate for the musical stage.

□ 1015

The song was so controversial that some cities in the deep South would not allow the musical to be played on their stages. Lawmakers in Georgia even tried to outlaw such entertainment with one legislator arguing that a song justifying interracial marriage was implicitly a threat to the American way of life. But Rodgers and Hammerstein insisted the song be sung because it told the truth, and nothing combats fear better than the truth. ''South Pacific'' premiered more than a half century ago, yet its lessons are perhaps even more relevant today.

We have come a long way since the Jim Crow era, but the truth is that discrimination, while perhaps not as blatant, is alive and well. Despite all the progress we have made, we are still taught to be fearful of differences, to discriminate against those of a different race or gender or background or sexual orientation. We tragically, although sometimes unknowingly, allow that discrimination to influence our actions. It is those actions, whether on a street corner in Florida or here on the floor of the House of Representatives, that teach yet another generation to hate and fear.

As lawmakers, we have a responsibility to root out discrimination, to impart upon a new generation a philosophy of tolerance, and to embrace our differences. By confronting discrimination head on, we can finally stop the

vicious cycle of prejudice and fear. Nelson Mandela said it best:

People must learn to hate, and if they can learn to hate, they can be taught to love, for love comes more naturally to the human heart than its opposite.

You have to be carefully taught, Mr. Speaker. The teaching must begin in our hearts and with our children.

OBAMACARE

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

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, in May of 2012, the House Ways and Means Committee released a report that expounds upon one of the most problematic provisions included in ObamaCare, the mandate on employers with at least 50 full-time equivalent employees to offer ''affordable'' and government-approved health insurance plans to their workers beginning in 2014.

Employers with at least 50 full-time equivalent employees who do not offer government-approved coverage must pay $2,000 in fines annually per employee. After 2014, the fine would be indexed to the average per capita premium for health insurance, as determined by the Health and Human Services Secretary.

Even if employers do offer government-approved health insurance coverage, they would still be fined if Health and Human Services deems the plan ''unaffordable'' and at least one full-time employee purchases a qualified health plan through an exchange and receives a taxpayer-funded subsidy for their coverage.

Seventy-one Fortune 100 companies that responded to the Ways and Means Committee survey included in the 2012 report estimate that they could save $28.6 billion in 2014 by eliminating health insurance coverage for their 5.9 million employees and opting to pay the $2,000 annual fine per employee. This would impact more than 10.2 million employees and dependents on employer-based plans. Under these estimates, from 2014 through 2023, the employers surveyed could save an estimated $422.4 billion.

The employer mandate provides a perverse incentive for companies to drop their employees from health plans that are otherwise working and are embraced by the employees themselves. This is a stark contrast from the promises made by President Obama, suggesting ''First of all, if you've got health insurance, you like your doctors, you like your plan, you can keep your doctor, you can keep your plan. Nobody is talking about taking that away from you.''

Mr. Speaker, as we are seeing, that is simply not true. But furthermore, the employer mandate will serve to drive up the costs of ObamaCare as more and more people become a part of the exchanges.

Even Comedy Central's Jon Stewart, in an interview with Health and Human Services Secretary Kathleen Sebelius this past January, posed the question as to whether or not the employee mandate would cause employers to ''dump'' employees into the exchanges until it ''becomes sort of a back door of government—not a takeover necessarily, but of a government responsibility for the health care, and then suddenly, obviously then, we're Sweden.''

Mr. Speaker, this week the House will vote to legitimize the administration's delay of the employer mandate for 1 year. While I support this delay, we must continue to focus efforts on repealing and replacing ObamaCare so that we can begin to reduce the escalating health care costs and the restrictions on access, the attacks on quality innovation in this country and the turnover of health care from a personal decision to the government.

DECREASING RATES OF FRAUD, WASTE AND ABUSE IN SNAP

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

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, 18 times this year I've come to this floor and talked about the need to end hunger now. Eighteen times I've defended our Nation's anti-hunger programs, discussed the paradox of hunger and obesity, and talked about hunger among the elderly.

Over the past few weeks, this House has voted on two versions of a farm bill reauthorization. The first was defeated after the Republican leadership overreached, not only by cutting the linchpin of our anti-hunger programs, SNAP—formerly known as food stamps—but also by adding poison pill after poison pill amendment to the bill.

Last week, the Republican leadership responded to the stinging defeat of their farm bill by stripping out the entire nutrition title while, at the same time, expanding subsidies for highly profitable big agribusinesses. Talk about messed up priorities, Mr. Speaker. By the way, the nutrition title not only includes SNAP, it includes as well funding for food banks and senior anti-hunger programs.

Opponents of SNAP like to focus on the idea that SNAP is somehow fraudulent; not just that some SNAP money is being misspent, but that so much is being wasted that we need to drastically rein in the program, regardless of whether SNAP cuts increase hunger in America. We heard these claims time after time during consideration of the two farm bills.

Sadly, those who claim rampant fraud, waste, and abuse in SNAP don't let facts get in the way of their arguments. That is because SNAP is among the most effective and efficient, if not the most effective and efficient, federally administered programs.

I serve on the House Agriculture Committee, and I took part in an extensive debate over SNAP during both the committee markup and on the House floor. Not one member, Democrat or Republican, on the House Agriculture Committee provided sourced, statistical information on fraud, waste, and abuse in the SNAP program.

On top of that, no hearings were held on the SNAP program at all. In fact, I challenged any member of the committee to find any Federal program that has a lower rate of fraud, waste, and abuse. The truth is no one could answer my challenge.

Mr. Speaker, according to both the U.S. Department of Agriculture and the Office of the Inspector General at USDA, the fraud rates for SNAP are at all-time lows and are going down. On top of that, USDA continues to pursue instances of fraud, waste, and abuse and is prosecuting these cases.

Despite the rapid growth in SNAP participation, primarily due to the historic economic recession we are still recovering from, the error rate for SNAP is also at a record low, according to the latest data available. Specifically, 3 percent of all SNAP benefits represented overpayments, meaning they either went to ineligible households or went to eligible households but in excessive amounts. This means that more than 98 percent of SNAP benefits were issued to eligible households. The combined error rate—the total error rate that includes both under- and overpayments—reached an all-time low in 2011, falling to 3.8 percent.

These statistics show just how well SNAP is truly managed. But there's even more data to consider. In July, the USDA's Office of Inspector General issued a report on fraud investigations of USDA programs. It showed that fraud in SNAP is limited primarily to a few bad actors. It also showed cases of fraud are far greater in other USDA programs.

According to this report, 10 cases involving USDA programs were closed in the past 2 months, and only one of them involved fraud on the part of a SNAP recipient. That's right, only 1 case in 10 had to do with an individual defrauding the SNAP program. In fact, half of those cases dealt with improper use of rural development funds. The remaining four cases all involved SNAP abuse by retailers, not recipients.

While this may seem like an innocuous statistic, it goes to the heart of what opponents claim: that SNAP beneficiaries—poor, hungry working Americans—are lazy and want to steal from the Federal Government. Nothing, and I mean nothing, could be further from the truth.

SNAP provides a lifeline to hungry Americans, whether they are 1, 10, 25, 50, 75 years old or older. In doing so, SNAP is likely the most effective and efficient program administered by the Federal Government.

Mr. Speaker, of course we can make SNAP better. We can make anything

better. We can make it more efficient. We can ensure that even more people get the food they need to prevent hunger in America. But we need to address hunger in a holistic and comprehensive way, including the role SNAP plays in preventing and treating hunger. This is why we need a White House Conference on Food and Nutrition if we are going to truly reduce hunger and improve nutrition in this country. We need a plan. We need to get this right. We need some urgency and some leadership on this issue.

Mr. Speaker, attacking SNAP, and demonizing those who rely on it to make ends meet isn't just wrong, it's counterproductive. Arbitrarily cutting SNAP will only make hunger in America worse, and it certainly won't reduce the rates of fraud, waste, and abuse. The SNAP program works. While it can always be improved, we can't simply cut our way to a hunger-free society. We must work together if we are going to end hunger now.

IN HONOR OF ADMIRAL FRANK BENTON KELSO, II

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

Mr. DESJARLAIS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the extraordinary life of Admiral Frank Benton Kelso, II, a great American and true son of Tennessee. On Sunday, June 23, Tennessee's Fourth Congressional District and our country lost this great American hero.

To describe Admiral Kelso as honorable, principled, and dedicated would be insufficient. His achievements and individual character are matched only by his patriotism and love of country.

Admiral Kelso's 79-year life included a gallant and decorated 42-year career in the United States Navy.

Admiral Kelso graduated from the U.S. Naval Academy in 1956 and began his illustrious career in the Navy by joining the nuclear submarine program, where he would later command two nuclear submarines.

In 1986, the Admiral commanded the Atlantic Fleet, planning military actions against Libya that significantly curbed Muammar Qadhafi's terrorist activities.

In 1990, he earned the position of Chief of Naval Operations, the Navy's top uniformed officer. During this time, he successfully led naval operations in the Persian Gulf War.

In addition to his distinguished naval career, Admiral Kelso was a family man. He was happily married to Landess McCown Kelso for 56 years until she passed away last year. Together, they had four children and eight grandchildren.

He retired from the Navy in 1994, and in 2003 he returned to his hometown of Fayetteville, Tennessee, where he would spend the last 10 years of his life. These years were filled with love for his family and friends and service to his community.

I believe that there is no greater example of commitment to one's country than the life of Admiral Frank Kelso. His legacy of integrity and courage truly exemplify the best of the United States Navy. To quote the celebrated song of our Navy, ''Here's wishing you a happy voyage home.''

GOVERNMENT FURLOUGHS

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

Mr. COURTNEY. Mr. Speaker, on July 1, the front page of The Washington Post had a headline which showed in many respects just, again, the disconnect between this town and the rest of the country. It said: ''They said the sequester would be scary. Mostly they were wrong.''

I would like those reporters to have joined me on July 3, 2 days later, when I went to the Groton Navy Base in southeastern Connecticut to talk to over 100 civilian DOD employees who were on the verge of being furloughed because of sequestration. Again, under sequester, 650,000 civilian DOD employees, for 1 day a week for the next 11 weeks, will be furloughed, or lose 20 percent of their paycheck, despite the fact that they contribute enormous value to the military readiness of this country.

Again, at that meeting, where I was joined by Captain Carl Lahti, who is the commander of the sub base, he talked about the fact that among the furloughed employees are crane operators, folks who install torpedoes, Tomahawk missiles, all the supplies to make sure that our attack sub fleet is ready to go at any given time. Again, losing them 1 day a week just pushes back the readiness of the submarine fleet.

I talked to Adam Puccino, who is the head of the Metal Trades Council and represents the maintenance crews on the base to make sure that the tip of the spear of America's Navy is ready to go. Again, losing those folks 1 day a week is going to slow down and retard the ability of that fleet to be ready.

□ 1030

Rob Faulise, who is the head of the NAGE force, talked about the staff that provides critical services, whether it's health care, firefighter services, clerical work, to make sure that that subbase is ready to accomplish its mission.

In every case, they all confirm the fact that not only is this going to cause personal hardship, but it's also going to harm the military capability of that base.

I received a number of emails from folks who were there that day or whose coworkers told them about that meeting. Here is what some of them said.

Kimberly from Ledyard, Connecticut, said:

> I am a Federal employee working on the Navy base in Groton. I am a GS–5 step 2, which means I make $17 an hour and am paid biweekly. I am married with three children, ages 6, 4, and 1. My husband works part time, and is already capped at a salary range of $16.54 an hour. It's already hard enough to make ends meet as it is, and now, with the furlough, I'm losing $226.44 every pay period.

Robert from North Stonington:

> As a member of DOD, specifically the Department of the Navy, working in Groton, I am now in the second week of furloughs. As a civilian employee for the past 39 years, I have never seen our government in such disarray. My command, supervisor of shipbuilding, performs extremely important jobs of government oversight of the design, construction and repair of our country's nuclear submarine fleet.

John from Groton:

> Furloughs will immediately manifest themselves in the local economies around every U.S. military base in the form of 20 percent fewer goods, gas and groceries being bought and in 20 percent fewer taxes being paid into town and State coffers that are already at an all-time low.

Lastly, Aurela from Gales Ferry, Connecticut, said:

> As a result of the civilian furloughs at the Navy branch health clinic, I believe our patients' access to care and continuity of quality care will be severely hampered. Our military and their dependents don't have the option to be sick or injured on a non-furlough day. Clinic staff has been trained to refer patients to urgent care facilities and to emergency rooms as a last resort, largely due to the sequester. Where is the wisdom of forcing the use of higher cost facilities in a fiscal crisis?

Thank you, Aurela, because it shows that, in fact, these furloughs don't really save anything structurally or long term for government. What is clearly needed is for Congress to respond to sequester based on what its original intention was. If you go to Phil Gramm, the granddaddy of sequestration—the Gramm-Rudman sequester act of 1985, which today sequester is verbatim based on—he stated in a speech in Washington not too long ago:

> It was never the objective of Gramm-Rudman to trigger the sequester. The objective of Gramm-Rudman was to have the threat of the sequester force compromise and action.

Again, that's from the inventor of sequestration.

Seven times, CHRIS VAN HOLLEN and the House Democratic minority have tried to get the Rules Committee to allow a vote to be taken on a measure to turn off sequester, replacing it with smarter cuts and smarter revenue to achieve the goal of deficit reduction, but to do it without a chain saw that is disrupting the lives of those individuals whose stories I just described. In every single instance, the Rules Committee denied the ability of this House to vote on a commonsense measure to turn off sequester.

Folks, we are now 4½ months into sequester. Its impact extends even beyond the Department of Defense. In Head Start programs, kids are losing slots, and NIH research grants are being canceled. It is time for Congress to listen to Phil Gramm, to compromise, to act to turn off sequester,

and to represent these hardworking Americans who every single day are serving our Nation.

THE REPEAL OF OBAMACARE

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

Mr. CONAWAY. Mr. Speaker, 3 years ago, the Democrats told the American people that Congress had to pass the ObamaCare act so that we could learn what was in it. Well, 3 years later, we are just now learning what really is in the law and how it will cost American jobs and limit their health care choices.

It is no surprise to me that the administration has delayed the implementation of the employer mandate. Just as every honest observer said it would, ObamaCare is costing Americans full-time jobs and hourly wages as employers prepare to comply with the new mandates spawned by this law.

Later today, the House of Representatives will vote to delay imposing ObamaCare's crushing burdens on employers. For once, we agree with the President—this law cannot be implemented without significantly harming our economy. We will also go one step further and delay these same burdens from falling on the backs of individuals as well. I don't believe it is appropriate to protect one half of America from ObamaCare but not the other half. We will give American families the same reprieve from this law that the Obama administration is promising to employers.

The two votes we are taking today are important steps toward repeal. All of the regulations required by this law are still not written. With every day that passes, a new regulation is announced, revealing just a little more of what this bill will actually do. Each rule and regulation mandates new costs for employers, more restrictions for the insureds, and ultimately hikes the cost of health insurance for American families. This law is not ready to be implemented. There are too many questions, too many inconsistencies, and too many complications. Despite the promises of the Democrat leadership, the fact is that we still do not know what's in it.

Mr. Speaker, my constituents want to see this law repealed. I think it is bad policy, bad politics, and terrible for health care in America. I have supported every effort to end this law, and I will continue to support these efforts as long as I am in office.

Fundamentally, I do not believe that this law will ever be ready; so next year, if the President has not worked with us to delay it or to replace it, I will be back to argue for additional delays on both the individual mandate and employer mandate. I will continue to demand that Congress and the President repeal this law and replace it with one that puts patients first, that allows new and innovative paths for care and coverage, and that does not put the government between patients and their doctors.

EFFECTS OF SEQUESTRATION ON FEDERAL COURT SYSTEM

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

Mr. CONNOLLY. I was going to talk about sequestration—and I will, Mr. Speaker—but I've got to respond to my friend on what he calls ObamaCare. It does everything he says he wants it to do, and I will remind those critics of ObamaCare that the individual mandate was a Republican idea; and far from putting government between patients and their doctors, it actually facilitates patients' care directly with their doctors and their medical providers.

Just 2 weeks ago, we celebrated our Nation's independence, and it reminded us of the full panoply of American history. American history, especially at the Constitutional Convention, is all about parties coming together for the common good and compromising.

The first great compromise created the United States Senate and the United States House of Representatives, allowing proportional representation here to protect the interests of the bigger States, but equal representation in the other body to protect all of the States. That was the first great compromise.

The second great compromise was between Thomas Jefferson and Alexander Hamilton. It involved the Federal debt and the location of the future Nation's Capital. They had a dinner, and they compromised. Hamilton got what he wanted in the Federal debt, and Jefferson got what he wanted in terms of the Nation's Capital. It was all about compromise. That's what we have to now remind ourselves of as we deal with the horrors of sequestration—yes, horrors.

On July 5, the EPA, the Department of Housing and Urban Development, and the IRS completely shuttered their offices throughout the United States, furloughing 115,000 employees that day. It was the third such agency shutdown for those agencies. Last week, 680,000 Department of Defense civilian employees began a one-day-a-week furlough that will continue through the end of this fiscal year.

For my colleagues who are so fond of saying, Let's run government the way a business ought to be run, what business would furlough 85 percent of its workforce one day a week for 3 months? What CEO or chairman of the board would last one day advocating for that as a management practice? Yet my friends on the other side of the aisle think that's perfectly fine in order to manage the Federal Government.

I recently met with the members of the Federal Bar Association, who highlighted yet another unforeseen cost of sequestration, and that has to do with $350 million of cuts in the judicial branch.

Since July of 2011, spending cuts have forced the Federal court system to shed 10 percent of the total judicial staff through layoffs. Staffing of the court system is now at 2005 staffing levels, but the volume has only grown. Many Federal courts across the Nation plan now to close one day a week. Think about that. The American judicial system is looking at possibly only operating 4 days a week because of the lack of resources due to sequestration. This will result in the slower processing of civil and bankruptcy cases, which will have a ripple effect on local economies for individuals and companies all across this country. Court security will be cut by 30 percent, and we can only ask ourselves rhetorically what could go wrong with that. Probation will be affected.

These cuts will undermine our ability to fulfill the Sixth Amendment right of defendants to a speedy trial and representation for the indigent. Cuts to the Federal Defender Services program will lead to attorneys being furloughed up to 15 days for the remainder of this fiscal year. The office already is understaffed after losing 113 employees between last fall and spring as a result of budget cuts.

Mr. Speaker, the Judicial Conference of the United States recently called this situation an unprecedented fiscal crisis that will seriously compromise the constitutional mission of the United States courts—the same Constitution that so many of my friends on the other side of the aisle proudly hold up and say they believe in. It's just the latest in a string of what, I hope, are unintended consequences from sequestration and another reason we must act within the next month to resolve the situation and stop the mindless disinvestment in the important functions of government.

RECESS

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

Accordingly (at 10 o'clock and 40 minutes a.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1200

AFTER RECESS

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

PRAYER

Reverend Robert Wagenseil, Calvary Episcopal Church, Indian Rocks Beach, Florida, offered the following prayer:

God of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob: thank You for the men and women who have been called to serve Your people in this House.

As they strive to chart the best possible course for our Nation, enable them to remember that we are all in the same boat when it comes to our love of this country and our desire to see the hopes and dreams of our fellow citizens fulfilled.

As they seek to walk the road of truth, help them to learn what it means to walk that road together on the common ground of respect and forbearance.

Bless their families and make their homes havens of kindness, encouragement, and love.

Finally, when they shall have served their final day as Members of this House, send them home filled with the true and lasting joy that always comes at last to those who have done their duty and done it well.

Amen.

THE JOURNAL

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

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

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

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

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

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

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

The point of no quorum is considered withdrawn.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER. Will the gentlewoman from Ohio (Mrs. BEATTY) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mrs. BEATTY led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

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

WELCOMING REVEREND ROBERT WAGENSEIL

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

There was no objection.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, it is a great honor to introduce to the House our guest chaplain today, Father Bob Wagenseil, the pastor of Calvary Episcopal Church in the beautiful town of Indian Rocks Beach, Florida.

Father Bob, as he is affectionately known, is a dear friend and a beloved member of our community. He was ordained in May of 1981 and spent most of his 14 years serving churches in Long Island and New York City. By 1993, he was appointed archdeacon of Queens.

To our good fortune in Florida, he was asked to come to Calvary Episcopal in 1995, and it has been a true love affair ever since. In addition to serving the church, which just celebrated its 50th anniversary, Father Bob and his wife, Patricia, or PT as she is known, have served our community in many special ways.

He serves as chaplain of the Suncoast Fire and Rescue, where he is also a volunteer firefighter. He helped develop a computer learning center at the church, a critically important food pantry, and nearest and dearest to his heart, a community sailing program for the youth of the church and the local community.

Father Bob will retire from Calvary on September 15 of this year after 18 years of service to the church and 34 years to the priesthood. He and PT, who have been married for 35 years, will remain active members of our community and dear friends to the thousands and thousands of people whose lives they have touched, including Congressman BILL YOUNG and his wife, Beverly, and our two sons, Patrick and Billy.

Please join me in welcoming Father Bob Wagenseil and PT to the House today.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

RELIEF FROM OBAMACARE

(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. Madam Speaker, the case for ObamaCare repeal was given a big boost by the administration's decision to delay the controversial employer mandate for another year. This House will vote we hope this week to support that much-needed action, as well as postpone the individual mandate for 1 year.

Delaying the burdensome employer mandate will allow companies to continue providing employee health care benefits without reducing work hours. Providing a 1-year delay from the individual mandate will relieve American families from thousands of dollars of additional taxes.

But postponing the two mandates are only the latest steps to repeal ObamaCare. Without complete repeal, Americans will face $1.1 trillion in new taxes, $716 billion in Medicare cuts, and huge health insurance premium increases.

Madam Speaker, we must all work together to finish the job by completely repealing ObamaCare so that small businesses and individuals will be permanently free from this onerous regulation.

CELEBRATING THE 100-YEAR ANNIVERSARY OF DELTA SIGMA THETA SORORITY

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

Mrs. BEATTY. Madam Speaker, I rise today in honor of standing up for women and celebrating the 100-year anniversary of my sorority, Delta Sigma Theta Sorority, a sorority of more than 200,000 Black college-educated women founded in 1913, an organization where 22 African American women were the only women of color to participate in the women's suffrage march.

I thank Delta Kappa Chapter, where I was made, and the Columbus and Dayton alumni chapters, where I serve, for standing on their shoulders and continuing the legacy because they understand that we must continue to stand up for women in health care, in education, and in the workplace, because when women do better, our children do well; when women do well, our families do well; when women do well, our men do well; and yes, when women do well, America does well.

Thank you, women, and thank you, Delta Sigma Theta Sorority.

OBAMACARE DELAYS

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

Mr. OLSON. Madam Speaker, I rise to ask my colleagues to support H.R. 2667 and H.R. 2668, bills that would delay the employer and individual mandates in ObamaCare.

These mandates force businesses to provide health coverage to their employees and as well for individuals to purchase government-dictated health care or pay a penalty. President Obama cited the complexity of the mandate as the reason for his delay. A first-grader back home would say ''no kidding.''

Billion dollar corporations with access to the White House get excused from ObamaCare but the struggling American family gets left out. That's unfair, that's wrong, and more is coming.

That is why I urge my colleagues to support these two bills until we can fully repeal ObamaCare and give every American quality health care at a price they can afford with a doctor of their choice.

RISING VIOLENCE IN OUR URBAN COMMUNITIES

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

Mr. VEASEY. Madam Speaker, I recently stood with my colleagues of the Congressional Black Caucus to call for a National Emergency Summit on Urban Violence. In light of the verdict in Florida, the Trayvon Martin verdict, I wanted to talk about the violence that has recently happened in my district and why we need to do something about mental illness.

We had an incident where a man killed his pregnant girlfriend, the mother, and her 10-year-old brother, and then went into a neighboring police station and asked for the police to shoot him.

We had another incident, a young Somali boy, only 5 years old. The people that lived in the apartment complex loved to see this little boy ride his bicycle around. A 13-year-old got into a disagreement with him and beat him in the head until he died, and he left him in a backyard.

Then we had another recent drive-by shooting in my district where the assailant said he shot the wrong guy, and the wrong guy was an innocent 12-year-old boy.

We need to do something about mental illness and about violence that is gripping this country. It is clear that there are many people who due to mental illness do not have the ability to calmly and rationally resolve their differences with others. Instead, they turn to violence.

Let's do something about the rising violence in our urban communities.

EMPLOYER AND INDIVIDUAL DELAYS PROVIDE FAIRNESS

(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. Madam Speaker, the President made inaccurate promises when he shoved a 2,000-page health care takeover bill through both Houses of a Democrat-controlled Congress. Now he is usurping power again by choosing to relieve employers from the higher taxes and increased government regulations mandated by the Unaffordable Care Act that still requires individuals to suffer. For a President who says he is for fairness, this decision protects Big Business and targets American families, taking more from their paychecks.

House Republicans are acting to protect every American from the unworkable provisions by voting to repeal both the employer and individual mandates. ObamaCare is an unworkable, unaffordable law that destroys jobs, disrupts the doctor-patient relationship, and promotes uncertainty for future generations. As a proponent of limited government, I fully remain committed to defunding, dismantling, or repealing ObamaCare to provide the fairness necessary to allow every American family to make their own health care decisions.

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

UNITED STATES POSTAL SERVICE

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

Mr. HIGGINS. Madam Speaker, the United States Postal Service continues to try to fix themselves financially with service cuts that will undermine the agency's viability, not strengthen it.

I am pleased to be a cosponsor of my colleague Congresswoman ROSA DELAURO's legislation, the Protect Overnight Delivery Act, to prevent the Postal Service from weakening delivery standards.

Eliminating overnight delivery would threaten hundreds of postal facilities across the Nation, including the William Street facility in my western New York community.

Madam Speaker, while the Postal Service is certainly in need of reform, this is the wrong way to do it. Once again, the Postal Service is making ill-conceived decisions that hurt both workers and consumers.

OBAMA'S UNFAIRNESS

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

Mrs. ROBY. Madam Speaker, I rise to discuss today's fairness. Earlier this month, the Obama administration announced it would be delaying the business mandate in the President's health care law.

Setting aside for a moment the dubious legal authority the executive branch is using to pick and choose which parts of the law will be enforced and which won't, this action represents unfair treatment in the implementation of ObamaCare. In delaying the business mandate for a year but not the individual mandate, the President is choosing to protect Big Business from ObamaCare, but not hardworking individuals and families. In explaining this delay, White House officials repeatedly said the President was ''listening'' to business.

Madam Speaker, why isn't the President ''listening'' to the American people? Why is Big Business getting a break while individual Americans get the short end of the stick? Maybe this is what happens when Big Business has access to the White House and individual Americans can't even take a tour.

Today, we will take action to protect all Americans by delaying both the employer mandate and the individual mandate. Our work to dismantle ObamaCare is part of our ongoing fight to spur economic growth, create jobs, and provide a more secure future for all Americans.

□ 1215

THE AFFORDABLE CARE ACT

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

Ms. MENG. Madam Speaker, I rise today in strong opposition to this 38th attempt to repeal the Affordable Care Act.

Our country needs affordable care. My constituents in Queens, New York, need affordable health care. Right now, only 17,000 New Yorkers buy their own health insurance because the insurance premium rates are too high, and 2.6 million New Yorkers do not have health insurance. Nationwide, 13 million people are uninsured.

The most exciting part is that ObamaCare is already working. As of this morning, the new, approved health care premiums available in the New York State health care exchanges for 2014 are, on average, 50 percent lower than this year's insurance premiums. That is not even taking into account individuals who can take advantage of other Federal subsidies and that everyone with a health insurance plan will be able to gain access to basic, free preventative health care services.

I want to thank New York Governor Andrew Cuomo and the New York State Legislature for their leadership on this issue.

With all the partisan sniping across the aisle about health care, we cannot lose sight of why our country needs ObamaCare. Better access to affordable, preventative health care is essential to reining in health care costs; and more importantly, it's essential for a healthy America.

INDIVIDUALS NEED RELIEF FROM OBAMACARE, TOO

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

Mr. LAMBORN. Madam Speaker, the record is clear—ObamaCare has been a train wreck since its inception. This latest delay is a testament to the poor planning and widespread mismanagement by President Obama and his administration.

President Obama's decision to delay the employer mandate comes after months of promises from the Obama administration claiming that implementation was on schedule and that the law was working the way it was supposed to. Every day, I hear from constituents who remain strongly opposed to the government's takeover of their health care. Delaying the employer mandate for 1 year is a step in the right direction, but individuals need relief also.

We must protect all Americans from the unworkable mandates of the President's health care plan by voting to delay both the individual and employer mandates. I urge all of my colleagues to support H.R. 2668, and I urge its swift adoption.

COMMUNITY PARKS REVITALIZATION ACT

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

Mr. SIRES. Madam Speaker, I rise today to speak about the Community Parks Revitalization Act.

This bipartisan legislation would provide matching funds and a new loan program to assist our communities in developing and redeveloping parks and recreational facilities.

As a former mayor, I have seen firsthand the value that investing in parks brings to our communities. When we make investments in our parks, it leads to healthy, vibrant neighborhoods in which businesses want to invest and families want to live. Our parks and recreational centers are also instrumental in helping to achieve the important national goal of increasing exercise and in providing recreational opportunities for our youth and disabled or injured veterans.

The Community Parks Revitalization Act has the support of many national organizations, including the National Recreation and Park Association and the American Society of Landscape Architects, and it has strong bipartisan support in the 113th Congress.

I encourage my colleagues to join me in strengthening our community parks.

NEED FOR EDUCATIONAL REFORM

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

Mr. DAINES. Madam Speaker, one of the best parts of my job is meeting with Montana students. These young people are the future leaders of our State, and it's exciting to hear about their ideas and aspirations for making their communities and our State a better place to live and to work.

As a father of four and personally, myself, as a product of Montana's public schools—in fact, from kindergarten in Bozeman all the way through college at Montana State University—I know that Montana's students have so much potential. Our oldest daughter, Annie, will be graduating from Montana State University this fall with a degree in elementary education. That's why it's critical that they have access to quality education and training that prepares them to pursue careers and goals they are passionate about.

We must work towards commonsense reforms that empower our schools and teachers to innovate and address our students' unique needs. No two students or schools are the same. More local and State input and less Federal bureaucracy will help provide our educators with the flexibility they need to help our kids learn. I am looking forward to our upcoming debate on how we can work to improve our education system.

EFFECTS OF SEQUESTER

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

Mrs. DAVIS of California. Madam Speaker, this week, over 650,000 civilian employees of the Department of Defense are required to begin taking involuntary furlough days. Over 25,000 of these employees reside in San Diego. This represents about a 20 percent pay cut for the next 3 months for these public servants. This pay cut is in addition to the fact that Federal employees have not received their standard salary adjustments for the past 3 years.

These salary cuts have a very damaging effect on the employees and on their families, an effect which should be clear to all of us; but they also have disastrous secondary effects. I am worried particularly about the impact these cuts will have on the recruitment and retention of the civilian workforce. As one of my San Diegan constituents in the Federal workforce said:

> Furloughs send a very demoralizing and humiliating message to all Federal employees, one that suggests that we are not valued and that the work we do is not valued.

We must do better. We can start by appointing budget conferees immediately.

IN SUPPORT OF AUTHORITY FOR MANDATE DELAY ACT AND FAIRNESS FOR AMERICAN FAMILIES ACT

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

Mr. MARCHANT. Madam Speaker, the House will vote today to delay the implementation of both the employer and the individual health insurance mandates dictated by ObamaCare. The administration announced by way of a blog post that it could not implement the employer mandate by its legal deadline despite repeated assurances that everything was okay.

It is completely unfair for the administration to grant an extension to businesses but not to individual tax-paying Americans. House Republicans are fighting for all Americans. There is still much work to be done. ObamaCare continues to be a drag on our economic recovery, leading to fewer choices and more expensive insurance premiums. I urge the support of these bills and the complete repeal of the President's health care law.

CANCER CARE

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

Mr. LOEBSACK. Madam Speaker, I rise today to highlight the benefits of cancer research and the importance of funding for the National Institutes of Health. In my home State of Iowa alone, 17,480 people will be diagnosed with cancer this year and 6,420 will lose their battles with this disease. Like every State, Iowa receives essential funding from the NIH.

NIH funds lifesaving medical research that is leading to the development of new and better ways to prevent, diagnose, and treat cancer and other diseases. The research takes place at thousands of universities, hospitals, cancer centers, and laboratories across the country, including at the University of Iowa's Holden Comprehensive Cancer Center. In addition to the obvious benefits of combating cancer and so many other diseases, NIH funding supports economic activity and jobs, something we often don't think about. In 2012, NIH funding supported 3,934 jobs in Iowa alone.

Funding for cancer research and the NIH, I believe, must be a top priority. I urge Congress to support this lifesaving research.

OBAMACARE PERMANENT DELAY

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

Mrs. WALORSKI. The administration proved what local employers have been telling me for months—ObamaCare is bad policy.

Even after 3 years of preparation, this law is far from ready for implementation and has proven to be unaffordable. Just today, we learned that we have already paid an additional $1 billion in new taxes on the medical device tax alone. If there is a delay enacted for businesses, then there needs to be a Hoosier delay for hardworking taxpayers as well. After all, the American people are the building blocks for our companies. These individuals include parents, young people, single moms, veterans, and seasoned employees. Together, they form our Nation's workforce.

In our district in northern Indiana, I have heard from schools, restaurants, manufacturers, and small business owners who strongly oppose this mandate. At the very least, news of this delay is a relief, but the future is still clouded with uncertainty as long as this law exists. Hoosiers know that a 1-year delay of the employer mandate, and even of the individual mandate, is no more than a Band-Aid.

ObamaCare is a roadblock for American companies. According to small businesses in the Second District, this law is the number one job killer. That's why I ask for the President to permanently delay the health care law.

SEQUESTER

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

Mr. CARTWRIGHT. Madam Speaker, as the House prepares this week to vote for the 38th time to take patient protections away from working families

and to undermine the economic security of the middle class, millions of working Americans are struggling to make ends meet due to this Chamber's inaction.

It has been months since across-the-board sequester cuts were enacted, devastating so many important Federal programs on which Americans rely; and now, as the House leadership refuses to allow votes on alternatives to replace the sequester, 18,132 Defense employees are currently being involuntarily furloughed across Pennsylvania, resulting in a $71 million economic loss for my State. In one place alone, 3,528 middle class Americans are being furloughed at the Tobyhanna Army Depot, which is a facility that provides essential support for our warfighters.

We have to work together to fix this problem and to reduce our deficit by growing the economy.

DELAYING INDIVIDUAL AND EMPLOYER MANDATES

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

Mr. MESSER. ObamaCare is not working. The American people know that. Now, it seems President Obama knows that, too.

The President's unilateral decision to violate the law and delay the employer mandate postpones some of the law's worst damage for businesses. Fundamental fairness dictates that individuals get the same reprieve. Some say delay gives the administration time to get it right. I say no amount of time will fix what's wrong with this job-killing law.

Each day this law is delayed gives us more time to seek its total repeal. We must protect as many people as possible from the pain this Big Government behemoth is inflicting on our Nation.

LEARN ACT

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

Mr. YARMUTH. Madam Speaker, literacy is the foundation for success in every aspect of our economy and society.

Research clearly demonstrates that a literacy-rich environment starting in early childhood is a critical prerequisite for high school graduation, college success, and career readiness; but according to the National Assessment of Educational Progress, two-thirds of all fourth and eight graders do not read at a proficient level. Underachievement in literacy at all educational levels contributes significantly to our Nation's high dropout rate, which costs the country hundreds of billions of dollars and squanders the potential and contribution of each student who drops out.

That is why today, along with my colleague, the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. POLIS), I am introducing the Literacy Education for All, Results for the Nation Act. The LEARN Act provides a strong Federal investment for States and localities to develop and implement comprehensive literacy plans for children from birth through the 12th grade.

Madam Speaker, I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting the LEARN Act in order to help ensure today's students are prepared to lead the workforce of the future and to keep our Nation at the forefront of the global economy.

□ 1230

IN RECOGNITION OF JEB HARMON

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

Mr. GOSAR. Madam Speaker, joining me off the House floor today is Jeb Harmon, a dedicated staffer of mine for almost 2 years.

Jeb embodies the spirit, work ethic, and patriotism we need from young adults who will one day lead our Nation. He has worked tirelessly first as an intern and then as a valued member of my communications team, helping to keep my constituents updated on my actions in D.C. and at home.

Jeb isn't a future leader. Jeb is a leader today. In just a few weeks, Jeb will leave my office to go to law school. Though he will be missed, I am incredibly proud of him.

For Jeb and for all students reaching their own American Dream, we must keep the burden of student loan debt from being cost prohibitive.

MILITARY SEXUAL ASSAULT

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

Ms. GABBARD. Mr. Speaker, yesterday in the Senate, we heard some great news. Senators RAND PAUL and TED CRUZ joined Senator KIRSTEN GILLIBRAND and many others in support of the Military Justice Improvement Act.

This is a group of courageous leaders, bipartisan, taking serious action to stop the epidemic of violent sexual assaults amongst our men and women who courageously serve in our military.

Recently, the Defense Department reported that 26,000 sexual assaults had occurred in 2012 alone. Contrary to popular belief, this is not just an issue affecting female servicemembers. Over 53 percent of these assaults, over half of the 26,000, had been male victims. Unfortunately, 87 percent of these assaults went unreported.

This is a matter of basic fairness, transparency, and justice. Placing the decision to bring charges against these perpetrators of serious violent crimes into the hands of experienced professional military investigators and prosecutors outside of the chain of command will not erode a commander's ability to lead his or her troops.

We must change the status quo. These crimes have been ignored for far too long.

OBAMACARE IS A BAD LAW

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

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, the President announced that his administration plans to ignore ObamaCare's employer mandate for 1 year, exempting businesses from its harmful side effects.

The White House scrambling is to be expected. ObamaCare is a bad law. But it's a bad law the President asked for; and it's a bad law he, as mastermind and chief enforcer, must obey, unless Congress authorizes a change.

It's no secret to anyone that House Republicans see ObamaCare for the broken law it is. We don't want any American to suffer under its weight. We voted nearly 40 times to delay, dismantle, or repeal the law, and we'll vote again to delay the implementation of ObamaCare's onerous employer mandate today.

But we aren't stopping there. If businesses are getting a break from the President's law, individual Americans should, too.

Attempting to justify selective enforcement is beyond rationality. Delaying the individual mandate tax is a matter of basic fairness.

PATIENT PROTECTION AND AFFORDABLE CARE ACT

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

Ms. HANABUSA. Mr. Speaker, 38 times? How many times will we vote to repeal or take away patient protection from families and to undermine the middle class? It makes no sense.

Look at what we know:

The United States Supreme Court said the PPACA is constitutional;

Millions have already benefited;

One hundred million cannot have lifetime limits placed upon their health care;

By January 2014, 129 million cannot be denied coverage due to a preexisting condition;

By 2020, there will be no doughnut hole, and already 6.3 million seniors save $6.1 billion on prescription drugs;

Women cannot be discriminated against by 2014; last year alone, 90 percent of the best-selling plans still charged women more; and

Seventeen million children are now protected from being denied coverage due to a preexisting condition.

Mr. Speaker, really, 38 times? Why? It makes no common sense.

OBAMACARE WILL DESTROY THE VERY HEALTH AND WELL-BEING OF WORKERS

(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, here it is, Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act, section 1513, page 159, paragraph D, Effective Date. This is the section that deals with the so-called ''employer responsibility,'' what we call the ''employer mandate,'' the effective date as defined in law:

The amendments made by this section shall apply to the months beginning after December 31, 2013.

Mr. Speaker, I'd like to bring the House's attention to a letter that was submitted to Leader PELOSI and Leader REID by leaders of some of our country's labor unions. This is from James Hoffa from the Teamsters Union.

Since the Affordable Care Act was enacted, we have been bringing our deep concerns to the administration seeking reasonable regulatory interpretations to the statute that would help prevent the destruction of nonprofit health plans. As you both know firsthand, our persuasive arguments have been disregarded and met with a stone wall by the White House and the pertinent agencies. This is especially stinging because other stakeholders have repeatedly received successful interpretations for their respective grievances. Most disconcerting of course is last week's huge accommodation for the employer community—extending the statutorily mandated December 31, 2013, deadline for the employer mandate and penalties.

BEDFORD MEMORIAL ELEMENTARY

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

Ms. SHEA-PORTER. Mr. Speaker, I recently had the pleasure of visiting New Hampshire's Bedford Memorial Elementary School to congratulate the school community for their recognition as a National Blue Ribbon School.

Bedford Memorial Elementary educates children from preschool through the fourth grade, and the school is dedicated to each student's academic, emotional, and physical development. The teachers' and staff's attention to every single child and every single detail was obvious from the moment I entered the school. The young students at the schoolwide ceremony I attended were some of the best behaved children I have ever seen, and it was clear that the teachers and the administration celebrated children and were dedicated to their wellness and their education.

At the ceremony, the school recognized the children, the leaders who had worked throughout the year to help other students get along. They also sang, and they danced a very happy and spirited dance that helped showcase their arts and their holistic approach to education.

The ceremony served as a testimony to the tremendous leadership of the principal and the staff and the school board and, most importantly, the parents.

The Department of Education's Blue Ribbon School Award is exactly the kind of positive recognition that helps our best available schools and shows others what is possible in every school for every child.

Congratulations to them.

THE CENTENNIAL ANNIVERSARY OF DELTA SIGMA THETA SORORITY

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

Mr. COHEN. I rise today to honor the great contributions of Delta Sigma Theta Sorority, which is celebrating its 100th anniversary here in Washington, D.C., this week.

Founded in 1913, on the campus of Howard University, Delta Sigma Theta is committed to sisterhood, scholarship, and service. It's the largest African American women's organization in the country, and provides assistance and support to communities throughout the world.

Delta has played an important part in civil rights and women's rights, and even in 1913, just after its founding, marched in the women's suffrage march. That was its first activity.

For a century, Delta members have been at the forefront of politics, medicine, law, the arts, military, and faith. Esteemed members of Delta include civil rights heroine and Presidential Medal of Freedom recipient, the late Dorothy Height, and two of my heroines, Congresspeople Barbara Jordan and Shirley Chisholm. And in the arts, Ruby Dee Davis, Cicely Tyson, and Lena Horne.

Delta's storied history also includes the accomplishments of many women from my hometown, Memphis: Mary Church Terrell, Representative Johnnie Turner, Speaker Pro Tempore Lois DeBerry, the late and great civil rights leader Maxine Smith, National Civil Rights Museum Director Beverly Robertson, and Olympic Gold Medalist Rochelle Stevens.

I salute both the Memphis and Shelby County alumnae chapters and the thousands of Deltas who are currently in our Nation's Capital to celebrate their first 100 years. I thank them for their service, and wish them many more.

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. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 300 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 300

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider in the House the bill (H.R. 2668) to delay the application of the individual health insurance mandate. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. The bill shall be considered as read. All points of order against provisions in the bill are waived. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and on any amendment thereto to final passage without intervening motion except: (1) one hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Ways and Means; and (2) one motion to recommit.

SEC. 2. Upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider in the House the bill (H.R. 2667) to delay the application of the employer health insurance mandate, and for other purposes. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. The bill shall be considered as read. All points of order against provisions in the bill are waived. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and on any amendment thereto to final passage without intervening motion except: (1) one hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Ways and Means; and (2) one motion to recommit.

SEC. 3. (a) In the engrossment of H.R. 2668, the Clerk shall—

(1) add the text of H.R. 2667, as passed by the House, as new matter at the end of H.R. 2668;

(2) conform the title of H.R. 2668 to reflect the addition of the text of H.R. 2667, as passed by the House, to the engrossment;

(3) assign appropriate designations to provisions within the engrossment; and

(4) conform cross-references and provisions for short titles within the engrossment.

(b) Upon the addition of the text of H.R. 2667, as passed by the House, to the engrossment of H.R. 2668, H.R. 2667 shall be laid on the table.

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

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

GENERAL LEAVE

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 300 provides for consideration of two closely related bills, H.R. 2667, the Authority for Mandate Delay, and H.R. 2668, the Fairness for American Families Act. The rule provides for 1 hour of general debate for each bill, controlled by the Committee on Ways and Means. Further, the minority will be offered a motion to recommit on each bill. Because the issues before us in these two bills are so closely linked, the rule provides that, upon passage, the Clerk will merge the text

of both bills into a single measure to send to the Senate.

Mr. Speaker, we're here today because the President has decided that he alone, without consultation, without advice, consent, or even notice to the United States Congress, has the sole authority to decide which laws he will and which laws he will not enforce. The President has done this with regard to immigration laws; he has done this with regard to duly enacted marriage laws; and now, in an act of too true hubris, he has done this with respect to his own signature issue, the President's health care law.

In a July 2, 2013, blog post—a blog post; not a letter, not a phone call, not a press conference, not even a press release, but a blog post—the President announced three significant changes to his health care law that we have been assured over and over is perfect, it's on track, it's on schedule, we will be ready. But this announcement, posted just before the July 4th holiday, 6 p.m. eastern time, on July 2, when the administration knew that everyone in the country was preparing to celebrate this country's independence, spending time with their families, everyone's attention was diverted so they did not notice that two major provisions to the President's signature piece of legislation were being postponed:

First, the requirement that employers report data to the Internal Revenue Service are postponed for a year;

Second, the requirement that large employers offer coverage to full-time workers or pay a penalty. Large employers are defined as having 50 or more full-time equivalent workers. Well, that's postponed; and

Third, the requirement that coverage offered by large companies be not more than 9.5 percent of an employee's pay for his or her individual coverage.

With the President's supporters chanting they can't wait any longer for the benefits of the health care law to go into effect, the President has responded and told them, ''Just wait.''

In showing that the House Republicans and the President can, in fact, come together and agree upon an issue, Mr. GRIFFIN from Arkansas introduced H.R. 2667, the Authority for Mandate Delay Act, providing the President with the statutory authority that he has already usurped and codifying the President's announcement.

□ 1245

Although Republicans have long held that all provisions in the health care bill should be delayed—delayed permanently—we can at least come together when we are on the same page as the President and support his efforts by passing his announcement into law.

However, while he's giving a pass to employers by not requiring them to offer health care coverage next year, he is giving no such pass to individual citizens. The individual mandate and other elements of the Affordable Care Act remain unchanged. Republicans believe providing relief to businesses while denying that same relief to individuals is inherently unfair.

For this reason, Representative TODD YOUNG from Indiana has introduced H.R. 2668, the Fairness for American Families Act. This bill would provide the same relief to individuals and families that the President has provided to business owners. It is the fair thing to do. It is the right thing to do.

The President has justified his postponement of the employer mandate by pointing out that the regulations surrounding the mandate are just so very complicated, businesses will need at least one more year to comply. And, quite frankly, his administration will need at least one more year to put the regulations into place. This is the same argument that could be used for the individual mandate. I am highly skeptical, as are many of my colleagues on both sides of the aisle, that this administration will be able to have the exchanges and the insurance programs up and running.

Remember, open enrollment starts in just a few weeks, October 1 of this year, a prerequisite for the individual mandate to be able to be implemented. Although officials from the administration repeatedly claim they are on track to implement this law and meet its deadlines, the employer mandate postponement shows that the train, in fact, is not coming off the rails, it's already off the rails with regard to implementation.

On October 1, navigating the exchanges will be a nightmare for our constituents, and yet the administration has turned its back on giving them any relief from their law. Even the law's original proponents are beginning to become more vocal about the law's unintended consequences and negative effects on Americans' lives. In a letter sent to NANCY PELOSI and Leader REID last Friday, three major unions wrote:

> When you and the President sought our support for the Affordable Care Act, you pledged that if we liked the health plans we have now, we could keep them. Sadly, that promise is under threat. Right now, unless you and the Obama administration enact an equitable fix, the Affordable Care Act will shatter not only our hard-earned benefits, but destroy the foundation of the 40-hour workweek that is the backbone of the American middle class.

After detailing in the letter how Democrats have repeatedly ignored the unions' pleas to fix this ill-conceived bill, the letter concludes:

> Time is running out: Congress wrote this law; we voted for you. We have a problem; you need to fix it. The unintended consequences of the Affordable Care Act are severe. Perverse incentives are already creating nightmare scenarios.

Mr. Speaker, I hope that the Democrats will join Republicans today and, quite frankly, follow the President's lead and postpone this law. What's good for business should be good for the American people. Republicans have sided with the American people on this issue time and again. The American people do not want this law to be implemented as its written, and we're here today to see that it is not. I am encouraging my colleagues to vote ''yes'' on the rule and ''yes'' on the two underlying bills.

With that, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank my friend for yielding me the customary 30 minutes, and I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I feel as though I could give the same speech today that I have delivered repeatedly in the Rules Committee and on the House floor for the past 3 years. Despite failing 37 times before, the majority is trying the 38th and 39th time today to repeal, defund, or otherwise undermine the Affordable Care Act.

However, unlike past votes, today's attempt to undermine the law occurs on the very same day that my home State of New York delivered incredible news to New York families. Today we learned that, thanks to the Affordable Care Act, health insurance premiums for many of my fellow New Yorkers will be reduced by 50 percent or more. In my district alone, 56,330 persons will be eligible to access those savings through New York's new health insurance exchange.

New York is just the latest in a growing number of States finding the same thing—including Oregon, California, and Washington—where the cost of health care premiums are being reduced because of the Affordable Care Act.

As The New York Times reported this morning, some low-income individuals in New York could see their premiums go from $1,000 a month to as low as $308 a month, and subsidies provided for lower-income persons through the Affordable Care Act will drive those premiums even lower. Believe me when I tell you that New York does not want to be relieved of the burden of the Affordable Care Act. For many of them, it will be the first time in their lives they've been able to afford it.

This is incredibly good news for millions of people in New York and a realization of the law's promise to provide more affordable health care.

Among other accomplishments, the Affordable Care Act is increasing competition in New York because 17 insurers have been approved to participate in the individual insurance marketplace. That competition, again, Mr. Speaker, as all of us know, is what helps to bring down the cost. And that is working. Meanwhile, on top of that, as we know the Affordable Care Act requires all insurance companies to spend 80 cents of your premium dollar on your health care, we know that will even add to the tumbling costs.

And perhaps most importantly, the individual mandate included in the Affordable Care Act will soon take effect, driving down costs even more. Given

this fact alone, it is the height of irresponsibility and nihilistic obstruction for the majority to attempt to delay its implementation one more time. Delaying the individual mandate would undermine the very foundation of the Affordable Care Act and cause health care premiums to skyrocket. In fact, the Urban Institute has estimated that without the individual mandate, an extra 13.8 million people would go without insurance because of the cost.

Everyone from doctors to health insurance companies knows this fact. And, indeed, they are working together in New York to implement this act. That's why organizations such as the American Academy of Family Physicians, the American Heart Association, and the American Diabetes Association are opposing the majority's proposal today.

In a letter to Congress, the American Academy of Family Physicians recently wrote that the individual mandate ''is the foundation of improving access to care and vital to ensuring that everyone has health insurance coverage. For that reason, the American Academy of Family Physicians supports the health coverage requirement for individuals'' and urges that we get on with the program.

Mr. Speaker, the fact of the matter is the majority's proposal is nothing more than an attempt to score cheap political points. As has been the case for the last 3 years, the Senate will not take up this bill, and everybody here knows that. And even if they did by some strange quirk of fate pass it, the President would veto it. He's said so already. So we're spending another week of legislative business doing another meaningless piece of legislation that we know will not go anywhere.

We should be rejoicing, Mr. Speaker, about the things that are coming in from States that have already set up their exchanges about the money that is being saved and the many, many more people being insured. I've said many times before the estimated cost of running the House of Representatives is $24 million a week. Of all people, the Members of the majority who claim to care so dearly for stopping wasteful spending should be objecting to a legislative agenda that holds a variation of the same go-nowhere bill for 39 times.

Bridges are collapsing. Our economic growth is anemic. Millions of Americans are unemployed, and if the farm bill passed here last week were to become law, they would not only be unemployed, they would not be allowed to get food stamps to help them feed their families.

Meanwhile, sequestration is closing Head Start programs, furloughing working moms and dads, and cutting programs that serve vulnerable populations such as our Indian populations living on reservations who are hit extremely hard by sequestration.

Yet instead of addressing any of these issues, the majority continues to play this game. Such a self-serving political pursuit is a shameful mark on the history of this Chamber and our democracy.

Etched above the Speaker's rostrum is a quote from Daniel Webster that speaks to the need to end the political games and to focus on issues that are important to the American people. In part, those words read:

> Let us see whether we also in our day and generation may not perform something worthy to be remembered.

In 2010, I was proud to play a central role in the passage of the Affordable Care Act. I faced a lot of vitriol because of it. In the darkest moments, my district office was vandalized and the lives of my grandchildren were threatened. Yet I remained dedicated to passing the law because at the time health care costs were approaching 20 percent of our Nation's GDP, and an unconscionable number of Americans were being denied basic health care because of the cost of preexisting conditions. And in eight States in this United States and the District of Columbia, violence against women, domestic violence, was considered a preexisting condition. No more.

Before voting on the legislation, the Democratic Caucus read the bill three times line by line. By the time it was signed into law, it was clear this legislation would deliver on the promise of secure and affordable care for millions who had been denied health care for far too long.

Looking back at that moment in time, it is my belief that the law we produced will go down in history, as Webster says, as ''something worthy to be remembered.''

Already, thanks to the Affordable Care Act, seniors have begun receiving free preventive screenings and subsidies to cover the cost of prescription medicines when they fall in the doughnut hole. In a few years, the doughnut hole will be completely closed.

In addition, children under the age of 26 are now protected under their parent's insurance coverage while they find their first job and start a life of their own. Finally, prior to passage of the Affordable Care Act, in eight States, disgracefully, domestic violence was considered a preexisting condition. Those policies are now outlawed. And soon, no health insurance plan in the country will be allowed to deny an individual coverage because of a preexisting condition, and women will no longer have to pay a higher price for their insurance than men simply because of their gender.

All of this incredible progress is because of the Affordable Care Act. So while repealing the mandate may serve the narrow political interests of the majority, it is a dangerous proposition for the health and wellbeing of American families. Americans deserve a Congress focused on solutions, not a 39th attempt to rehash debates of the past.

Mr. Speaker, as we debate yet another go-nowhere attempt to undermine the Affordable Care Act, I urge the majority to read the words above the Speaker's rostrum and put an end to their tired political games. It is past time for us to get to work on meaningful legislation to help the American people.

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

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, at this time I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. KLINE), the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

Mr. KLINE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of the rule and the underlying legislation.

As the attention of the American people turned to celebrating the July 4th holiday, the Obama administration quietly announced through a blog post on the Treasury Department's Web site it would delay enforcement of a vital part of the President's health care law—the employer mandate.

The reason for the delay? According to administration officials, the Federal bureaucracy needs more time to get it right. Let's be honest: no amount of time or bureaucratic tinkering will ease the pain ObamaCare is inflicting on workplaces across the country. The employer mandate will destroy jobs, whether it's implemented a year from now or 10 years from now. In fact, Mr. Speaker, jobs are already being lost and employees' work hours are being cut today because of the law.

That's the difficult reality facing workers and job creators from my home State of Minnesota and across the country.

□ 1300

It's part of the reason we are stuck in a jobs crisis with 12 million Americans searching for full-time work. Even union leaders are beginning to realize how the health care law they supported is hurting workers.

And the quote from my colleague, Mr. BURGESS, laid that out very clearly. They were promised, as all Americans were promised, if they liked their health care, they could keep it; and they're finding out that's simply not true.

The delay of the employer mandate is the latest confirmation of the fatally flawed nature of ObamaCare and the need to dismantle it. That is why I support the proposal to delay the employer mandate for 1 year, as well as a bill the House will also consider today to delay enforcement of the individual mandate.

In less than a year, individuals who fail to purchase government-approved health insurance will be forced to pay higher taxes. It isn't right, Mr. Speaker, to deny American families the same relief available to American businesses.

The American people didn't ask for this government takeover of health

care, and they don't want it. Let's give every family and business the reprieve from ObamaCare they deserve.

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

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, before I yield time, I'd like to insert in the RECORD the article from The New York Times this morning entitled ''Health Plan Cost For New Yorkers Set to Fall 50 Percent.''

[The New York Times, Jul. 16, 2013]

HEALTH PLAN COST FOR NEW YORKERS SET TO FALL 50%

(By Roni Caryn Rabin and Reed Abelson)

Individuals buying health insurance on their own will see their premiums tumble next year in New York State as changes under the federal health care law take effect, Gov. Andrew M. Cuomo announced on Wednesday.

State insurance regulators say they have approved rates for 2014 that are at least 50 percent lower on average than those currently available in New York. Beginning in October, individuals in New York City who now pay $1,000 a month or more for coverage will be able to shop for health insurance for as little as $308 monthly. With federal subsidies, the cost will be even lower.

Supporters of the new health care law, the Affordable Care Act, credited the drop in rates to the online purchasing exchanges the law created, which they say are spurring competition among insurers that are anticipating an influx of new customers. The law requires that an exchange be started in every state.

''Health insurance has suddenly become affordable in New York,'' said Elisabeth Benjamin, vice president for health initiatives with the Community Service Society of New York. ''It's not bargain-basement prices, but we're going from Bergdorf's to Filene's here.''

''The extraordinary decline in New York's insurance rates for individual consumers demonstrates the profound promise of the Affordable Care Act,'' she added.

Administration officials, long confronted by Republicans and other critics of President Obama's signature law, were quick to add New York to the list of states that appear to be successfully carrying out the law and setting up exchanges.

''We're seeing in New York what we've seen in other states like California and Oregon—that competition and transparency in the marketplaces are leading to affordable and new choices for families,'' said Joanne Peters, a spokeswoman for the Department of Health and Human Services.

The new premium rates do not affect a majority of New Yorkers, who receive insurance through their employers, only those who must purchase it on their own. Because the cost of individual coverage has soared, only 17,000 New Yorkers currently buy insurance on their own. About 2.6 million are uninsured in New York State.

State officials estimate as many as 615,000 individuals will buy health insurance on their own in the first few years the health law is in effect. In addition to lower premiums, about three-quarters of those people will be eligible for the subsidies available to lower-income individuals.

''New York's health benefits exchange will offer the type of real competition that helps drive down health insurance costs for consumers and businesses,'' said Mr. Cuomo.

The plans to be offered on the exchanges all meet certain basic requirements, as laid out in the law, but are in four categories from most generous to least: platinum, gold, silver and bronze. An individual with annual income of $17,000 will pay about $55 a month for a silver plan, state regulators said. A person with a $20,000 income will pay about $85 a month for a silver plan, while someone earning $25,000 will pay about $145 a month for a silver plan.

The least expensive plans, some offered by newcomers to the market, may not offer wide access to hospitals and doctors, experts said.

While the rates will fall over all, apples-to-apples comparisons are impossible from this year to next because all of the plans are essentially new insurance products.

The rates for small businesses, which are considerably lower than for individuals, will not fall as precipitously. But small businesses will be eligible for tax credits, and the exchanges will make it easier for them to select a plan. Roughly 15,000 plans are available today to small businesses, and choosing among them is particularly challenging.

''Where New York previously had a dizzying array of thousands upon thousands of plans, small businesses will now be able to truly comparison-shop for the best prices,'' said Benjamin M. Lawsky, the state's top financial regulator.

Officials at the state Department of Financial Services say they have approved 17 insurers to sell individual coverage through the New York exchange, including eight that are just entering the state's commercial market. Many of these are insurers specializing in Medicaid plans that cater to low-income individuals.

North Shore-LIJ Health System, the large hospital system on Long Island, intends to offer a health plan for individuals as well as businesses for the first time. Some of the state's best-known insurers, UnitedHealth Group and WellPoint, are also expected to participate. Insurers may decline to participate after they receive approval for their rates, but this is unlikely.

For years, New York has represented much that can go wrong with insurance markets. The state required insurers to cover everyone regardless of pre-existing conditions, but did not require everyone to purchase insurance—a feature of the new health care law—and did not offer generous subsidies so people could afford coverage.

With no ability to persuade the young and the healthy to buy policies, the state's premiums have long been among the highest in the nation. ''If there was any state that the A.C.A. could bring rates down, it was New York,'' said Timothy Jost, a law professor at Washington and Lee University who closely follows the federal law.

Mr. Jost and other policy experts say the new health exchanges appear to be creating sufficient competition, particularly in states that have embraced the exchanges and are trying to create a marketplace that allows consumers to shop easily.

''That's a very different dynamic for these companies, and it's prodding them to be more aggressive and competitive in their pricing,'' said Sabrina Corlette, a professor at Georgetown University's Center on Health Insurance Reform.

But some consumers may still find the prices and plans disappointing. Jerry Ball, 46, who owns a recycling business in Queens, said the cost of covering his family increased so rapidly in the last few years that he had to scale back their coverage. Still, he pays nearly $18,000 a year for a high-deductible policy for a family of three.

He said he would be reluctant to part ways with his insurer, Oxford, and was disappointed that even the least expensive Oxford plan being offered next year would cost about as much as he pays now.

With another plan, he said: ''Will I be able to maintain my doctors? I'm concerned that some of the better doctors aren't going to take health insurance.''

He acknowledged that the new law would allow him for the first time to easily switch plans, but it is still hard for him to believe it guarantees coverage for pre-existing conditions. ''I have to be careful. I can't be denied coverage, right?'' he asked.

I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. COURTNEY).

Mr. COURTNEY. Mr. Speaker, the premise of H.R. 2667, the employer mandate bill, which is part of the rule here today, is that somehow the administration overreached by announcing this postponement of the employer tax measure which was part of the Affordable Care Act.

The fact of the matter is, if the proponents had picked up the phone and called the Congressional Research Service and asked them if the IRS has postponed imposition of statutorily required requirements, the fact of the matter, they would have found out what I hold in my hand, which is a memo that was issued today that cites four examples, just within the last 2 or 3 years, where the IRS delayed statutory reporting requirements because of the fact that comments from private sector voices around the country warned that it needed more time to be implemented.

The 2006 law imposing a 3 percent withholding requirement effective December 31, 2010, was delayed till 2012. The 2009 Worker Home Ownership and Business Assistance Act was delayed for a year for a statutory electronic filing requirement.

The Foreign Account Tax Compliance Withholding Act was postponed 2 years, again, because of a comment that came in from the private sector.

And the FAA law, which was passed in 2011, which had a retroactive collection of excise tax, that was waived by the IRS, again, because of the fact that, after passage of the act, they listened to the American people and to the American business community about the fact that there were some honest-to-God logistical issues that needed to be worked out.

That's exactly what was announced right before the July 4 weekend.

Mr. Speaker, I would ask that this Congressional Research Service memo be admitted to the RECORD so that we at least have some reality basis about what exactly occurred here. This is totally within the IRS's province of authority, with well-established precedent.

The fact of the matter is that this vote is a nullity. It does nothing as a matter of law. CBO has scored it as zero. So the fact of the matter is we're just filling up more time here.

The fact is that we've got people all over this country whose paychecks are being furloughed because of inaction by this Congress.

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

Ms. SLAUGHTER. I yield the gentleman another minute.

Mr. COURTNEY. Because of inaction of this Congress, people are losing 20

percent of their paycheck. That's what's hurting the American economy right now.

We have a bipartisan immigration bill which cleared the Senate which we know, from CBO, would actually reduce the deficit and grow the economy. That's what we should be voting on.

We had a bipartisan farm bill which passed the Senate which, again, provides a real horizon for rural America. That's what we should be voting on.

Instead, we are filling this Chamber up with more of the tired rhetoric for a bill that does absolutely nothing and which the Congressional Research Service shows us is completely, totally outside of well-established precedent of American law.

CONGRESSIONAL RESEARCH SERVICE,
Washington, DC, July 16, 2013.

MEMORANDUM

To: Honorable Joe Courtney—Attention: Maija Welton

From: Erika K. Lunder, Legislative Attorney; Carol A. Pettit, Legislative Attorney

Subject: Recent Examples of IRS Postponement of Statutory Effective Dates

This memorandum responds to your request for examples of instances in which the Internal Revenue Service (IRS) has postponed statutorily imposed effective dates. This memorandum does not discuss the July 2013 announcement by the Obama Administration to delay implementation of the employer reporting responsibility requirements in the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act. Four recent examples where the Treasury Department, through IRS, has postponed statutorily imposed effective dates are detailed in this memorandum.

1. The IRS postponed the effective date for a requirement that federal and state governments, along with their political subdivisions and instrumentalities, withhold 3% of payments to persons providing property or services. The 2006 law imposing the requirement stated the withholding provision ''shall apply to payments made after December 31, 2010.'' In 2008, the IRS issued proposed regulations that would ''generally be effective for payments made after the later of December 31, 2010, or the date that is 6 months after the publication of final regulations.'' In 2009, and prior to the regulations being finalized, Congress extended the effective date in the original Act, from December 31, 2010, to December 31, 2011. In May 2011, the IRS issued final regulations, which provided that the withholding requirements would ''apply to payments made after December 31, 2012.'' The IRS explained the reasons for the postponed effective date:

Numerous commenters indicated that an extended period of time following the issuance of final regulations would be necessary for government entities to adopt the systems and processes necessary to comply with the §3402(t) withholding and related reporting requirements. Noting the necessity to formulate government acquisition rules that are consistent with the final regulations, as well as the infrastructure needed to apply those rules, some commenters stated that government entities would need at least 18 months from the issuance of final regulations under section 3402(t) to be able to comply.

In response to these practical considerations, the final regulations provide that the withholding and reporting requirements under these regulations apply to payments made after December 31, 2012, subject to an existing contract exception . . . With respect to payments before January 1, 2013, government entities are not required to apply section 3402(t) withholding and the related reporting, and accordingly will not be subject to any liability, penalties or interest for failure to do so.

In November 2011, Congress repealed the 3% withholding requirement, so it never went into effect.

2. The IRS provided a transitional period for the electronic filing mandate enacted by the Worker, Homeownership, and Business Assistance Act of 2009. As a result, the effective date of the provision was postponed for one year for preparers who anticipated filing more than 10 but fewer than 100 returns during calendar year 2011.

As enacted, the provision generally required that tax return preparers who anticipated filing more than 10 individual tax returns during a calendar year must file those returns on magnetic media. The requirement was statutorily effective for returns filed after December 31, 2010. However, on December 2, 2010, the IRS issued both a notice and proposed regulation postponing the electronic filing mandate for those otherwise affected preparers who anticipated filing fewer than 100 individual tax returns. Those preparers generally would only be required to electronically file returns that they filed after December 31, 2011. The reason given for the transition period was ''to promote the effective and efficient administration of the electronic filing requirement in section 6011(e)(3).'' The final regulation basically adopted the proposed regulation and was effective March 30, 2011.

3. The IRS has extended various deadlines under the Foreign Account Tax Compliance Act (FATCA). FATCA imposes reporting, withholding, and other requirements on certain foreign financial institutions (FFIs) and payments. The 2010 law enacting FATCA provides that, in general, ''the amendments made by this section shall apply to payments made after December 31. 2012.'' In July 2011, the IRS released a notice that provided a timeline for implementing some of the Act's requirements. For example, the notice provided that certain reporting requirements would start in 2014, and that the withholding requirements would begin on January 1, 2014, and be fully phased in on January 1, 2015. The notice explained the reasons for the phased-in implementation:

Treasury and the IRS have received numerous comments concerning the practical difficulties in implementing aspects of the Chapter 4 rules within the time frames provided in the Act and under Notice 2010–60 and Notice 2011–34. The challenges identified relate to the time to develop compliance, reporting, and withholding systems necessary to comply with Chapter 4 and the implementing notices. In addition, a number of stakeholders have noted that complying with certain provisions may require coordination with a number of foreign governments. Treasury and the IRS have met with stakeholders and foreign governments to understand the specific administrative and legal challenges that must be addressed and the time necessary to do so. While the Act provides that the provisions of Chapter 4 are effective beginning in 2013, Treasury and the IRS have determined that because Chapter 4 creates the need for significant modifications to the information management systems of FFIs, withholding agents, and the IRS, it is reasonable for regulations to provide for a phased implementation of the various provisions of Chapter 4.

The IRS subsequently issued proposed regulations in February 2012, and in October 2012 released an announcement that extended an additional deadline, citing to practical concerns with the proposed regulations' time frames. The announcement explained that:

The Treasury Department and the IRS have received comments identifying certain practical issues in implementing the chapter 4 rules within the time frames prescribed in the proposed regulations. In particular, comments have noted that the chapter 4 status of entity account holders may change during 2013 as FFIs enter into FFI agreements with the IRS, with the result that withholding agents that put in place new account opening procedures by January 1, 2013, could be required to undertake duplicative efforts to verify an FFI's status as a participating, deemed-compliant, or nonparticipating FFI. Furthermore, comments have indicated that global financial institutions intend to implement uniform due diligence procedures for all affiliates. Accordingly, these comments have suggested aligning the timelines for due diligence for U.S. withholding agents, FFIs in countries with Intergovernmental Agreements, and FF Is in countries without Intergovernmental Agreements in order to significantly reduce administrative burden.

On July 13, 2013, the IRS issued another notice, which extended the effective date for withholding on some payments to July 1, 2014.

4. The IRS extended the effective date of legislation that had provided for retroactive application of several aviation-related taxes. On July 23, 2011, the federal excise taxes on amounts paid for air transportation of people and property expired, and the tax rates on aviation fuel and gasoline were reduced. The Airport and Airway Extension Act of 2011, enacted into law on August 5, 2011, extended the two taxes and the prior rates, retroactive back to July 23, 2011. On August 5, 2011, the IRS announced that it would not require the payment or collection of the two air transportation taxes until August 8, 2011, due to the administrative burden that would arise from requiring payment and collection on past purchases, and would provide penalty relief for taxpayers paying the fuel taxes until that same day.

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, I yield as much time as he may consume to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. SESSIONS), the distinguished chairman of the Rules Committee.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman, the member of the Rules Committee, Dr. MICHAEL BURGESS, from Lewisville, Texas. Dr. BURGESS is a brand-new member of the Rules Committee and came to the Rules Committee because of his understanding, not just of medicine and health care as a doctor and a provider for many, many years, but also because of his grasp of knowledge of this health care bill which is an enormous bill, which, while we are talking about the economic consequences primarily today on the marketplace where this bill is causing employers to not hire more employees, is causing more employers to take to part-time worker status their employees because of the extreme ramifications of this, what was called Affordable Care Act, known as the ObamaCare Act.

And today we are here for the simple purpose to say what the President of the United States has now recognized, without comment, and done, not just in the middle of the night on a Web site, but even done on a weekend, and

I believe when the President potentially was out of the country.

We're now dealing with the United States Congress speaking our viewpoints about that bill. And the gentleman, Dr. BURGESS, is going to consume time today where he's going to talk about also the problems that physicians have, that patients have, that we look at from a family perspective of trying to make sure we get health care in an affordable way without ruining it.

But today I'd like to focus, if I can, my comments on that it's not a surprise that we have a problem. It's not a surprise that we have a problem with this ObamaCare, or is known as the Affordable Care Act, not just because of the concept that it is, and not just because of how it was run through this Congress, but really, the concept that the Democrats are trying to overlay on the American people a system of government-controlled health care that does not work.

It does not work and will not work in America because America has a vibrant free-enterprise system whereby a person, whether they're an employer or an employee or just as a regular citizen, could contract to get the health care that they would choose to have.

And the reason why health care has become more expensive is that the Federal Government does not pay their fair share for Medicare or Medicaid. This United States Congress does not adequately pay their fair share for our seniors or for poor people, and so what happens is it's taken out on people that work. It is showing up in their cost of health care.

So rather than trying to fix their problem and their responsibility, what President Obama and Democrats did is stick it, more of it, the cost, and a system on the American worker, rather than living up to their responsibility.

And we are here today because the President of the United States got worried because he's hearing so many people come back and say this won't work in America; this is harming job creation; this is harming businesses that want to employ people, and it's causing a huge distortion in the marketplace.

So what the President did, literally, without comment, except on a Web site, he said, we will back off this for 1 year.

Now, we heard testimony last night at the Rules Committee, everything is okay. Everything is okay. We just are trying to hear feedback from business, and we're going to back off for a year.

That's not really the case. The facts of the case are that this administration, from top to bottom, has failed to provide information to the American people and to business about how they intended for their socialist, government-run plan to work. And they have not provided leadership for 3 years. They've not answered questions. They've not made decisions. They've not been open about how it would really work.

So business has the problem of a legal side. They have a legal responsibility.

Now, you won't have the White House come out and admit this, but they have failed to do their job. And so business has a legal requirement on them of providing notice. They have notice that they have to provide to consumers under State laws and under Federal law.

The facts of the case are they couldn't figure it out because they did not know enough about how this government-run health care system would work. They didn't understand legal consequences. They don't understand reporting consequences. They don't understand consequences because this government is so big and so powerful that they control too much of our life.

Now, in this equation, we also see where a number of unions have now let their opinion be known, and they are directly on the side of this bill today because now they have learned more about this bill, and they are worried. They're worried sick about not just the health care for their members, but how it will individually affect their own families' lives.

The facts of the case are simple. The Democrat Party here is trying to do everything they can do to cover up what is a monster mistake, an inability by the Obama administration to effectively lead on a government-run health care system.

Their only back-up point is to say, if you do this, you're going to put everything in jeopardy. My response is, thank goodness. It needs to be in jeopardy.

What they have done is, effectively, picked on, by doing what they've done, individuals who are not as powerful as groups of individuals collectively under business or under labor unions.

We need to look at the entire scope of this. What is bad for business is superbad for individuals. And individuals are going to find themselves at the behest of working with the IRS on their health care.

They're going to work with the IRS, an organization that is incapable of effectively delivering a fair product and rationally following the law. They think they're above the law. They think that they can control our lives, and, in fact, Mr. Speaker, they can.

So there's far more to this entire debate than simply we're trying to go against precedent of what this President has within his authorities or responsibilities or precedents. Far bigger than that.

What we're here to say today is this Obama health care plan, and his decision that he has made about not moving forward with the law, is a selective enforcement, and it's really their fault. It is their fault for a lack of leadership. It is their fault because they passed a bill that was entirely done by the United States Senate.

And we agreed up in the Rules Committee, no Republican in this House, that we would simply take it as it was, without understanding it, without making it workable and without ever understanding the consequences, because the bottom line is Democrats have been trying to do this for 50 years. And what they're really after is a single-payer system, where the government literally, completely makes every decision, not some of the decisions.

So Republicans are on the floor of the House today to say we ought to repeal the whole thing. We're going to start by this action today, and we're going to follow it up by saying we ought to give individuals the same opportunity to evade this that the President has given to special interests and to business.

It's a sad day today, but let's not twist the facts of the case. A government-run health care system is, at it's very basis, a beginning of socialism in medicine, and we oppose that.

I thank the Speaker for the time. I thank the gentleman for the time.

□ 1315

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

By happenstance, I have some figures here that will explain to my colleague and friend, Mr. SESSIONS, the chair of the Rules Committee, what will really happen in his district if he should have his way and this were to go away, and who is really going to be hurt and who really is going to be in jeopardy:

9,200 young adults right now are on their parents' health insurance in his district; more than 6,600 seniors receive prescription drug discounts worth $10.1 million, or an average discount of $700 a person; 66,000 seniors are now eligible for Medicare preventive services without paying copays, coinsurance, or a deductible; 182,000 individuals in his district, including 39,000 children and 74,000 women, now have health insurance that covers preventive services without copays, coinsurance or a deductible; 182,000 individuals are saving money due to the ACA provisions that prevent insurance companies from spending more than 20 percent of their premiums on profits and administrative overhead.

Over 46,000 customers in his district received approximately $6.5 million in insurance company rebates. That's pretty impressive—$6.5 million. I wonder how many in my district. They will receive an average rebate of at least $95 a family.

Up to 42,000 children in his district with preexisting health conditions can no longer be denied coverage, and 237,000 individuals—that's a lot of constituents—in his district now have insurance that cannot place a lifetime limit on their coverage and will not face an annual limit for what will be covered. Up to 152,000 individuals in his district who lack health insurance will have access to quality, affordable coverage without fear of discrimination or

higher rates because of a preexisting condition. In addition, the 43,000 individuals who currently purchase private health insurance on the individual or small group market will have access to a more secure, higher quality coverage. And many will be eligible for financial assistance.

I think I've made the point that those are the people who are really going to be hurt, should he get his wishes today.

I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. ANDREWS).

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

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Speaker, one of the gentlemen who spoke a few minutes ago said the facts should not be twisted. I completely agree.

Here are some facts that the House and the country should have under consideration as we debate this bill. We hear repeatedly on the other side that the Affordable Care Act is a job-killing health care law. In the months prior to the enactment of the Affordable Care Act, the economy lost 6.9 million jobs. In the months since the enactment of the Affordable Care Act, the economy has gained 6.5 million jobs. If it were true that the Affordable Care Act is a job-killing health care law, then why did the number of jobs go up and not down?

Second, we hear that the Affordable Care Act is responsible for an explosion in health care premiums. Today, the State of New York reported that the bids on offering coverage through the new New York health insurance exchange have come in. The typical New Yorker who buys health care for himself or herself will have a premium 50 percent lower than they do today.

Similar numbers have been reflected in California, Oregon, Washington, and other States around the country. If it were true that the Affordable Care Act has led to an explosion of premiums, how do we explain what has happened in New York, California, Oregon, Washington, and other States?

Finally, we hear the conclusion that this is a socialist takeover of the health care system by the government. Well, here's the way it works. A person who goes into the exchange receives a voucher, a tax credit, and shops among competing private health insurance plans and chooses the one that they like best for their family, much in the nature of a Pell Grant or an FHA loan when one is borrowing a house.

The House deserves the facts. It is not factual that jobs have gone down since the law was passed. They have gone up. It is not factual that premiums have skyrocketed. In the places where the law has been implemented, they have gone down. Finally, a government takeover is false. This is a consumer takeover of health care away from the insurance companies.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Texas has 10½ minutes remaining.

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to a member of the Education and Workforce Committee, the gentleman from Indiana, Dr. BUCSHON.

Mr. BUCSHON. Mr. Speaker, I was a practicing physician for 15 years, and I rise today to support the rule and support delaying the Affordable Care Act's employer and individual mandates. I support these delays because it's unfair to employees in my district who have suffered lost wages and lost hours at work because of these mandates:

the 54 employees in the Greencastle, Indiana, school district who had their hours cut from full time to part time;

the 150 employees in the Washington/Greene County school district who had their hours cut from full time to part time;

the Spencer County employees who saw their hours cut from 40 hours a week to 28 hours a week;

Wolfe's Auto Auction in Terre Haute, which I recently visited, that has had to cut many employees from full to part time.

There are countless other middle-class Hoosiers who are suffering across Indiana because of these mandates. They're schoolbus drivers, teachers, hospital nurses, and county government employees. Hoosiers work hard every day to provide for their families. Rather than helping them, the government is keeping them from doing it.

This administration would like everybody to believe the economy is growing and over 700,000 jobs were recently created. They failed to mention that 500,000 of those jobs were part time. It's hard to find a full-time job when the government penalizes your employer for giving you more than 30 hours of work.

We talk a lot in this body about how we need to help everyone in these difficult economic times. Yet my colleagues have supported legislation that they know has compromised the opportunity to find a good-paying job and provide for your family. But they stand here and argue that that has not been the case.

A 1-year delay to these mandates is just a Band-Aid. I'll be voting in favor of the rule and the bill. Ultimately, we need to fully repeal the Affordable Care Act.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. If we defeat the previous question, we want to offer an amendment to the rule that would allow the House to consider the Invest in American Jobs Act of 2013. This bill would ensure, at last, that Federally funded transportation and infrastructure projects are constructed with steel, iron, and manufactured goods that are made in America.

To discuss this proposal, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from West Virginia (Mr. RAHALL), the distinguished ranking member of the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

Mr. RAHALL. I appreciate the gentlewoman's kind words.

Mr. Speaker, when I go home to West Virginia each week and discuss the state of our Nation with my friends and neighbors, I hear about three things: jobs, jobs, jobs.

That's what this Congress should focus on.

We should stop the political charade of spending time on one bill after another which will not see the light of day in the other body and work together on something that Members of all political stripes should be able to agree upon: creating American jobs and ensuring that our Federal tax dollars are spent wisely.

We are here today in support of those twin goals by ensuring that the investments that we make in our Nation's transportation infrastructure truly help rebuild America—our infrastructure, our companies, and our workers.

Mr. Speaker, in just a few months' time, one of the largest publicly supported infrastructure projects in this country is scheduled to be completed with the opening of the $6.3 billion east span of the San Francisco-Oakland Bay Bridge. But instead of steel cast in the Alleghenies or roadbed segments assembled in Alameda, cars and trucks using the bridge will be driving over 43,000 tons of steel imported from China, which supported 3,000 Chinese jobs and was financed by U.S. taxpayers.

Last year, Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure Democrats insisted on closing the loopholes in our ''Buy America'' laws to prevent the continuation of this outrageous and economically harmful practice of outsourcing our Federal highway and transit construction as part of the Surface Transportation Reauthorization Act, known as MAP–21. Unfortunately, despite being passed out of committee and attracting 245 votes on the House floor as part of a motion to instruct, many provisions we pushed for that would have guaranteed strong Buy America requirements for all surface transportation infrastructure investments were left on the cutting-room floor during the conference process.

Today, we're here to finish the job and ensure that all taxpayer-funded infrastructure investments support American jobs.

If we defeat the previous question, the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. SLAUGHTER), the ranking member of the Committee on Rules, will offer an amendment that will make in order H.R. 949, the Invest in American Jobs Act of 2013, under an open rule. The bill spurs job creation and fosters domestic manufacturing. It will ensure that investments in highways, bridges, public transit and passenger rail systems, airport projects and water infrastructure projects will be stamped Made in America and crafted with American workmanship.

By closing critical loopholes in our Buy America laws and changing domestic content requirements for public transit rolling stock and aviation facilities and equipment, our bill ensures that these investments, financed by

U.S. taxpayers, will be used to create and sustain good-paying jobs in our local communities, not outsourced overseas.

Right now we have a lot of Federal transportation and infrastructure dollars in the pipeline and coming down the pike: more than $50 billion of Federal funding is being invested this year in highway and transit infrastructure projects alone. In the coming months, Congress is also expected to consider legislation to provide significant Federal investment in rail and water infrastructure.

All too often we are giving these contracts—and these high-skill jobs—away to foreign manufacturers and workers. Giving our tax dollars away to support jobs overseas is inexcusable in any instance, but is downright unconscionable when millions of Americans are looking for work.

Let's close these loopholes in our Buy America laws and unleash the American entrepreneurial spirit.

Mr. Speaker, let the House of Representatives vote on H.R. 949, the "Invest in American Jobs Act", because when we make it in America, more Americans can make it.

I urge my colleagues to join me in defeating the previous question.

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

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE) for the purpose of a unanimous consent request.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to oppose the rule and the underlying bill because it takes health care away from America's children, seniors, and others. Again, getting a sound bite for America.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to the Rule and the underlying legislation because this bill would delay the implementation of the employer mandate a key provision of the Affordable Care Act until 2014.

The House majority on May 16, 2013 placed before this body another bill in another attempt to end the Affordable Care Act also known as Obama Care. Their efforts to do anything and everything they can think of to stop millions of Americans from enjoying the security of health care enjoyed by all of my colleagues in this body is astounding. The health care we enjoy is at the taxpayer expense so we do know what a federally-supported health plan can do. 27.6% of Texans are without health care coverage.

The Department of Health and Human Services announced over $9 million in grants to fund community health centers all over the state of Texas. The funds will be used to enroll the uninsured in new health coverage options made available under the Affordable Care Act—or Obama Care Act.

The Affordable Care Act is needed and we should not pretend otherwise. The Administration announced that it would on its own allow a delay to work with the 5% of employers who are having difficulty meeting the mandate for providing health insurance for all of their employees. This means that 95% have met the obligation so the need for this change in law is not founded in fact.

In my district over the weekend, I held a press conference to congratulate Community Health Centers in the City of Houston who received part of $9 million to the State by the Department of Health and Human Services. The Grants to Community Health Centers will fund work to enroll the uninsured in new health coverage options made available under the Affordable Care Act—or Obama Care Act.

Community Health Centers are non-profit, community focused health care providers who serve low-income and medically underserved communities. Community Health Centers care for over 22 million people nationally.

In 2012, 50 million people in the United States had no health insurance coverage, with many losing insurance as a result of the recent recession.

The grants provided to Community Health Care Centers like Legacy Community Health Services located in my district will help millions of uninsured people in our nation get the medical care they need and deserve.

LIST OF COMMUNITY HEALTH CENTERS AWARDED FUNDS IN THE CITY OF HOUSTON

Fourth Ward Clinic	$124,395
El Centro Del Corazon	144,525
Houston Community Health Care	90,691
South Central Houston Community	165,755
Asian American Health Coalition of the Greater Houston Area	90,867
Spring Branch Community Health Center	108,346
Houston Area Community Services	73,981
Legacy Community Health Services	267,747
Health Care for the Homeless	104,000
Harris County Hospital District	154,326

In 2012, Texas had 67 health centers operating in 388 sites providing services to over 1 million patients. Fifty-one percent of the 1 million people cared for in my state were uninsured.

Statistics on the Affordable Care Act: Affordable Care Act Benefits to the 18th Congressional District: 11,400 young adults have insurance through their parents; 4,100 seniors received $5.4 million in discounts for prescription medication an average of $600 per person. This was a cost savings of $650 on average and so far in 2013 the savings are $1,040. 71,000 seniors are now eligible for Medicare prevention services without paying co-pays.

121,000 individuals, including 23,000 children and 50,000 women now have health insurance that prevents insurance companies from spending more than 20% of their premium dollars on profits and administrative overhead; 46,000 children with pre-existing illnesses can no longer be denied insurance; 153,000 people in my district have health insurance that has no lifetime limits on their coverage and will not face annual limits.

Up to 193,000 people in the 18th Congressional District of Houston Texas will have access to quality affordable health care without fear of discrimination or higher rates because of preexisting health conditions.

17,000 individuals who purchase insurance on the private health insurance market established for individuals or small groups will have access to more secure, higher quality coverage and many will have access to financial assistance.

National Benefit of Obama Care: 13 million Americans received $1.1 billion in rebates from their health insurance companies last year. 105 million Americans have free preventive services. Millions of women now have free coverage for comprehensive women's preventive medical services.

100 million Americans no longer have a lifetime limit on healthcare coverage. 17 million children with pre-existing conditions can no longer be denied coverage by insurers. 6.6 million young-adults up to age 26 can stay on their parents' health insurance plans.

6.3 million Seniors in the "donut hole" have saved $6.1 billion on their prescription drugs. 3.2 million Seniors have access to free annual wellness visits under Medicare, and

360,000 Small Businesses are using the Health Care Tax Credit to help them provide health insurance to their workers.

Statistics on Texas and the Affordable Care Act: 3.8 million Texas residents receive preventative care services. 7 million Texans no longer have lifetime limits on their healthcare insurance. 300,731 young adults can remain on their parents' health insurance until age 26.

5 million Texas residents can receive a rebate check from their insurance company if it does not spend 80 percent of premium dollars on healthcare. 4,029 people with pre-existing conditions now have health insurance.

In 2014, Insurance companies will be banned from: Discriminating against anyone with a preexisting condition; charging higher rates based on gender or health status; enforcing lifetime dollar limits; enforcing annual dollar limits on health benefits.

The healthcare law has many benefits. For these reasons, I urge my Colleagues to join me in voting no on the rule for this bad bill.

The House and the Senate have real work to create jobs, strengthen the food security for our most vulnerable—children, elderly, disabled and low-wage workers. We need to address immigration reform and Border Security and we should be focused on the need to pass appropriations bills that eliminate Sequestration that is strangling the financial security of millions of federal workers. Sequestration not only hurt federal workers but the local economies that no longer have the incomes provided by federal agencies to stimulate the recovery our nation is now entering.

We should be about the business of the people sent us to Washington to work in their interest.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. BISHOP), who got great news this morning.

Mr. BISHOP of New York. Mr. Speaker, we did indeed get great news in New York today with respect to how the exchanges in the Affordable Care Act will affect premiums.

I rise to oppose the rule and urge Members to defeat the previous question so that the House may consider the Invest in American Jobs Act introduced by my friend and colleague, Mr. RAHALL, the distinguished ranking member of the Transportation and Infrastructure Committee. This critically important legislation will support domestic manufacturing and create American jobs by strengthening Buy America requirements for investment in our Nation's infrastructure. I strongly support the provisions of this legislation that will permanently codify Buy America requirements for our Nation's preeminent Federal clean water infrastructure program, the Clean Water State Revolving Fund.

When Congress first enacted the Clean Water Act in 1972, it required that any grant funding for wastewater infrastructure—then funded through the Construction Grants program—be used to support ''articles, materials or supplies mined, produced, or manufactured in the United States.'' Unfortunately, in 1987, when then-President Ronald Reagan urged Congress to abolish the Construction Grants program in favor of the current Clean Water SRF, these initial Buy America requirements expired. It was not until 2009, when Congress enacted the Recovery Act, that Buy America provisions were restored for Federal investment in wastewater infrastructure through the Clean Water SRF.

What was remarkable was both how adept the Nation's wastewater industry and the States were at implementing these commonsense domestic preference reforms and how important these were to breathing life back into a faltering domestic supply chain for wastewater infrastructure. As the Recovery Act demonstrated, Buy America requirements for wastewater infrastructure can work, can be implemented with relative efficiency, and most importantly, create jobs—both in the casting of raw materials as well as in the finishing work.

I strongly support reinstatement of the Buy America requirements for the Clean Water SRF program that are contained in this bill. I urge Members to support American jobs by defeating the previous question.

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. BROWN).

Ms. BROWN of Florida. Today, we are here to finish the job of ensuring that all taxpayer-funded infrastructure investments support American jobs.

If we defeat the previous question, the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. SLAUGHTER), the ranking member on the Committee on Rules, will offer an amendment to the rules that will make in order H.R. 949, the Invest in American Jobs Act of 2013, under an open rule.

□ 1330

H.R. 949 strengthens domestic manufacturing requirements not only for Federal-aid highways, transit, aviation, and other Federal infrastructure investments, but also in rail.

When I was chair of the Subcommittee on Railroads, Pipelines, and Hazardous Materials, I held a roundtable of the importance of buying American in passenger rail projects. Well over 100 American companies participated and advocated for stronger rules. As a result, we included a provision in the Passenger Rail Investment and Improvement Act of 2008 which required that the federally funded rail projects use domestic steel, iron, and other manufactured goods.

We heard a lot of complaints, but 5 years later we know that it works. Let me just say that in Rochelle, Illinois, they just created more than 300 jobs using American companies. H.R. 949 would extend this same Buy America requirements to Amtrak and the Railroad Rehabilitation and Improvement Financing loan program.

When it comes to transportation, every $1 billion we spend in infrastructure creates 33,000 new jobs. Now, because of the provision, Buy America, for every $1 billion we spend, it creates 43,890 good-paying American jobs.

I urge the House to defeat the previous question so we can consider this important bill.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, before I close, Dr. BURGESS is a good doctor. I want to put in the same statistics that I read for Chairman SESSIONS for his district. Almost a third of his constituents would be involved, and I know he's going to want to read that in the RECORD.

But let me get to closing. As I have repeatedly said over the last 3 years, the majority is again wasting valuable time, millions of taxpayer dollars to vote today, for the 39th time, to undermine the Affordable Care Act. Meanwhile, they have not taken a single vote on jobs in this Congress, so we are going to be able to give you a chance to remedy that.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert the text of the amendment in the RECORD, along with extraneous material, immediately prior to the vote on the previous question.

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

There was no objection.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote ''no'' and defeat the previous question so that we can really begin to work on our infrastructure and get Americans back to work.

I urge a ''no'' vote on the rule, and I yield back the balance of my time.

BENEFITS OF THE HEALTH CARE REFORM LAW IN THE 26TH CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT OF TEXAS

COMMITTEES ON ENERGY AND COMMERCE, WAYS AND MEANS, AND EDUCATION AND THE WORKFORCE, DEMOCRATIC STAFF REPORT, JULY 2013

The landmark Affordable Care Act (ACA) began delivering important new benefits and protections to tens of millions of American families almost immediately after it was signed into law by President Obama. But the largest benefits of the law will become available to consumers on October 1, 2013, when health insurance marketplaces open in all 50 states. These marketplaces will offer individuals, families, and small businesses an efficient, transparent one-stop shop to compare health insurance policies, receive financial assistance, and sign up for high-quality, affordable, and secure insurance coverage.

This fact sheet summarizes new data on the significant benefits of the health care reform law in Rep. Burgess's district. It also provides the first picture of the impacts of the law in districts redrawn or newly created following the 2010 Census. As a result of the law:

9,500 young adults in the district now have health insurance through their parents' plan.

More than 4,900 seniors in the district received prescription drug discounts worth $7 million, an average discount of $650 per person in 2011, $720 in 2012, and $850 thus far in 2013.

55,000 seniors in the district are now eligible for Medicare preventive services without paying any co-pays, coinsurance, or deductible.

232,000 individuals in the district—including 66,000 children and 86,000 women—now have health insurance that covers preventive services without any co-pays, coinsurance, or deductible.

230,000 individuals in the district are saving money due to ACA provisions that prevent insurance companies from spending more than 20% of their premiums on profits and administrative overhead. Because of these protections, over 59,300 consumers in the district received approximately $8.3 million in insurance company rebates in 2012 and 2011—an average rebate of $95 per family in 2012 and $187 per family in 2011.

Up to 48,000 children in the district with preexisting health conditions can no longer be denied coverage by health insurers.

305,000 individuals in the district now have insurance that cannot place lifetime limits on their coverage and will not face annual limits on coverage starting in 2014.

Up to 90,000 individuals in the district who lack health insurance will have access to quality, affordable coverage without fear of discrimination or higher rates because of a preexisting health condition. In addition, the 44,000 individuals who currently purchase private health insurance on the individual or small group market will have access to more secure, higher quality coverage and many will be eligible for financial assistance.

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

Let's also just deal with a couple of things that have been said during the last hour of debate.

The gentleman from Connecticut stood up and provided a CRS report that detailed various times in the past where rules have been delayed, the Department of the Treasury, regarding tax law. But what he listed were all bills that have passed since President Obama came into office, and they all had to be postponed because they were ill-conceived and ill-thought-out.

I would just submit that it was December 24 of 2009 when this thing passed out of the United States Senate. If, as the gentlelady says is correct, they sat down and read this thing line by line three times, they were bound to have encountered page 159, paragraph D:

Effective Date. The amendments made by this section shall apply to the months beginning after December 31, 2013.

Mr. Speaker, I would just submit, if the Department of the Treasury said this was going to be a problem—they've known about it for almost 4 years—where have they been? And why was it necessary for it to come up on July 2 at 6 p.m.?

Mr. Speaker, I have asked representatives from the administration, representatives from the agencies: What are you doing? Are there contingency plans? This thing looks awfully complicated. This thing looks awfully complex. Can you get it done? Are you

thinking about delaying it? Are you thinking about jettisoning other parts? And as late as the end of April, the first of May, I was told, no, there are no such plans.

Now, the Administrator for the Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services apparently today, in a hearing, testified that, Yes, sometime in June we had actually made the decision that we were going to have to do something here. This is inconsistency coming from the administration.

We ask for information, and no information is forthcoming. And then we're accused of being obstructionists and saying, Well, you never wanted the law in the first place. Maybe so. But how in the world can we even have a meaningful dialogue if, when you come into the committee and you're asked a direct question under oath, you won't respond accurately? The propensity for prevarication of this administration has been absolutely stunning.

Now, we're here today because of a blog post on July 2 at 6 p.m. I would very much like to get the author of this blog post into our Committee on Oversight and Investigations on Energy and Commerce and ask her just exactly what was going on, what led to this decision: Did you get a legal memo? Did you get information from some legal counsel as to the fact that this was okay? I would welcome that opportunity. But, Mr. Speaker, you and I know that that opportunity is never going to occur.

So, Mr. Speaker, today's rule provides for the consideration of two critical bills, ensuring that the American people are not penalized for this administration's inability to implement its own law properly.

I applaud the efforts of my colleagues, Mr. GRIFFIN and Mr. YOUNG, and I look forward to the spirited debate on these two bills in the ensuing hours, and I'm sure this House will produce spirited debate.

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

AN AMENDMENT TO H. RES. 300 OFFERED BY MS. SLAUGHTER OF NEW YORK

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

SEC. 4. Immediately upon adoption of this resolution the Speaker shall, pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule XVIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the bill (H.R. 949) to ensure that transportation and infrastructure projects carried out using Federal financial assistance are constructed with steel, iron, and manufactured goods that are produced in the United States, and for other purposes. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. General debate shall be confined to the bill and shall not exceed one hour equally divided among and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure and the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Financial Services. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. All points of order against provisions in the bill are waived. At the conclusion of consideration of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions. If the Committee of the Whole rises and reports that it has come to no resolution on the bill, then on the next legislative day the House shall, immediately after the third daily order of business under clause 1 of rule XIV, resolve into the Committee of the Whole for further consideration of the bill.

SEC. 5. Clause 1(c) of rule XIX shall not apply to the consideration of H.R. 949 as specified in section 4 of this resolution.

THE VOTE ON THE PREVIOUS QUESTION: WHAT IT REALLY MEANS

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

RECESS

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

Accordingly (at 1 o'clock and 36 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1416

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. COOK) at 2 o'clock and 16 minutes p.m.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, proceedings will resume on the question previously postponed. Votes will be taken in the following order:

Ordering the previous question on House Resolution 300;

Adopting House Resolution 300, if ordered.

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

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on ordering the previous question 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, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 230, nays 192, not voting 11, as follows:

[Roll No. 357]

YEAS—230

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

NAYS—192

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

NOT VOTING—11

Campbell
Castor (FL)
DeGette
Grimm
Herrera Beutler
Holt
Horsford
Hunter
Lewis
McCarthy (NY)
Negrete McLeod

□ 1442

Ms. CLARKE, Messrs. PAYNE, OWENS, CLEAVER, RUSH, and Ms. SCHWARTZ changed their vote from ''yea'' to ''nay.''

Messrs. CRAWFORD and BACHUS changed their vote from ''nay'' to ''yea.''

So the previous question was ordered.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. DENHAM). The question is on the resolution.

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 232, nays 183, not voting 18, as follows:

[Roll No. 358]

YEAS—232

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

NAYS—183

Andrews
Barrow (GA)
Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Bera (CA)
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Cárdenas
Carney
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Castro (TX)
Chu
Cicilline
Clarke
Clay
Cleaver

Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Courtney
Crowley
Cuellar
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
DeFazio
DeLauro
DelBene
Deutch
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle
Duckworth
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Enyart
Eshoo
Esty
Farr
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Garcia
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Hahn
Hanabusa
Hastings (FL)
Heck (WA)
Higgins
Himes
Hinojosa
Honda
Hoyer
Huffman
Israel
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
Kirkpatrick
Kuster
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lipinski
Loebsack
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Lynch
Maloney, Carolyn
Maloney, Sean
Matheson
Matsui
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McNerney
Meeks
Meng
Michaud
Miller, George
Moore
Moran
Murphy (FL)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Nolan
O'Rourke
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters (CA)
Peters (MI)
Peterson
Pingree (ME)
Pocan
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rahall
Rangel
Richmond
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Schrader
Schwartz
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Sinema
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Speier
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Titus
Tonko
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watt
Waxman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—18

Barr
Bustos
Campbell
Castor (FL)
Cummings
DeGette
Delaney
Fattah
Grijalva
Grimm
Gutiérrez
Herrera Beutler
Holt
Horsford
Hunter
Lewis
McCarthy (NY)
Negrete McLeod

□ 1449

So the resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated for:

Mr. BARR. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 358, I was unavoidably detained and unable to vote. Had I been present, I would have voted "yea."

Stated against:

Mrs. BUSTOS. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 358 I was detained. Had I been present, I would have voted "nay."

OFFICIAL PHOTOGRAPH OF 113TH CONGRESS

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to House Resolution 270, this time has been designated for the taking of the official photo of the House of Representatives in session.

The House will be in a brief recess while the Chamber is being prepared for the photo. As soon as the photographer indicates that these preparations are complete, the Chair will call the House to order to resume its actual session for the taking of the photograph. At that point the Members will take their cues from the photographer. Shortly after the photographer is finished, the House will proceed with business.

RECESS

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess while the Chamber is being prepared.

Accordingly (at 2 o'clock and 52 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1455

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker at 2 o'clock and 55 minutes p.m.

(Thereupon, the Members sat for the official photograph of the House of Representatives for the 113th Congress.)

MOTION TO ADJOURN

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

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

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 10, noes 409, not voting 14, as follows:

[Roll No. 359]

AYES—10

Andrews
Cartwright
Farr
Johnson (GA)
Maffei
McDermott
Polis
Richmond
Smith (NJ)
Waxman

NOES—409

Aderholt
Alexander
Amash
Amodei
Bachmann
Bachus
Barber
Barletta
Barr
Barrow (GA)
Barton
Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Benishek
Bentivolio
Bera (CA)
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Bonner
Boustany
Brady (PA)
Brady (TX)
Braley (IA)
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Broun (GA)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Burgess
Bustos
Butterfield
Calvert
Camp
Cantor
Capito
Capps
Capuano
Cárdenas
Carney
Carson (IN)
Carter
Cassidy
Castro (TX)
Chabot
Chaffetz
Chu
Cicilline
Clarke
Clay
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
DeFazio
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Deutch
Diaz-Balart
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle
Duckworth
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Edwards
Ellison
Ellmers
Engel
Enyart
Eshoo
Esty
Farenthold
Fattah
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foster
Foxx
Frankel (FL)
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Garcia
Gardner
Garrett
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gibson
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Grijalva
Guthrie
Gutiérrez
Hahn
Hall
Hanabusa
Hanna
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Heck (NV)
Heck (WA)
Hensarling
Higgins
Himes
Hinojosa
Holding
Honda
Hoyer
Hudson
Huelskamp
Huffman
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hurt
Israel
Issa
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Jenkins
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Jordan
Joyce
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kelly (PA)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kinzinger (IL)
Kirkpatrick
Kline
Kuster
Labrador
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Langevin
Lankford
Larson (CT)
Latham
Latta
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loebsack
Lofgren
Long
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Lummis
Lynch
Maloney, Carolyn
Maloney, Sean
Marchant
Marino
Massie
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul
McClintock
McCollum
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
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)
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Price (NC)
Quigley
Radel
Rahall
Rangel
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rice (SC)
Rigell
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
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
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 (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
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watt
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Welch
Wenstrup
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (FL)
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Womack

Woodall	Yoho	Young (IN)
Yarmuth	Young (AK)	
Yoder	Young (FL)	

NOT VOTING—14

Campbell	Holt	McCarthy (NY)
Castor (FL)	Horsford	Negrete McLeod
DeGette	Hunter	Olson
Grimm	Larsen (WA)	Sarbanes
Herrera Beutler	Lewis	

□ 1511

Mr. GOWDY changed his vote from ''aye'' to ''no.''

So the motion to adjourn was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

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

AUTHORITY FOR MANDATE DELAY ACT

Mr. CAMP. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 300, I call up the bill (H.R. 2667) to delay the application of the employer health insurance mandate, and for other purposes, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HOLDING). Pursuant to House Resolution 300, the bill is considered read.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 2667

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 ''Authority for Mandate Delay Act''.

SEC. 2. DELAY IN APPLICATION OF EMPLOYER HEALTH INSURANCE MANDATE.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 1513(d) of the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act is amended by striking ''December 31, 2013'' and inserting ''December 31, 2014''.

(b) REPORTING REQUIREMENTS.—

(1) REPORTING BY EMPLOYERS.—Section 1514(d) of the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act is amended by striking ''December 31, 2013'' and inserting ''December 31, 2014''.

(2) REPORTING BY INSURANCE PROVIDERS.—Section 1502(e) of the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act is amended by striking ''2013'' and inserting ''2014''.

(c) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall take effect as if included in the provision of the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act to which they relate.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Michigan (Mr. CAMP) and the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. LEVIN) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. CAMP).

□ 1515

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. CAMP. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and to include extraneous material on H.R. 2667.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 2667, a bill that delays the employer mandate.

While it's encouraging to see the administration has finally acknowledged the burdens ObamaCare is placing on employers, we must be a Nation of laws, not blog posts, which is how the administration announced the delay.

While this bill provides employers with some temporary relief from the health care law, it provides no real relief. Even with this delay, small businesses and families will not get what they were promised—affordable health care.

Inexplicably, the administration thinks only businesses should be exempt from the pain inflicted by ObamaCare. How is that fair? Families and individuals are already struggling in this Obama economy. They're paying more for gas, more for food, and wages aren't keeping up with the ever-increasing costs of everyday life. Don't these hardworking Americans deserve the same relief the administration is giving to the business community? That's why we must also pass the Fairness for American Families Act, which will delay the individual mandate.

House Republicans believe it's only fair that families and individuals receive the same treatment. These two bills will ensure that fairness is applied to employers and employees, as well as families and individuals.

The Obama administration claims that they are listening to the American people. Senate Majority Leader HARRY REID recently said ''ObamaCare has been wonderful.'' These claims reveal a Democratic leadership that is out of touch with reality.

When I go back to my district, I hear firsthand from constituents about the concerns with the law. They ask me: Why are my premiums skyrocketing? How can I grow my business with all these new mandates, regulations, and red tape? Why am I losing the insurance I have and like?

House Republicans share those concerns, and these bills are a positive step forward to protect hardworking taxpayers and businesses from some of the most onerous provisions in the health care law.

The administration's ''time out'' from the law doesn't change the fact that ObamaCare is unworkable. Instead, it's an admission that this law is unworkable. Just a few months ago, Health and Human Services Secretary Kathleen Sebelius pledged before the Ways and Means Committee that this law would be ready on time and without delays. Well, now we know the truth. This administration cannot make its own law work.

The American people deserve real reforms that actually make health care affordable. During the health care debate, only one bill was scored by the Congressional Budget Office as actually lowering premiums—the House Republican alternative to the Democrats' health care law. It met the top health care priority of American families—lowering the cost of health insurance premiums. We should scrap this law and get back to commonsense, step-by-step reforms on health care.

I urge my colleagues across the aisle to join us and support this legislation. Vote to treat American families and individuals the same as businesses. Vote ''yes'' to codify the delay of the employer mandate, and vote ''yes'' to delay the individual mandate.

At this time, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BRADY) control the remainder of the time.

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

There was no objection.

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

Well, here we go again. Another repeal vote, another political sideshow, and another blow to bipartisanship, which is so vital to addressing a whole host of important issues, including an issue important to our committee—tax reform. Instead of moving forward, once again my Republican colleagues are looking backwards.

The fact is that the President has taken an action that my Republican colleagues support. The administration determined that a delay of employer responsibility requirements was necessary in order to ensure effective implementation of the Tax Code, so it exercised its authority—longstanding administrative relief used by administrations of both parties for many years to grant transition relief.

The Republican response? The Republicans cannot leave well enough alone. They insist on maneuvering for political purposes. Duplicative legislation for purely political reasons that will go nowhere in the Senate and that serves only to set up their 38th vote to repeal the Affordable Care Act.

After the announcement, my colleague, Chairman CAMP, in a new populist flourish, said:

> The Obama administration's decision to give corporate America a free pass while continuing to force average, everyday Americans to abide by the law is deeply disturbing.

And the majority leader, Mr. CANTOR, with hyperpopulism, said:

> The President came down on the side of big business, but left the American people out in the cold.

Out in the cold? Republican hypocrisy is reaching new heights. Under the Affordable Care Act, tens of millions of Americans will gain previously unavailable access to affordable health insurance. To date—and I emphasize this—more than 6 million young adults have health insurance through their parents' plans, 6 million seniors have

saved $6.1 billion on prescription drugs, and 105 million Americans have received free preventative services.

And in State to State, Americans buying insurance within the new marketplaces will have access to coverage for less than they pay today. New Yorkers, for one, learned today that, on average, individual premiums within the marketplace will be half what they are today. They certainly do not feel left out in the cold.

Competition under ACA is working, and the Republicans call it ''socialism.''

The market reforms from the health law work together to eliminate the ability of insurance companies to discriminate on the basis of preexisting conditions and gender. But the system will only work and remain affordable if everyone has insurance. And the law provides the reforms and assistance to put affordable coverage within reach for everyone.

Without the shared responsibility, the law will not work and insurance premiums will skyrocket. 129 million people with preexisting conditions will once again be priced or forced out of coverage, and we will be back where we started.

Republicans know this. Why? Because the individual mandate was a Republican idea going all the way back to the 1980s, when the conservative Heritage Foundation originated the idea. Its supporters have argued:

> All citizens should be required to obtain a basic level of health insurance. Not having health insurance imposes a risk of delaying medical care. It also may impose costs on others because we, as a society, provide care to the uninsured. The risk of shifting cost to others has led many States to mandate that all drivers have liability insurance. The same logic applies to health insurance.

But Republicans are not here today to act logically or take responsibility. They have never, never, never had a comprehensive health care reform plan. Instead, their only goal is to score political points.

So we urge, vote ''no'' on both bills.

I reserve the balance of my time, and I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Washington (Mr. MCDERMOTT) control the balance of the time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the gentleman from Washington will control the time of the gentleman from Michigan.

There was no objection.

Mr. BRADY of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 2 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, this is just about fairness. What families and workers in my district are asking is this: Isn't it unfair to grant businesses relief from this Big Government mandate but still force average workers to comply with it? If the President's health care law isn't ready for business, how is it ready for my family, for my children, for my loved one?

At its heart, both families and workers are worried and wondering: Why isn't the White House listening to us? This isn't fair.

The President has proclaimed the law is working the way it's supposed to, and the White House, Treasury Department, and every agency tells us things are right on track, but they're not. They miss deadline after deadline after deadline in this troubling implementation. The truth is it's not ready.

With the temporary relief from the business mandate, yes, it was welcome news, but it didn't solve the problems our local businesses are struggling with under ObamaCare. In fact, the President's health care law is causing more confusion and more uncertainty.

Workers are seeing fewer hours and smaller paychecks. That's not fair.

Businesses are struggling to find the money to pay for higher health care costs under ObamaCare. That's not fair.

And our neighbors are struggling to find full-time jobs; 20 million Americans can't find them. It's fewer jobs to apply for. That's not fair.

Why is it that, under this White House, Warren Buffett gets a break from ObamaCare but Joe Six-Pack, the single mom working at the local restaurant, they don't get any kind of break? Well, we just want fairness for workers, fairness for families. We're tired of the White House picking winners and losers. This is about fairness and equality.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MCDERMOTT. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. RANGEL).

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

Mr. RANGEL. I've been here over four decades, and I have never seen legislation just completely be ignored. I'm thoroughly convinced that the Republican majority are not the least bit concerned about health care, because if they were, they would have a health care plan.

The whole idea of talking about repealing ObamaCare and not having a substitute for it means that the President can talk about education, he can talk about jobs, he can talk about anything, but their plan, their legislative plan is just to say ''no,'' just to say ''no'' to the President no matter what he comes up with, even if it adversely affects the economy of our great country or even if it affects the security of our great country.

I am convinced, as I said this morning, that if the President actually walked on water, the first thing the Republicans would say is that President Obama can't swim.

So I think that we've had enough of this politics. Thirty, forty times we're talking about repealing it.

Are you against having preexisting conditions being accepted for health insurance?

Are you against kids being able to stay on the policy of their parents until they're 26?

Are you against having preventive care given to people? I hope you're not, because soon—and very soon—the American people are going to get fed up with this gridlock politics.

So I hope the spiritual leaders who are concerned about health, kids, and the aged, and I hope the business community would see that, if you want to have economic growth, you've got to get the Congress and you've got to get government involved. It's not a question of laying on people. It's a question of economic growth, which means our infrastructure has to be reinvested in.

We have to be competitive and we have to do the right thing, not by Republicans and Democrats, but for all of our people. We can't afford to have a day when a person needs health care that someone's got to ask whether you're a Republican or whether you're a Democrat. And it's abundantly clear the President is for full health insurance.

Mr. BRADY of Texas. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. RYAN), the chairman of the Budget Committee, a father of three children who understands how tough it is to make ends meet for health care.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. I thank the gentleman.

Madam Speaker, here's what we're doing: The President himself is saying that this employer mandate isn't ready, it can't work, and therefore he's delaying it.

Here's the point: In our Constitution, it is Congress that writes the laws and the President that executes the laws. He doesn't get to choose which laws he wants to enforce selectively.

We agree with him on the mandate. That's why the first of these bills says, okay, let's delay that. And here's Congress acting to do that because that's Congress' job, not the administration's job.

But while we're doing this, we have to ask this other question: If the Fortune 500 companies come to the White House and say this mandate is onerous—it's not ready; millions of people are going to lose their health insurance; it's going to be a repudiation of your promise that if you like what you've got, you can keep it; delay this, great—what about the families and small businesses that are going to have the same kind of mandate? And that's the second vote we're going to have.

□ 1530

What about the families and small businesses that are going to have the same kind of mandate? That's the second vote we're going to have. If it's good for big business, if this is onerous for them, if the White House admits it won't work for them, then why are they complicit with sticking the same kind of enforcement, the same kind of ''not ready for prime time'' mandate on families, on small businesses?

This law is unraveling before us. What's going to happen at the end of the day is when you can't verify a person's employment base health insurance, when a person personally attests

to whatever their income is, you are going to have a lot of people at the end of the year get all these subsidies that they weren't supposed to get, either by confusion, by waste, even by fraud, and the IRS is going to come in with one really big tax bill on families in a year's time and that will be a massive rude awakening.

This law is imploding, this law is unnecessary, this law needlessly raises health care costs, and this law will cause millions of people to lose the health insurance that they have that they want to keep. Not only delay this mandate, delay the other mandate, so we can fix this once and for all with real health care reform.

Mr. MCDERMOTT. Madam Speaker, I yield myself 2 minutes.

We are back in the theater of the absurd. What we are hearing right now is the sound of Republican heart rates going up: ''ObamaCare is coming.'' These last benefits are going to happen, like it or not. And worse, they are going to work. We are seeing the time-honored political tactic of confusion. The sleight of hand. Direct people's attention over here so they won't see what you are doing over there. Shout about delaying the employer mandate and confuse the people when the more corrosive bill comes next, the tool that makes reform possible: the individual mandate.

Maybe they're so scared because it's already working. Washington, Oregon, and California are already reporting lower rates in 2014. Today, New York premiums were cut by 50 percent. Sick children are getting covered. Consumers are getting reimbursements from their insurers. There is no evidence of the sticker shock you will hear about. The promise we made Americans is being fulfilled and Republicans see a giant election map slowly losing red blocks.

This bill isn't about employers. It's a frenetic expression of their anxiety over the President's signature legislation working. I thought 38 times trying to repeal it would be enough, but apparently not. We have got to try one more time. You haven't learned it isn't going to work.

Do you know why there's no fuss in this town about these bills? Because the insurance industry knows it's all nonsense. They know it won't work without an individual mandate, and you will not get it repealed. We ought to just get on with it and vote ''no'' on this bill.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BRADY of Texas. Madam Speaker, I would like to yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Louisiana, a physician who practiced medicine for 30 years, chairman of the Oversight Subcommittee, Dr. BOUSTANY.

Mr. BOUSTANY. Madam Speaker, ObamaCare is massively flawed and that's why it needs to be repealed or replaced with sensible reforms. Now after 3 years, some very smart administration lawyers have come to the conclusion that the employer mandate is too complex and it won't work. It is pretty clear to me and others across America that it is going to cause hourly workers across America to see a drop in the number of hours they work and will force even more businesses to hold off on hiring.

Frankly, the employer mandate needs to be repealed, not delayed. It should be fully repealed. That's why I introduced H.R. 903, to fully repeal it. Until we can do that, I will surely and gladly vote for this delay.

At a time when our economy is showing sluggish growth, horribly sluggish growth, with high unemployment, record unemployment, businesses across this country face uncertainty. Frankly, I will say this is about fairness. Getting rid of this employer mandate, if we delay it or even repeal it, it's about fairness to hardworking small business owners who are struggling every day, it's about hardworking workers who hope to keep their jobs or hope not to be reduced in their hours.

Mr. BRADY of Texas. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Georgia, Dr. PRICE, control the remainder of the time for us.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN). Without objection, the gentleman from Georgia will control the remaining time.

There was no objection.

Mr. MCDERMOTT. Madam Speaker, I submit for the RECORD two records which show that hundreds of thousands of constituents in the First District of Wisconsin and the Eighth District of Texas would benefit from the Affordable Care Act.

BENEFITS OF THE HEALTH CARE REFORM LAW IN THE 1ST CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT OF WISCONSIN

COMMITTEES ON ENERGY AND COMMERCE, WAYS AND MEANS, AND EDUCATION AND THE WORKFORCE DEMOCRATIC STAFF REPORT, JULY 2013

The landmark Affordable Care Act (ACA) began delivering important new benefits and protections to tens of millions of American families almost immediately after it was signed into law by President Obama. But the largest benefits of the law will become available to consumers on October 1, 2013, when health insurance marketplaces open in all 50 states. These marketplaces will offer individuals, families, and small businesses an efficient, transparent one-stop shop to compare health insurance policies, receive financial assistance, and sign up for high-quality, affordable, and secure insurance coverage.

This fact sheet summarizes new data on the significant benefits of the health care reform law in Rep. Ryan's district. It also provides the first picture of the impacts of the law in districts redrawn or newly created following the 2010 Census. As a result of the law:

4,500 young adults in the district now have health insurance through their parents' plan.

More than 9,800 seniors in the district received prescription drug discounts worth $14 million, an average discount of $650 per person in 2011, $730 in 2012, and $780 thus far in 2013.

123,000 seniors in the district are now eligible for Medicare preventive services without paying any co-pays, coinsurance, or deductible.

213,000 individuals in the district—including 50,000 children and 84,000 women—now have health insurance that covers preventive services without any co-pays, coinsurance, or deductible.

165,000 individuals in the district are saving money due to ACA provisions that prevent insurance companies from spending more than 20% of their premiums on profits and administrative overhead. Because of these protections, over 36,300 consumers in the district received approximately $1.8 million in insurance company rebates in 2012 and 2011.

Up to 42,000 children in the district with preexisting health conditions can no longer be denied coverage by health insurers.

259,000 individuals in the district now have insurance that cannot place lifetime limits on their coverage and will not face annual limits on coverage starting in 2014.

Up to 61,000 individuals in the district who lack health insurance will have access to quality, affordable coverage without fear of discrimination or higher rates because of a preexisting health condition. In addition, the 34,000 individuals who currently purchase private health insurance on the individual or small group market will have access to more secure, higher quality coverage and many will be eligible for financial assistance.

BENEFITS OF THE HEALTH CARE REFORM LAW IN THE 8TH CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT OF TEXAS

COMMITTEES ON ENERGY AND COMMERCE, WAYS AND MEANS, AND EDUCATION AND THE WORKFORCE DEMOCRATIC STAFF REPORT, JULY 2013

The landmark Affordable Care Act (ACA) began delivering important new benefits and protections to tens of millions of American families almost immediately after it was signed into law by President Obama. But the largest benefits of the law will become available to consumers on October 1, 2013, when health insurance marketplaces open in all 50 states. These marketplaces will offer individuals, families, and small businesses an efficient, transparent one-stop shop to compare health insurance policies, receive financial assistance, and sign up for high-quality, affordable, and secure insurance coverage.

This fact sheet summarizes new data on the significant benefits of the health care reform law in Rep. Brady's district. It also provides the first picture of the impacts of the law in districts redrawn or newly created following the 2010 Census. As a result of the law:

8,600 young adults in the district now have health insurance through their parents' plan.

More than 9,400 seniors in the district received prescription drug discounts worth $12.9 million, an average discount of $630 per person in 2011, $700 in 2012, and $620 thus far in 2013.

111,000 seniors in the district are now eligible for Medicare preventive services without paying any co-pays, coinsurance, or deductible.

183,000 individuals in the district—including 46,000 children and 71,000 women—now have health insurance that covers preventive services without any co-pays, coinsurance, or deductible.

169,000 individuals in the district are saving money due to ACA provisions that prevent insurance companies from spending more than 20% of their premiums on profits and administrative overhead. Because of these protections, over 46,700 consumers in the district received approximately $6.6 million in insurance company rebates in 2012 and 2011—an average rebate of $95 per family in 2012 and $187 per family in 2011.

Up to 44,000 children in the district with preexisting health conditions can no longer be denied coverage by health insurers.

225,000 individuals in the district now have insurance that cannot place lifetime limits on their coverage and will not face annual limits on coverage starting in 2014.

Up to 143,000 individuals in the district who lack health insurance will have access to quality, affordable coverage without fear of discrimination or higher rates because of a preexisting health condition. In addition, the 31,000 individuals who currently purchase private health insurance on the individual or small group market will have access to more secure, higher quality coverage and many will be eligible for financial assistance.

I now yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER).

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Madam Speaker, this is the latest chapter in a long-running process of deliberately trying to sabotage health care reform.

The delay of the employer mandate for 5 percent of American businesses that employ only 1 percent of American workers is not Earth-shattering, not entirely unforeseen, but more to the point, given a concerted effort by my Republican friends to dismantle health care reform, you would think that they would embrace it.

It is being attacked instead because there is no interest by my Republican friends in a comprehensive approach to making health care work better. They have no plan. This is simply a tactic to gain political advantage by fanning flames of discontent.

They want to take credit, actually, for many of the features of ObamaCare that are supported by the public, but they have no intention of either paying for them or providing a framework comprehensive reform so that it will work.

ObamaCare is actually working where it is allowed to work. In Oregon, we are seeing improvements in health care coverage, reduction in health insurance premiums, and we are on track to save tax dollars while improving the quality of health care. If everybody practiced medicine the way that it is being practiced in metropolitan Portland, people would get sick less often, they would get well faster, they would live longer, and there would be no Medicare funding crisis.

Instead of working to fine-tune the reform which embodies many of the principles that have been advanced, embraced, and implemented by Republican Governors—not just Mitt Romney, they have chosen instead to make it fail.

It is another illustration of a party without ideas, opposing comprehensive immigration reform, opposing agricultural reform. House Republicans won't even allow a conference committee to be appointed so that we can have a budget agreed to, while putting sand in the gears at every turn for efforts to get more value out of the health care system. It is not just sad and unfortunate, it is shameful.

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. Madam Speaker, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the chairman of the Energy and Commerce Committee, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. UPTON).

Mr. UPTON. Madam Speaker, 2 weeks ago, as Americans were gathering with loved ones to celebrate our Nation's independence, a Treasury bureaucrat quietly posted a blog detailing a major policy shift in the administration's signature health care law—the delay of the employer mandate. While it appeared to be a sudden turnabout, today we learned the administration had made the decision in June and that ''it was considered in a very careful way for a while.''

This is a direct contradiction to previous testimony before Congress. Every single time that we asked the administration witness if implementation was on track, they looked us in the eye and said, ''Absolutely, yes.''

Why did the ''most transparent administration in history'' mislead Congress and try to dupe the public? Because it knew that the law is bad for business and bad for jobs.

Today, we give the administration authority in full view of the American public to delay the employer mandate for a year. The House will stand up for the millions of young adults, working families, and older Americans who cannot afford the health care law's looming rate shock. Fair is fair. If businesses aren't subject to the same burdens and penalties under the health care law next year, average Americans shouldn't face them either.

Many middle class families are going to pay dramatically higher premiums as a result of the Affordable Care Act. The Energy and Commerce Committee surveyed 17 of the Nation's leading insurers and found many consumers in the individual market could see their premiums nearly double, with potential highs eclipsing 400 percent.

The broken promises are many. Missed deadlines and delays have become routine. This law is so off the rails that the administration is now disregarding entire sections of the statute. This debate is about jobs and it is about fairness.

We continue to believe a permanent delay of these damaging policies is the best course of action. For today, let's join together and protect Americans for at least another year.

I ask my colleagues to support H.R. 2667 and H.R. 2668 so that we can delay and dismantle these policies that will hurt American jobs.

Mr. McDERMOTT. Madam Speaker, I yield back to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. LEVIN).

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. LEVIN) will control the time.

There was no objection.

Mr. LEVIN. Madam Speaker, I yield myself 30 seconds.

I just want to put in the facts on the Sixth District where my friend Mr. UPTON comes from, the Sixth District of Michigan:

6,700 young adults in the district now have health insurance through their parents' plan;

9,100 seniors have received prescription drug discounts;

131,000 seniors in the district are now eligible for preventive services without paying;

197,000 individuals now have health insurance that covers preventive services;

Up to 41,000 children in the district with preexisting health conditions can no longer be denied coverage by health insurers.

I now yield 2 minutes to a member of our committee, the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. KIND).

Mr. KIND. Madam Speaker, I rise today again with disappointment at the fact that these two bills are nonsense and completely unnecessary.

One is doing what the Obama administration has already said they would do, and that is to delay the employer reporting requirements because of the feedback they got from businesses large and small and from associations who said not that they can't do it; they just need a little bit more time in implementing it.

The other would do away with the individual responsibility component.

But the real story today, Madam Speaker, is not what's happening on the House floor or the votes that these two bills are going to get. It was what announcement came out of the State of New York and was reported in The New York Times:

''Health plan costs for New Yorkers set to fall 50 percent.''

This is because of the creation of the health insurance exchanges under the Affordable Care Act. Individual policy rates are going to be at least 50 percent less than what individuals are currently paying today because the exchanges are doing what they were meant to do, increase competition and transparency, making it more affordable for uninsured Americans to go out and obtain affordable coverage.

My father gave me some pretty good advice early on in my life when he said, Son, you are going to encounter two forms of critics in your life: one who criticizes you because they want to see you fail, and the other is going to criticize you because they want to see you succeed, and being able to differentiate between the two is going to determine how successful you are in life.

That has been the problem with the Affordable Care Act from the very beginning. We have a major political party who does not want to see this succeed, and they're doing everything they can to undermine it, even if it brings increased pain and difficulty to more businesses, families, and individuals throughout the country. Today's demonstration with these two bills just reaffirms that proposition.

I encourage my colleagues to vote ''no'' on H.R. 2668.

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. Madam Speaker, I am now pleased to yield 1½ minutes to a pivotal member of the Ways and Means Committee, the gentleman from Washington (Mr. REICHERT).

Mr. REICHERT. Madam Speaker, 2 weeks ago, the administration announced a delay of a crucial piece of

ObamaCare: the employer mandate. Why? Because they were petitioned by businesses from across this great Nation of ours to do that. Why did they petition the White House to waive the employer mandate? Because they recognize, Madam Speaker, that this was a burdensome law on their business; that this was a tax burden that they couldn't bear; that this would slow their businesses, slow hiring, and slow growth. They recognize that. My constituents in Washington State recognize that. Even the President's biggest allies—labor unions—agree. They have warned that ObamaCare will ''destroy the health and wellbeing of hard-working Americans.''

□ 1545

But, Madam Speaker, this legislation also recognizes another dangerous precedent that this administration has been setting in that this legislation will delay the employer mandate for 1 year so that the law is in line with what the President decided to do. This is not how our government should work, but that's how this President operates, and we've seen this from him time and time again: A problem with the health care law? Let's just delay it. Welfare-to-work requirements? I'll just waive those. A change in unemployment insurance laws? I don't have to implement that.

I know about enforcing laws. I was a cop for 33 years. You don't pick and choose. You enforce the law. That's what this President should do, and we're making a law in line with what the President wants.

Mr. LEVIN. Madam Speaker, I yield myself 30 seconds.

I just want to review the benefits of the gentleman's district that he represents:

5,400 young adults now have health insurance through their parents' plans;

more than 6,900 seniors receive prescription drug discounts;

100,000 seniors are now eligible for Medicare preventative services without paying any co-pays, coinsurance, or deductibles;

209,000 individuals now have health insurance that covers preventative services without pay;

Up to 42,000 children in the district with preexisting health conditions can no longer be denied coverage by health insurers.

That's what the ACA is doing.

It is now my privilege to yield 2 minutes to another distinguished member of our committee, the gentleman from New York (Mr. CROWLEY).

Mr. CROWLEY. Madam Speaker, I thank my friend for yielding me this time.

Here we are once again, wasting our constituents' time by voting on the exact same action the administration has already taken. Apparently, we must vote yet again to dismantle important parts of the Affordable Care Act. We keep hearing that these votes are necessary because of the ''burden'' that's out there for individuals and their families. Let me tell you about what I worry about in terms of burdens for my constituents:

the burden of a young worker knowing that she is stuck in a job that's bad for her, but she keeps it because it's the only place she can get health insurance;

the burden of a father trying desperately to find an insurance plan that will cover his son even though his son has diabetes;

the burden of a mother living in constant fear that her family could lose their home because, without insurance, one unexpected medical episode could lead to bankruptcy.

Relieving those burdens is why I supported the Affordable Care Act, and I don't understand why my colleagues on the other side of the aisle are so eager to tear that down.

Later today, we will be voting on whether to undermine one of the key pieces of the law that is responsible for actually making coverage more affordable. In fact, just this morning, as the gentleman from Wisconsin, RON KIND, mentioned earlier, it was announced that in my State of New York these very provisions are cutting the cost for a family to buy their own insurance by half—by over 50 percent.

I know that was a difficult article for you all to read this morning; but instead of applauding this critical relief for families, my colleagues on the other side of the aisle plan to attack the parts of the very law that made that possible in the first place. I've even heard reports that some opponents of the law are urging people to burn their so-called ''ObamaCare cards'' and, in protest, to not buy insurance. As an aside, I want to point out for my colleagues that there is no such thing as an ''ObamaCare card,'' so be careful not to burn your fingers when you're using your imaginary prop.

I just don't understand why they wouldn't want their constituents to have access to affordable, quality insurance that these people currently can't get now.

Please do not vote for these bills. They undermine the spirit of this country.

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. Madam Speaker, I am pleased to yield 1 minute to the chief deputy whip of the Republican Conference and a member of the Ways and Means Committee, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. ROSKAM).

Mr. ROSKAM. I thank the gentleman.

Let's talk about burdens—the burden of listening to the President of the United States, Madam Speaker, on June 7 of this year say that this bill is working the way it's supposed to.

No, it's not.

Then, within the twinkling of an eye, the White House has to say, Oh, it's not working the way it's supposed to. We need to have this delayed for a year.

Let's talk about the burden of signing a tax return form under penalties of perjury and all of that burden that presses down with the force of the law when you make a misrepresentation and when you're trying to follow up on 200 pages of an individual mandate, and people don't know if they're on foot or on horseback on this thing. That's a burden. That's a burden that the country can't sustain, and that's the burden that we can relieve by voting ''aye.''

Mr. LEVIN. Madam Speaker, I yield myself 30 seconds.

The application, Mr. ROSKAM, is three pages. Let me also mention what's in play in your district and why ACA matters:

5,200 young adults have insurance through their parents;

7,800 seniors have discounts for prescription drugs;

87,000 seniors are now eligible for preventative services without paying;

243,000 individuals now have health insurance covering preventative services without these co-pays;

234,000 individuals are saving money.

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

Mr. LEVIN. I yield myself an additional 15 seconds.

Due to ACA provisions that prevent insurance companies from spending more than 20 percent of their premiums, now 35,000 individuals have insurance that cannot place lifetime limits on their coverage.

So when you pick up a book with hundreds of pages, tell your constituents what it means for them.

I am now privileged to yield 2 minutes to a gentleman from Energy and Commerce who has played such a decisive role in the reform of health care, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PALLONE).

Mr. PALLONE. Madam Speaker, I have to say that I am so sick and tired of the time that the House Republicans continue to waste on their anti-ObamaCare message—repeal, defund, obstruct. You pick the tactic. Our country has some pressing issues that we should be addressing here today, like rising student loan rates, immigration reform, budget issues, or a jobs bill. Yet the Republicans insist on focusing on politicizing this health care fight over and over again. ObamaCare is here to stay. Let's face it. If you have to make some improvements at some point after it's fully implemented, we'll look at them but not now before it has even taken place.

Let me talk to you about this individual mandate. The requirement that individuals obtain coverage is the most critical part of the law. In order for our health care system to operate in a sustainable and cost-effective way, we have to get Americans covered so the insurance marketplace must include both sick and healthy individuals in order to ensure that the system is sustainable. Repealing the individual responsibility provision will only raise health insurance premiums and increase the number of uninsured Americans. That's why that New York State

report says that premiums for those in the individual market have gone down 50 percent. It's because you do have the individual requirement now and because everybody sick and healthy is part of a much larger pool.

Now, as to this other issue of the employer-reporting requirements, that has already been delayed by the administration. It's a done deal. Nothing that we're going to do here today in the House is going to change that. Also, the effect of that is minimal because the vast majority of large employers already provide health coverage. I think less than 4 percent do not. If someone is not covered, he can go into the exchange, and he can probably qualify for tax credits and get affordable coverage.

As Mr. LEVIN has said, this has already had a major impact on providing health coverage for individuals. Whether they're children, students, seniors, families, small business owners, so many have already gotten affordable coverage. Once this kicks in in October, you'll be able to go into an exchange; and by next year, the vast majority—almost every American—will have affordable coverage with good benefits, and what people pay will not be based on preexisting conditions.

Leave it alone. This is the law and it's a good law.

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. Madam Speaker, how much time remains on both sides?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Georgia has 17½ minutes remaining, and the gentleman from Michigan has 10¾ minutes remaining.

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. Madam Speaker, I am pleased now to yield 2 minutes to the author of H.R. 2667, a gentleman who recognizes where the authority ought to come from for this piece of legislation, the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. GRIFFIN).

Mr. GRIFFIN of Arkansas. Madam Speaker, the employer mandate provisions in the Affordable Care Act are already stifling job growth. We don't have to wait to see what's going to happen. In my district, I was approached by a 21-year-old Hispanic American. He contacted me.

He said, I'm a franchise owner. I'm the vice president of a small franchise that I inherited from my mother.

He said that his business has grown about 25 percent each year over the past 2 years and that he is one of the top franchisees in his group. He is a rising senior in college who is managing a small business. He said that he currently has 45 employees; and according to him, right now would be the perfect time to add another 10 or 20 full-time, good-paying jobs—but this is a small business owner. He said he can't do it because of the employer mandate. It makes him choose between increasingly expensive insurance premiums or punitive tax penalties for each employee. He contacted me for relief. If this mandate cannot be repealed, he said, could he please make the 50 threshold 250 so as not to strangle his business. The 21-year-old said it best:

> The government should be my partner so I can help my employees prosper. I can help them more than the government, but I'm literally not able because of taxes, the Affordable Care Act and other regulations.

After 3 years of pain, the President has finally realized that the employer mandate is a bad idea. It is already costing jobs and lowering wages for millions of hardworking Americans. Americans who are forced to be part of ObamaCare deserve more than to be governed by blog posts from the Treasury Department. Only Congress can change the law. Personally, I want to repeal and replace the law; but today we can join with the President and vote for my bill.

Mr. LEVIN. I yield myself 45 seconds.

I would just like to ask the gentleman from Arkansas if the small business person he mentioned has any health coverage for his employees. What we need to do is to continue this law and its implementation so that those employees will have some health insurance.

In his district, because of ACA, 9,500 young adults have insurance through their parents;

3,400 seniors have received prescription drug discounts;

125,000 seniors are now eligible for preventative services without paying co-pays, et cetera.

> BENEFITS OF THE HEALTH CARE REFORM LAW IN THE 2ND CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT OF ARKANSAS
>
> COMMITTEES ON ENERGY AND COMMERCE, WAYS AND MEANS, AND EDUCATION AND THE WORKFORCE, DEMOCRATIC STAFF REPORT, JULY 2013
>
> The landmark Affordable Care Act (ACA) began delivering important new benefits and protections to tens of millions of American families almost immediately after it was signed into law by President Obama. But the largest benefits of the law will become available to consumers on October 1, 2013, when health insurance marketplaces open in all 50 states. These marketplaces will offer individuals, families, and small businesses an efficient, transparent one-stop shop to compare health insurance policies, receive financial assistance, and sign up for high-quality, affordable, and secure insurance coverage.
>
> This fact sheet summarizes new data on the significant benefits of the health care reform law in Rep. Griffin's district. It also provides the first picture of the impacts of the law in districts redrawn or newly create following the 2010 Census. As a result of the law:
>
> 9,500 young adults in the district now have health insurance through their parents' plan.
>
> More than 3,400 seniors in the district received prescription drug discounts worth $7.6 million, an average discount of $600 per person in 2011, $730 in 2012, and $990 thus far in 2013.
>
> 125,000 seniors in the district are now eligible for Medicare preventive services without paying any co-pays, coinsurance, or deductible.
>
> 195,000 individuals in the district—including 41,000 children and 81,000 women—now have health insurance that covers preventive services without any co-pays, coinsurance, or deductible.
>
> 158,000 individuals in the district are saving money due to ACA provisions that prevent insurance companies from spending more than 20% of their premiums on profits and administrative overhead. Because of these protections, over 34,200 consumers in the district received approximately $3.2 million in insurance company rebates in 2012 and 2011—an average rebate of $49 per family in 2012 and $114 per family in 2011.
>
> Up to 42,000 children in the district with preexisting health conditions can no longer be denied coverage by health insurers.
>
> 223,000 individuals in the district now have insurance that cannot place lifetime limits on their coverage and will not face annual limits on coverage starting in 2014.
>
> 113,000 individuals in the district who lack health insurance will have access to quality, affordable coverage without fear of discrimination or higher rates because of a preexisting health condition. In addition, the 40,000 individuals who currently purchase private health insurance on the individual or small group market will have access to more secure, higher quality coverage and many will be eligible for financial assistance.

It is now my privilege to yield 2 minutes to the ranking member on Small Business, who has worked so hard on health care reform and with sensitivity to the small businesses of this country, the gentlelady from New York (Ms. VELÁZQUEZ).

Ms. VELÁZQUEZ. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I rise in opposition to this legislation. The American people are tired of political gimmicks and games. They want to see real efforts to create jobs and grow our economy. This legislation does nothing to advance these goals.

The President has already taken steps to alleviate the burden on small businesses by delaying the employer mandate. This step will ensure small firms have the time, resources, and tools they need to provide coverage to their employees before the mandate kicks in. At best, the legislation before us today is duplicative of that effort. At worst, it amounts to political grandstanding.

Let's be absolutely clear—even if these measures pass the House, we know they will go nowhere in the Senate. If, in some distorted reality, the Senate somehow approves this legislation, it will not be signed into law by the President. So the only real purpose of this bill and the debate is to score cheap political points. Passing this bill will do nothing to help Americans who are struggling to find work, afford rent, or put groceries on the table. Instead, we are bringing up yet another bill to repeal health care reform—the 38th such bill of this Congress—but I forgot: it's the summer, so we're showing reruns.

The Affordable Care Act is already providing valuable benefits to the American people. It was just reported today that New Yorkers will see a 50 percent cut in their insurance premiums thanks to this landmark law. Millions of young adults who are graduating from college can remain on their parents' plans as they enter the job market. Children with life-threatening ailments are no longer denied coverage under preexisting-condition rules. Women are no longer paying

more due to discriminatory insurance company practices.

These are the benefits that our Republican colleagues would deny the American people. Vote ''no.'' This debate is over.

□ 1600

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I'm pleased now to yield 1 minute to the chairman of the Oversight Subcommittee on Energy and Commerce, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. MURPHY).

Mr. MURPHY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, right before the Fourth of July, the administration admitted the Affordable Care Act wasn't ready, and as we just heard from the other side of the aisle, the bill is a burden. So they waived the mandate tax for employers, but not the American people.

The White House says remain calm, all is well, but there are many signs the law is not ready: the Small Business Health Insurance Exchange is delayed; in States that don't expand Medicaid, we're going to delay the mandates for some; for some insurance rates, they'll raise 90 percent to 400 percent; and if you want to qualify for subsidies, they tell us you don't have to tell the truth on your paperwork because no one's going to check.

Don't force Americans to be taxed on something they don't want and is not ready.

They told us we had to pass the bill in order to find out what's in it, and now they're telling the Americans you have to buy the policy to find out what's in it or else be taxed.

Be fair. Delay the mandate tax for employers and the American people.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Speaker, could you tell us the time on each side, please.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. COLLINS of Georgia). The gentleman from Michigan has 8 minutes remaining, and the gentleman from Georgia has 14½ minutes remaining.

Mr. LEVIN. At this time, I insert into the RECORD the benefits of health care reform in the 18th District of Pennsylvania.

BENEFITS OF THE HEALTH CARE REFORM LAW IN THE 18TH CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA

COMMITTEES ON ENERGY AND COMMERCE, WAYS AND MEANS, AND EDUCATION AND THE WORKFORCE, DEMOCRATIC STAFF REPORT, JULY 2013

The landmark Affordable Care Act (ACA) began delivering important new benefits and protections to tens of millions of American families almost immediately after it was signed into law by President Obama. But the largest benefits of the law will become available to consumers on October 1, 2013, when health insurance marketplaces open in all 50 states. These marketplaces will offer individuals, families, and small businesses an efficient, transparent one-stop shop to compare health insurance policies, receive financial assistance, and sign up for high-quality, affordable, and secure insurance coverage.

This fact sheet summarizes new data on the significant benefits of the health care reform law in Rep. Murphy's district. It also provides the first picture of the impacts of the law in districts redrawn or newly created following the 2010 Census. As a result of the law:

3,800 young adults in the district now have health insurance through their parents' plan.

More than 15,300 seniors in the district received prescription drug discounts worth $23.1 million, an average discount of $620 per person in 2011, $800 in 2012, and $730 thus far in 2013.

133,000 seniors in the district are now eligible for Medicare preventive services without paying any co-pays, coinsurance, or deductible.

230,000 individuals in the district—including 45,000 children and 97,000 women—now have health insurance that covers preventive services without any co-pays, coinsurance, or deductible.

181,000 individuals in the district are saving money due to ACA provisions that prevent insurance companies from spending more than 20% of their premiums on profits and administrative overhead. Because of these protections, over 35,800 consumers in the district received approximately $3.6 million in insurance company rebates in 2012 and 2011—an average rebate of $77 per family in 2012 and $165 per family in 2011.

Up to 35,000 children in the district with preexisting health conditions can no longer be denied coverage by health insurers.

266,000 individuals in the district now have insurance that cannot place lifetime limits on their coverage and will not face annual limits on coverage starting in 2014.

Up to 49,000 individuals in the district who lack health insurance will have access to quality, affordable coverage without fear of discrimination or higher rates because of a preexisting health condition. In addition, the 40,000 individuals who currently purchase private health insurance on the individual or small group market will have access to more secure, higher quality coverage and many will be eligible for financial assistance.

I now yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New York (Mr. MEEKS).

Mr. MEEKS. Mr. Speaker, I tell my colleagues on the other side it's time to stop chasing the ghost; 38, 39 times in trying to repeal ObamaCare? Give up chasing the ghost.

I also tell my friends stop being confused by the facts. The facts are, as The New York Times indicated today in New York, that the cost of health care insurance, because of the Affordable Care Act, will go down 50 percent. The fact is, as Mr. LEVIN has indicated time after time, that preventive care will be available for all Americans. The fact is that you will not be discriminated against because you're a woman. The fact is the American people want the Affordable Care Act.

How do I know? They reelected President Obama again, understanding that President Obama stood for health care for all Americans and bringing down the cost of health care in America. That's what this is about.

Thirty-eight times? Give up chasing the ghost.

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I'm pleased now to yield 2 minutes to the chair of the Health Subcommittee on Energy and Commerce, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. PITTS).

Mr. PITTS. Mr. Speaker, today I rise in support of delaying both the employer and individual mandates.

According to a new Gallup poll, 4 in 10 uninsured Americans don't even realize that they'll be subject to fines under the Affordable Care Act. They're about to find out that they're required to purchase insurance that is now even more expensive than it was in the past.

In California, one of the few States to release detailed data about the cost of ObamaCare coverage, individual market premiums will double for many residents.

Researchers compared the estimated cost of health insurance plans on the new exchanges with what is currently available on the individual market in the State, and astonishingly they found that current health plans cost significantly less than comparable plans that will be sold on the exchanges come October 1. In other words, some people will be paying more for the same thing because of the new complexity of federally supported exchanges. Now, some individuals will be eligible for subsidies, but many will get no help at all. In fact, they'll be paying more in order to support the subsidies. They will just have to watch their take-home pay get smaller.

The administration heard from business owners about the chaos being caused by the law. Some employers are laying off employees; some employers are shifting to part-time employees; some employers are deciding not to expand their businesses; and many employees can't get a job. Employees are losing their health insurance, losing benefits, losing income, trying to find another part-time job just to survive, and the administration panicked and is unlawfully delaying the employer mandate.

It's deeply unfair to subject individuals to a mandate that they can neither comprehend nor afford.

Today, we're fighting for fairness, but we will continue the fight to completely stop this train wreck before it finally wrecks family budgets, health care, and our economy.

Mr. LEVIN. I now yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. BARROW).

Mr. BARROW of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for the time.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the legislation before us to delay the employer and individual mandates in the Affordable Care Act. These burdensome provisions are a drag on our economy and hurt the job creators in my district in Georgia and across the country.

Studies have shown that the employer mandate could cost our economy an estimated 3.2 million jobs. On top of that, businesses of all sizes have indicated this mandate will cause them to reduce the size of their businesses or, worse, close their doors. In an economy as fragile as ours, that's the exact opposite of what we want.

Today's vote is a step in the right direction, but we can go further. I'm leading the effort in the House with two of my Republican colleagues to

fully repeal the employer mandate. If repeal and replace really is the will of the majority, then I urge my colleagues to support today's legislation and quickly bring up a full repeal of the employer mandate.

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I'm pleased now to yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. BILIRAKIS), a member of the Energy and Commerce Committee.

Mr. BILIRAKIS. Mr. Speaker, last week the administration announced it would delay the employer mandate under ObamaCare. Even though the administration does not have the authority to do this, it is a sign that even the law's authors are realizing the law is unworkable.

Under ObamaCare, Americans' premiums are skyrocketing and employers are being forced to cut jobs, hours, and wages. Individuals, families, and businesses all deserve relief from this bad law.

This is about fairness—fairness for both hardworking taxpayers and American businesses.

While I have long opposed ObamaCare and believe the best solution is full repeal and replacement of the law, we must pass the Authority for Mandate Delay Act to provide greater certainty to all Americans.

Mr. LEVIN. At this time, I insert into the RECORD a document showing the benefits of health care reform in the 12th Congressional District of Florida.

BENEFITS OF THE HEALTH CARE REFORM LAW IN THE 12TH CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT OF FLORIDA

COMMITTEES ON ENERGY AND COMMERCE, WAYS AND MEANS, AND EDUCATION AND THE WORKFORCE DEMOCRATIC STAFF REPORT, JULY 2013

The landmark Affordable Care Act (ACA) began delivering important new benefits and protections to tens of millions of American families almost immediately after it was signed into law by President Obama. But the largest benefits of the law will become available to consumers on October 1, 2013, when health insurance marketplaces open in all 50 states. These marketplaces will offer individuals, families, and small businesses an efficient, transparent one-stop shop to compare health insurance policies, receive financial assistance, and sign up for high-quality, affordable, and secure insurance coverage.

This fact sheet summarizes new data on the significant benefits of the health care reform law in Rep. Bilirakis's district. It also provides the first picture of the impacts of the law in districts redrawn or newly created following the 2010 Census. As a result of the law:

6,100 young adults in the district now have health insurance through their parents' plan.

More than 10,200 seniors in the district received prescription drug discounts worth $12.9 million, an average discount of $550 per person in 2011, $660 in 2012, and $720 thus far in 2013.

153,000 seniors in the district are now eligible for Medicare preventive services without paying any co-pays, coinsurance, or deductible.

190,000 individuals in the district—including 41,000 children and 79,000 women—now have health insurance that covers preventive services without any co-pays, coinsurance, or deductible.

164,000 individuals in the district are saving money due to ACA provisions that prevent insurance companies from spending more than 20% of their premiums on profits and administrative overhead. Because of these protections, over 53,500 consumers in the district received approximately $7.6 million in insurance company rebates in 2012 and 2011—an average rebate of $132 per family in 2012 and $168 per family in 2011.

Up to 36,000 children in the district with preexisting health conditions can no longer be denied coverage by health insurers.

216,000 individuals in the district now have insurance that cannot place lifetime limits on their coverage and will not face annual limits on coverage starting in 2014.

Up to 97,000 individuals in the district who lack health insurance will have access to quality, affordable coverage without fear of discrimination or higher rates because of a preexisting health condition. In addition, the 45,000 individuals who currently purchase private health insurance on the individual or small group market will have access to more secure, higher quality coverage and many will be eligible for financial assistance.

It's now my pleasure to yield as much time as he may consume to the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. LARSON), a leader on the health care issue.

Mr. LARSON of Connecticut. I want to thank the gentleman from Michigan.

Most importantly, I'm here today because I want to thank my colleagues on the other side of the aisle for their embrace of ObamaCare. After 38 attempts to repeal it, we see at least, however grudgingly, an acceptance and understanding of the importance and significance of this very important care.

Whether this embrace is the kiss of Judas, as some may say, or some may say this is just merely a charade, I commend them for understanding that Medicare isn't an entitlement. After all, it's the insurance that people have paid for. Every American knows this because all they have to do is go to their pay stub to check it out.

So we thank our colleagues for this embrace of this very important issue before us today. I thank them because I see an opportunity here. I see an opportunity to bring forward the best of public health, the best of science and innovation and technology, the best of entrepreneurialism, kind of like what the Heritage Foundation came up with and that a Republican Governor piloted in a Democratic State, which is what we now today call the ''Affordable Health Care Act.''

There are studies that suggest that there is over $700 billion to $800 billion annually in fraud, abuse, waste, and inefficiencies. Let's work together to drive out the inefficiencies.

Thanks for the embrace today and the understanding that if we do this, we cannot only pay down the national debt, we can end sequestration and we can provide an opportunity for our citizens to make sure they live out their lives in dignity by having the most important program for their retirement—Medicare—there for the future.

I thank my colleagues.

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I'm pleased to yield 1½ minutes to the vice chairman of the Energy and Commerce Committee, the gentlelady from Tennessee (Mrs. BLACKBURN).

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman for the recognition.

I'm rising today to support the legislation that is in front of us.

I have to tell you, my constituents are wanting to know: When did the President decide he could pick and choose what laws he's going to enforce and what laws he's going to waive?

Over the course of 3 days, this administration decided they were just going to waive and rewrite this law, and it took them 3 years to try to implement it. I think what we're seeing is they're finally admitting this is a train wreck and it is not ready for prime time.

However, it is not fair that the President is choosing to protect big business from ObamaCare, but not hardworking American taxpayers, individuals, families. It is also eerily similar to the closed-door manner in which the law was written and passed. And now that people are reading it, they're finding out what is in it.

This legislation before us today would delay the requirements that nearly all Americans purchase minimum essential health insurance coverage or pay a tax penalty until 2015. The delay of the individual mandate is needed.

Due to the administrative delay of the employer mandate, my constituents overwhelmingly oppose this law, and I work each and every day to stop the harmful effects it's having on American families and businesses and to continue the fight for solutions to spur economic growth, create new jobs, and provide a more secure future for all Americans.

I encourage support of the legislation.

Mr. LEVIN. I will reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I'm pleased to yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. RENACCI), a member of the Ways and Means Committee.

Mr. RENACCI. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of both the Authority for Mandate Delay Act and the Fairness for American Families Act.

Thanks to ObamaCare, premiums in my home State of Ohio are expected to increase 88 percent, leaving taxpayers on the hook for those significant rate hikes.

Now the administration has decided to delay only the employer mandate, while leaving the individual mandate intact. That is blatantly unfair to my constituents and all Americans.

Why does the administration suddenly find it acceptable to give big companies a better deal than the average Ohioan? Come January 1, individuals could still face stiff penalties if they do not carry insurance, insurance an employer may decide they may no longer provide. With these two bills, we can provide individuals the same opportunity the administration is giving

businesses, by allowing them to opt out of ObamaCare next year, too.

I ask my colleagues to come together and pass this legislation. The people we represent are depending on it.

Mr. LEVIN. At this time, I insert into the RECORD a document showing benefits of the health care reform law in the 16th Congressional District of Ohio.

BENEFITS OF THE HEALTH CARE REFORM LAW IN THE 16TH CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT OF OHIO

COMMITTEES ON ENERGY AND COMMERCE, WAYS AND MEANS, AND EDUCATION AND THE WORKFORCE, DEMOCRATIC STAFF REPORT, JULY 2013

The landmark Affordable Care Act (ACA) began delivering important new benefits and protections to tens of millions of American families almost immediately after it was signed into law by President Obama. But the largest benefits of the law will become available to consumers on October 1, 2013, when health insurance marketplaces open in all 50 states. These marketplaces will offer individuals, families, and small businesses an efficient, transparent one-stop shop to compare health insurance policies, receive financial assistance, and sign up for high-quality, affordable, and secure insurance coverage.

This fact sheet summarizes new data on the significant benefits of the health care reform law in Rep. Renacci's district. It also provides the first picture of the impacts of the law in districts redrawn or newly created following the 2010 Census. As a result of the law:

4,800 young adults in the district now have health insurance through their parents' plan.

More than 10,100 seniors in the district received prescription drug discounts worth $13.7 million, an average discount of $510 per person in 2011, $770 in 2012, and $990 thus far in 2013.

104,000 seniors in the district are now eligible for Medicare preventive services without paying any co-pays, coinsurance, or deductible.

228,000 individuals in the district—including 51,000 children and 92,000 women—now have health insurance that covers preventive services without any co-pays, coinsurance, or deductible.

200,000 individuals in the district are saving money due to ACA provisions that prevent insurance companies from spending more than 20% of their premiums on profits and administrative overhead. Because of these protections, over 10,200 consumers in the district received approximately $800,000 in insurance company rebates in 2011 and 2012—an average rebate of $133 per family in 2012 and $139 per family in 2011.

Up to 40,000 children in the district with preexisting health conditions can no longer be denied coverage by health insurers.

272,000 individuals in the district now have insurance that cannot place lifetime limits on their coverage and will not face annual limits on coverage starting in 2014.

Up to 68,000 individuals in the district who lack health insurance will have access to quality, affordable coverage without fear of discrimination or higher rates because of a preexisting health condition.

In addition, the 37,000 individuals who currently purchase private health insurance on the individual or small group market will have access to more secure, higher quality coverage and many will be eligible for financial assistance.

Mr. Speaker, how much time do we have remaining?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Michigan has 4 minutes remaining.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Speaker, it is now my pleasure to yield the balance of our time on this bill to the gentleman from California (Mr. WAXMAN), the ranking member of Energy and Commerce and who is proudly one of the coauthors of health care reform after so many years of his efforts.

Mr. WAXMAN. Mr. Speaker, the Affordable Care Act is the law of the land. The Republicans never liked it. They didn't want to support it, and they did everything they could to try to stop it. They thought the courts would throw it out; the U.S. Supreme Court upheld it. They thought President Obama would be defeated; President Obama was reelected. This is the law of the land, and it's important to implement it.

Even my Republican colleagues don't know or are willfully ignoring the benefits this law provides to their constituents. I want to tell them and anybody watching this debate that, if they would go to the Web site for the Democrats on the Energy and Commerce Committee, which is democrats.energycommerce.house.gov, we have a district-by-district impact of the law.

□ 1615

I urge my colleagues to actually take a look at the benefits they are so eager to take away from their constituents.

What are these benefits?

People will not be denied health insurance because of preexisting conditions. The insurance companies will not be able to put in lifetime caps or go in and try to take away the insurance when they get sick. All of the abuses by the insurance companies will be stopped, and then people will be able to buy insurance in a marketplace where they can choose between different private insurance plans. And if some are low income, they'll get some help, but everybody is going to see an opportunity they've never had before because every insurance plan will have a minimum benefit package.

Mr. Speaker, 7,500 adults in my district are already getting insurance by being able to stay on their parents' plan up to age 26; 12,000 seniors in my district alone are getting prescription drug discounts under Medicare, and there are millions around the country that will benefit from that. People, whether they're on Medicare, Medi-Cal, Medicaid or private insurance will not be asked to make copayments for prevention. Preventive care will be emphasized so we can try to prevent diseases rather than have to pay to have people treated.

People will get money back if their insurance companies are spending no more than 20 percent on their overhead. We have had private insurance companies spending 30 and 40 percent on their salaries for their executives and less on the actual benefits. Every insurance plan will have to provide 80 percent of the premiums to go for the insurance coverage for health care services. This is an important bill.

Now, if you take away the individual requirement to get insurance, the people that are going to get insurance for sure are the people who are already sick. If you don't have full participation, you can't spread the costs out to make it all affordable. Republicans would like to take away the requirement that everybody get insurance so that they can have a failure of the law because people with preexisting positions will be put into their own category, and the insurance will be too much for them to afford. They're trying to undermine the whole law.

The President does not need legal authority to put off for a year the requirement that employers of 50 employees or more cover their employees or pay into the system. Most of those employers already cover their employees; 95 percent of those employers already cover their employees, and we hope to give tax breaks to others so they will join in and be able to cover their employees.

This is a bill that's going to benefit all Americans. Republicans opposed Medicare; they're opposed to ObamaCare. They don't want people to get fair treatment for their health insurance. Vote ''no'' on both bills today.

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

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I'm pleased to yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. KING).

Mr. KING of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Georgia for yielding and leading this.

Mr. Speaker, I despise ObamaCare—just about everybody in America knows that. I think it should be ripped out by the roots. A minority of the Supreme Court, the clear-thinking constitutionalists, though, agree with me.

The gentleman from California says, however, ObamaCare is the law of the land. All right, I'm going to agree with that for this argument—the law of the land. The law of the land is the Constitution. It's the supreme law of the land, and article II, section 3 says the President shall take care that the laws be faithfully executed. Well, the President of the United States has decided he's going to write his own law and waive the language that's clear statute in the bill that carries his name, ObamaCare, and his signature. It's appalling to me that the President could have such contempt for the Constitution and that this Congress would seek to conform to the President's whim.

We needed to bring, first, SCOTT GARRETT's resolution that declares and rejects this idea, this unconstitutional act of legislating from the executive branch of government. And I would point out the height of audacity, Mr. Speaker, is the President's veto threat for us to be conforming with his unconstitutional act.

STATEMENT OF ADMINISTRATION POLICY

H.R. 2667—AUTHORITY FOR MANDATE DELAY ACT

(Rep. Griffin, R–Ark., and 26 cosponsors)

H.R. 2668—FAIRNESS FOR AMERICAN FAMILIES ACT

(Rep. Young, R–Ind., and 23 cosponsors)

The Administration strongly opposes House passage of H.R. 2667 and H.R. 2668 because the bills, taken together, would cost millions of hard-working middle class families the security of affordable health coverage and care they deserve. Rather than attempting once again to repeal the Affordable Care Act, which the House has tried nearly 40 times, it's time for the Congress to stop fighting old political battles and join the President in an agenda focused on providing greater economic opportunity and security for middle class families and all those working to get into the middle class.

The Affordable Care Act gives people greater control over their own health care and has already improved many aspects of the Nation's health care system. Because of the Affordable Care Act, tens of millions of Americans who have previously been denied coverage due to a pre-existing medical condition will now be covered. The nearly one in two Americans under the age of 65 with pre-existing medical conditions will have the peace of mind that comes from knowing that they can't be dropped from their health plan or denied coverage because of those conditions. House passage of H.R. 2667 and H.R. 2668 will undermine this security for tens of millions of Americans with pre-existing conditions.

H.R. 2667 is unnecessary, and H.R. 2668 would raise health insurance premiums and increase the number of uninsured Americans. Enacting this legislation would undermine key elements of the health law, facilitating further efforts to repeal a law that is already helping millions of Americans stay on their parents' plans until age 26, millions more who are getting free preventive care that catches illness early on, and thousands of children with pre-existing conditions who are now covered.

If the President were presented with H.R. 2667 and H.R. 2668, he would veto them.

H. CON. RES. 45

Whereas section 1 of article I of the Constitution states that ''All legislative Powers herein granted shall be vested in a Congress of the United States, which shall consist of a Senate and House of Representatives'';

Whereas section 3 of article II of the Constitution states that the President ''shall take Care that the Laws be faithfully executed'', which imposes a duty upon the President to enforce the law, regardless of difficulty of enforcement or displeasure with the statute;

Whereas the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act was signed into law by President Barack Obama on March 23, 2010;

Whereas such Act contains a provision commonly referred to as the ''employer mandate'', which requires businesses that employ 50 or more full-time employees to provide health insurance to its employees upon threat of financial penalty;

Whereas section 1513(d) of such Act states that the employer mandate ''shall apply to months beginning after December 31, 2013'';

Whereas the executive branch announced on July 2, 2013, that it would unilaterally delay the enforcement of the employer mandate until January 2015;

Whereas the principle of separation of powers is a constitutional safeguard of liberty as asserted by James Madison in Federalist No. 47 in which he stated, ''The accumulation of all powers, legislative, executive, and judiciary, in the same hands . . . may justly be pronounced the very definition of tyranny''; and

Whereas the executive branch's unilateral decision to delay the implementation of a law sets a dangerous precedent under which legislation that is enacted through the passage of that legislation by the democratically elected Members of Congress and the signing of that legislation into law by the President will no longer have the force of law and will instead be relegated to having the status of a mere recommendation, which the President may choose to ignore: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That it is the sense of Congress that—

(1) President Barack Obama has violated section 3 of article II of the Constitution by refusing to enforce the employer mandate provisions of the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act;

(2) the perpetuation of republican government depends upon the rule of law;

(3) the executive branch, which has no constitutional authority to write or rewrite law at whim, has invaded upon the exclusive legislative power of Congress;

(4) the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act has proven to be unworkable; and

(5) such Act should be repealed by Congress immediately.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Members are reminded to refrain from improper references toward the President.

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, how much time remains on our side?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Georgia has 8 minutes remaining.

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. Am I correct that the other side is out of time?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. That is correct.

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. WALBERG).

Mr. WALBERG. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague from Georgia.

Mr. Speaker, this must come as a shock to the administration and Democrat Senate leadership who have recently described ObamaCare as ''wonderful for our country.'' But not to us in the House and the American people. Today, employers are cutting jobs, hours, and wages because they won't be able to comply with the law. Individuals are seeing premiums climb, and families are losing health insurance they like.

An administrative train wreck has become so likely that on July 2, the President announced a year delay for the employer mandate in his own law. This evokes a question for the President: if businesses are being given relief, shouldn't the same relief be given to the American people?

I rise in support of today's legislation to delay both the employer and individual mandate. It's only fair that all taxpayers, whether businesses or families, receive relief from these hurtful mandates.

I look forward to continuing to work with my colleagues to revive our economy, create jobs, and put the American people first so they can make their own health care decisions. And by the way, wouldn't it be great if personal responsibility, creativity, and liberty reigned again in America.

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I'm pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Kansas (Ms. JENKINS), a member of the Ways and Means Committee.

Ms. JENKINS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding and thank him for his leadership on this very important issue. And I'm pleased President Obama finally acknowledged how damaging the employer mandate will be to American businesses. I agree delaying ObamaCare's implementation and the economic setbacks that go with it make sense.

However, while that delay may temporarily help people like Mary from northeast Kansas, who was recently informed that her job will be transitioned from full time to part time in order to avoid the employer mandate, unless we also delay the individual mandate, she will still need to find a new insurance plan or risk paying the new law's insurance tax.

It simply is not fair to exempt big businesses from the law while leaving folks like Mary to pick up the tab. I urge my colleagues to support this bill which grants American families relief from this very unpopular provision.

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. GARRETT).

Mr. GARRETT. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Georgia.

The President's unilateral refusal to implement ObamaCare's employer mandate for 1 year presents us with a question: Can the President suspend a law that was enacted by Congress and signed into law by that President? On this question, the Constitution and the principles of this Republic could not be clearer. The answer is an emphatic no, he cannot. Article II, section 3—it's called the ''take care'' clause of the Constitution—imposes a duty upon the President to execute the laws of the land, regardless of the difficulty of enforcement or his displeasure of the law.

Not only has this President refused to enforce the law, but he has effectively rewritten the law, violating the separation of powers and infringing upon the exclusive right of this legislative body of this Congress.

The executive branch has no constitutional right to write a law or to rewrite the law. So by refusing to enforce and effectively rewriting it, the President is setting a dangerous precedent under which laws enacted by a democratically elected Congress will no longer have the force of law, but will instead be relegated to the status of mere recommendations, which the President may choose to ignore at his whim.

Mr. Speaker, this is not the rule of law; this is lawlessness, and that is why I have introduced House Concurrent Resolution 45 saying as much.

Finally, if President Obama finds ObamaCare to be as unworkable as he

says it is, then he should call upon this Congress to do the right thing and to repeal the law immediately.

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New York (Mr. REED), a member of the Ways and Means Committee.

Mr. REED. Mr. Speaker, I rise today and ask my colleagues on the other side of the aisle to join us in this employer mandate relief because what is happening here first of all is the President is unilaterally ignoring the law of the land, and he's not going to be President forever. So when a President of a different party, my party, is in that office, I hope they remember the action taken today. And I'll put it to the American people that it makes sense for us in this body to require the passage of this legislation so the President's power is put in check.

As to the individual mandate, Mr. Speaker, this is just fair. If we're going to relieve the burden on employers, then we need to relieve the burden on hardworking taxpayers and families across America. To me, it's just not right. It's fair to both pass this employer mandate relief bill as well as the individual relief bill that accompanies it later for discussion.

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. STUTZMAN).

Mr. STUTZMAN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank my colleague and friend from Georgia for yielding and for his hard work on this very important issue.

Mr. Speaker, Mr. HARRY REID might have said that ObamaCare is wonderful for America, but Hoosiers back home aren't buying the spin. ObamaCare was sold as a benefit to hardworking Americans, but it is increasingly clear on both sides of the aisle that ObamaCare is hurting the very people it was intended to help. There is nothing wonderful about the situation hardworking Americans face—fewer hours, more taxes, soaring premiums, and smaller paychecks.

''Just trust the bureaucrats'' is what the Democrats said when they forced this mess on the American people. Three years later, they're asking for more time. By unilaterally delaying the employer mandate for a year, the White House admitted what Hoosiers already know: if they're willing to exempt businesses, shouldn't every hardworking family get an exemption as well? Let's delay both ObamaCare mandates and continue to work towards fully repealing a failed law that is hurting Hoosiers and Americans across the country and holding back our economy.

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, how much time remains?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Georgia has 2 minutes remaining.

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. KELLY).

Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, what truly makes America unique is that everybody is treated fairly and equally under the law. That's what makes us so great. That's why people say, at least if I'm in America, I know I'm going to be treated the same way as everybody else. It's not going to matter what the color of my skin is; it's not going to matter how I worship; it's not going to matter whether I'm wealthy or poor; I'm going to be treated equally and fairly under the law.

And yet today, we're talking about something that is going on in our government right now where the President has decided to pick winners and losers. The President has decided that he is going to divide the country even further now because he's not going to do what is fair and what's equal, he's going to do what's convenient.

Now, it's pretty easy to understand what fair is. Fair is marked by impartiality and honesty. It's free from self-interest, prejudice, or favoritism. Equal means of the same measure, quantity, amount, or numbers, as in any other person, any other group, any other class, or any other part of society.

So I ask you, How in the world can you say businesses don't have to comply? We're going to go ahead and give them a year off. But yet the individual is going to be held to the letter of the law. If we are truly a country of laws, if we are truly going to treat everybody equally and fairly under the law, then how in the world can we be here today discussing this and debating this on this great floor. It just doesn't make sense.

A piece of legislation that continues to unravel before our very eyes, that creates uncertainty in our society, that creates uncertainty in our businesses, and now, we wonder when's the next shoe going to drop? What else is going to be changed? What laws will we enforce, what laws will we walk away from?

I would just tell my friends on both sides of the aisle, do what we all believe. Let's treat people fairly and equally under the law. Could there be anything more American than that? And the answer is, no; it's self-evident. So I ask all of us today to do what's right for America. What's good for the goose is good for the gander.

□ 1630

If it's not good for business, why should it be good for individuals?

Pass both pieces. Let the American people put their head on the pillow tonight with some kind of surety that they're going to be protected under the law and treated fairly and equally.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Speaker, I submit this report, which shows that hundreds of thousands of constituents in the 7th district of Tennessee benefit from various provisions in the Affordable Care Act.

BENEFITS OF THE HEALTH CARE REFORM LAW IN THE 7TH CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT OF TENNESSEE

COMMITTEES ON ENERGY AND COMMERCE, WAYS AND MEANS, AND EDUCATION AND THE WORKFORCE, DEMOCRATIC STAFF REPORT, JULY 2013

The landmark Affordable Care Act (ACA) began delivering important new benefits and protections to tens of millions of American families almost immediately after it was signed into law by President Obama. But the largest benefits of the law will become available to consumers on October 1, 2013, when health insurance marketplaces open in all 50 states. These marketplaces will offer individuals, families, and small businesses an efficient, transparent one-stop shop to compare health insurance policies, receive financial assistance, and sign up for high-quality, affordable, and secure insurance coverage.

This fact sheet summarizes new data on the significant benefits of the health care reform law in Rep. Blackburn's district. It also provides the first picture of the impacts of the law in districts redrawn or newly created following the 2010 Census. As a result of the law:

5,900 young adults in the district now have health insurance through their parents' plan.

More than 8,000 seniors in the district received prescription drug discounts worth $10 million, an average discount of $580 per person in 2011, $610 in 2012, and $960 thus far in 2013.

116,000 seniors in the district are now eligible for Medicare preventive services without paying any co-pays, coinsurance, or deductible.

191,000 individuals in the district—including 50,000 children and 75,000 women—now have health insurance that covers preventive services without any co-pays, coinsurance, or deductible.

181,000 individuals in the district are saving money due to ACA provisions that prevent insurance companies from spending more than 20% of their premiums on profits and administrative overhead. Because of these protections, over 27,900 consumers in the district received approximately $4 million in insurance company rebates in 2012 and 2011—an average rebate of $69 per family in 2012 and $201 per family in 2011.

Up to 44,000 children in the district with preexisting health conditions can no longer be denied coverage by health insurers.

208,000 individuals in the district now have insurance that cannot place lifetime limits on their coverage and will not face annual limits on coverage starting in 2014.

Up to 91,000 individuals in the district who lack health insurance will have access to quality, affordable coverage without fear of discrimination or higher rates because of a preexisting health condition. In addition, the 39,000 individuals who currently purchase private health insurance on the individual or small group market will have access to more secure, higher quality coverage and many will be eligible for financial assistance.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in advance of the back-to-back votes brought to the floor by House Republicans to delay two key pieces of the Affordable Care Act: the individual responsibility and employer mandates.

Today I will vote for the 38th time against a partisan attempt by Republicans to partially or completely repeal portions of the Affordable Care Act.

The debate on these bills has added to the already 80+ hours spent on repeal efforts in the House, which has cost the American taxpayer $55 million.

If the Majority were to succeed in their efforts to repeal the Affordable Care Act, 129

million Americans with pre-existing conditions would lose the security of knowing they cannot be denied coverage. 25 million Americans will miss out on the opportunity to receive quality, affordable health insurance coverage through the new health insurance marketplaces. 6.6 million young adults would lose coverage provided through their parents' plans, including 3.1 million who were previously uninsured. 105 million Americans could again worry about lifetime limits on their health insurance coverage.

Many constituents of Michigan's 13th District are among those already benefiting from Obamacare. So far, 121,000 of our neighbors who previously lacked health insurance have access to quality coverage without fear of discrimination or higher rates because of pre-existing conditions, including 43,000 children who can no longer be denied coverage. 136,000 individuals—including 26,000 children and 61,000 women—now have health insurance that covers preventative services without any copays, coinsurance, or deductibles. And 103,000 13th District residents are saving money directly because of ACA provisions.

All the while, the Majority has made no meaningful attempt to repeal damaging across-the-board sequestration cuts or come to the table to discuss legislation to create quality jobs with living wages.

Mr. Speaker, it's long past time to end the dysfunction epitornized by repeated efforts to repeal Obamacare, so that we can turn our focus to addressing the serious problems facing everyday Americans.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. All time for debate on H.R. 2667 has expired.

Pursuant to House Resolution 300, the previous question is ordered on the bill.

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

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 1(c) of rule XIX, further consideration of H.R. 2667 is postponed.

FAIRNESS FOR AMERICAN FAMILIES ACT

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 300, I call up the bill (H.R. 2668) to delay the application of the individual health insurance mandate, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 300, the bill is considered read.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 2668

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 ''Fairness for American Families Act''.

SEC. 2. DELAY IN APPLICATION OF INDIVIDUAL HEALTH INSURANCE MANDATE.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 5000A(a) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by striking ''2013'' and inserting ''2014''.

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—

(1) Section 5000A(c)(2)(B) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended—

(A) by striking ''2014'' in clause (i) and inserting ''2015'', and

(B) by striking ''2015'' in clauses (ii) and (iii) and inserting ''2016''.

(2) Section 5000A(c)(3)(B) of such Code is amended—

(A) by striking ''2014'' and inserting ''2015'', and

(B) by striking ''2015'' (prior to amendment by subparagraph (A)) and inserting ''2016''.

(3) Section 5000A(c)(3)(D) of such Code is amended—

(A) by striking ''2016'' and inserting ''2017'', and

(B) by striking ''2015'' and inserting ''2016''.

(4) Section 5000A(e)(1)(D) of such Code is amended—

(A) by striking ''2014'' and inserting ''2015'', and

(B) by striking ''2013'' and inserting ''2014''.

(c) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall take effect as if included in section 1501 of the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Georgia (Mr. PRICE) and the gentleman from Washington (Mr. MCDERMOTT) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Georgia.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and to include extraneous material on H.R. 2668.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, today I rise in strong support of H.R. 2668, the Fairness for American Families Act. The administration says that they invited business to come in and explain how the cost and the complexity of ObamaCare was hurting business and hurting the economy, and they granted business relief appropriately.

Mr. Speaker, why hasn't the administration invited the American people into the halls of government?

Why hasn't the White House listened to the concerns of the American people about the cost and the complexity of ObamaCare for American families?

Have American families seen a $2,500 premium decrease as promised by the President?

No. In fact, premiums have gone up.

The American people don't understand this law any better than the employers, employers who can hire lawyers and consultants and health benefits experts. In fact, individuals who have no help understand this law even less than business; yet the administration granted relief only to business.

Mr. Speaker, it's clear: the President has now admitted it. His law, ObamaCare, is not ready. Deadlines have been missed. System testing is not complete. Income verification systems are not in place.

In the words of Senator BAUCUS, the train wreck is happening.

The law should be repealed, Mr. Speaker. President Obama disagrees with that, and that's unfortunate. But we all should be able to come together on the simple principle of fairness. If business gets a 1-year delay, the American people ought to get a 1-year delay. It's a simple principle.

If ObamaCare is behind schedule, the American people should not have to bear the burdens alone. They should get the same delay as business.

I urge my colleagues to come together today and to advance this very simple principle that this government will treat its citizens fairly and equally.

I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Mr. Speaker, now we get to the real bill. If the Republicans can't repeal the Affordable Care Act, they're going to try and rot it from the inside.

For the last few days, my Republican colleagues have been spinning this vote as a great populist effort to help the middle class. They explain that, even with these repeals, we can keep all the things we like, covering our kids till age 26, prescription drug help, banning the denial of coverage for those with preexisting conditions.

And legally, they aren't wrong. They're not lying. They're just confusing the people. These laws will still be in place; but realistically, in the real world in which we live, it will be hard to cover your kids and subsidize drugs if the insurance industry no longer exists in this country.

Without the healthy consumers the mandate guarantees, only the sickest and the costliest will be left, and prices will skyrocket.

We have a letter from the Congressional Budget Office that says that if we delay this, you can expect that the prices of insurance will go up and fewer people will be covered.

The reason you don't see any fur flying is because the insurance industry knows this isn't going anywhere. This is just a lot of political theater.

In Washington, we tried this. In 1993, the Democrats put in universal coverage and guaranteed issue. Everybody had a mandate, and you were going to get it. The insurance companies couldn't do otherwise. Two years later, the Republicans repealed the guaranteed mandate, leaving the insurance industry covering the sickest in the State of Washington. Within 3 years, there were no individual policies sold in the State of Washington.

We have run this game once in Washington State, and you are coming out here today and running it again. It's been tried in other States. You cannot have universal coverage without a mandate. You cannot have insurance reform that guarantees everybody insurance.

Now, this isn't prophecy on my part. This has happened. A lot of what you hear about around here is that people

are talking, well, gee, we got these terrible insurance rates going up.

They're not going up in Washington in our exchange. They're not going up in Oregon in the exchange. They're not going up in California in the exchange. Today, New York reports they're not going up in New York.

Anybody who stands out here and says insurance rates are out of sight simply is misleading the people.

We ought to vote ''no'' on this bill.

I reserve the balance of my time.

U.S. CONGRESS,
CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET OFFICE,
Washington, DC, July 16, 2013.

Hon. DAVE CAMP,
Chairman, Committee on Ways and Means, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: CBO and the staff of the Joint Committee on Taxation (JCT) have begun a review of H.R. 2668, the Fairness for American Families Act, but we have not yet completed a cost estimate for the bill. On a preliminary basis, however, we expect that enacting H.R. 2668 would have the effect of reducing the deficit in 2014 and over the 2014–2023 period. That initial conclusion is based on our prior work on proposals to repeal the individual mandate established in the Affordable Care Act.

The legislation would delay for one year the requirement that nearly every resident of the United States have health insurance coverage by January 1, 2014. The bill also would shift by one year the schedule of penalties for people who do not comply with the mandate.

CBO and JCT expect that, during the period of delayed phase-in of the penalty for failing to comply with the mandate, health insurance premiums for individually purchased coverage would be higher under H.R. 2668 than they are projected to be under current law. In addition, the number of people with health insurance coverage would be reduced relative to current law.

I hope you find this preliminary information useful; if you wish further details, we will be pleased to provide them.

Sincerely,

DOUGLAS W. ELMENDORF.

Enclosure.

[From Bloomberg News, June 16, 2012]

HEALTH REFORM WITHOUT A MANDATE: LESSONS FROM WASHINGTON STATE

(By Sarah Kliff)

If the Supreme Court overturns the health reform law's individual mandate—a decision that could come as soon as Monday—it won't be totally unknown territory. For Washington state, it would be quite familiar.

Washington state attempted to pursue health insurance without an individual mandate.

In 1993, Washington also passed a law both guaranteeing all residents access to private health insurance, regardless of their health status, and requiring Washingtonians to purchase coverage.

The state legislature, however, repealed that last provision two years later. With the guaranteed access provisions still standing, the state saw premiums rise and enrollment drop, as residents only purchased coverage when they needed it. Health insurers fled the state and, by 1999, it was impossible to buy an individual plan in Washington—no company was selling.

Washington state is among a handful of states that have pursued universal access to health insurance. The challenges they have faced could give some clues about the federal overhaul's fate should the mandate get struck down. ''There are seven states that tried this in the mid-1990s and, in every case, it was a disaster,'' said M.I.T. health care economist Jonathan Gruber, who worked on both Massachusetts' reform law and the Affordable Care Act. ''It became pretty clear that, if you want a market to work, you need a mandate.''

Washington state began pursuing health reform in 1990, when the state legislature created a commission to study how best to provide universal coverage for its 5 million residents. The commission weighed a single-payer scheme, where state would create and run its own health plan. It ultimately settled on a ''managed competition'' model, where the state would play a greater role in regulating the insurance market.

''There were essentially three goals of the law: To cover everybody, to reduce the rate of health-care cost growth by managing competition better and to improve health care outcomes,'' says Aaron Katz, a University of Washington health policy professor who served on the commission.

Starting on July 1, 1993, health insurance companies were required to accept all state residents who applied for coverage. The new law also barred health plans from charging sick subscribers more, a practice known as underwriting. The requirement to purchase coverage, meanwhile, was not slated to take effect until five years later, in 1998.

That never came to be. After Republicans took control of the Washington state House in 1994, the state repealed its individual mandate. The guaranteed issue provision, however, remained on the books.

''The legislature was loath to repeal the insurance reforms because those were very popular,'' says Aaron Katz, a health policy professor at the University of Washington, who advised the legislature on the issue. ''That put the insurance companies in a bind.''

The bind they were in was this: The only people buying health insurance were those who foresaw having high medical costs. That drove health insurance premiums up. As premiums went up, and insurance became less affordable, enrollment decreased significantly.

As one report from the Washington state Insurance Commissioner's Office described it, the insurance market has entered a ''death spiral,'' with customers only buying coverage ''when they needed it.''

Jonathan Hensley, who then served as the president of local health plan Premera Blue Cross, recalls one letter he got from a healthy woman cancelling her insurance policy.

''She wrote in her letter that she very much appreciated our excellent service [and] that she would certainly pick our plan again when she became pregnant,'' says Hensley, who now works for another health insurer in Washington, Cambia.

Big premium spikes indicated that many Washingtonians were making similar decisions: Premera Blue Cross, increased premiums on its most popular product by 78 percent over the course of three years.

Health insurance companies, meanwhile, were losing money—and leaving the state. Between 1993 and 1998, 17 health insurance carriers had left the state's individual market. The two remaining plans—Regence Blue Shield and Group Health, a health maintenance organization—stopped writing policies in 1999. Washington state's individual market was essentially dead.

''What effectively happened was you got to this tipping point, where we couldn't afford to do business, and individual coverage was simply not available,'' says Hensley.

Hensley, along with other health-care stakeholders, met with then-Gov. Gary Locke to discuss new legislation to fix the insurance market. In 2000, the Washington state legislature significantly modified its guaranteed issue policy. Insurers would still have to cover most residents, but those with pre-existing conditions could be required to wait nine months for the policy to kick in. The very sickest applicants would, meanwhile, would be eligible for coverage in a high-risk insurance pool administered by the state.

Washington state's insurance market now has nine companies selling individual policies, compared to the 19 that participated in 1993. Thirteen percent of Washington state residents currently lack health coverage, the same number as when the health reform experiment started.

Washington state's experience does not make a perfect analogy for what would happen to the federal law, should its individual mandate get struck down. The Affordable Care Act has premium subsidies, for example, that could encourage more individuals to purchase coverage. It also allows insurance companies to charge older subscribers three times as much as young enrollees; in Washington, everyone had to receive the same rate.

Some, however, do see parallels between the role that the individual mandate played in Washington state's law—and could play in the law passed in Washington, D.C.

''Washington state's experience demonstrated that passing market reforms without requiring broad participation in the system does not work,'' said Karen Ignagni, President of America's Health Insurance Plans. ''The linkage is essential.''

Washington state, for its part, filed an amicus brief with the Supreme Court on the health reform law, that drew heavily from its own experience.

''We also know, from Washington state's own experience, that insurance coverage for pre-existing medical conditions must go hand in hand with the minimum insurance coverage requirements,'' Washington Gov. Christine Gregoire, a Democrat, said in a statement accompanying her filing.

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I'm pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. YOUNG), the author of the bill, recognizing his wisdom and his diligence in working on this issue and recognizing that fairness was absolutely vital on this issue.

Mr. YOUNG of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, on July 2, the President announced the delay of ObamaCare's employer mandate tax. Now, we know this is great for business, for those businesses that have the resources, the lobbyists, the accountants and so on to get their message out to Congress and the administration. But it does little for hard-working American individuals and families.

A government of the people, by the people, and for the people must be a government that is fair to all of its citizens. It's simply unfair to give business a pass, but not to give such treatment to rank-and-file Americans.

So that's why I introduced H.R. 2668, the Fairness for American Families Act. The bill gives individuals the same reprieve from ObamaCare that our President gives to Big Business.

Under current law, individuals must buy insurance on January 1 or pay a tax. My bill would merely delay implementation of the individual mandate tax for 1 year as well.

It's worth noting that the individual tax is just as confusing to hardworking Americans as the employer tax is to businesses; but families don't have teams of accountants and lawyers to help them comply with ObamaCare.

It isn't getting any easier either. On July 5, an additional 145 pages of regulations were promulgated by this administration related to the individual tax. So how are ordinary Americans supposed to keep up with all of this?

That's why poll after poll shows that the individual mandate tax is so unpopular. In fact, only 12 percent of Americans like it.

The White House said they delayed the employer tax because it's too darn complex for businesses. Well, I hear from my constituents every day that the individual tax is just as confusing. They want relief.

The President only wants to give relief to some. I think all of our constituents deserve relief. And with that in mind, I ask my colleagues from both political parties, let's take off our political blinders for once. Let's do the right thing here, and let's support the Fairness for American Families Act.

Let's provide the same relief to America's families that the Obama administration has granted to Big Business. That's only fair.

Mr. MCDERMOTT. Mr. Speaker, I will insert for the RECORD the report on the Ninth Indiana District and the people who will benefit from that bill when it goes into effect on the first of October.

BENEFITS OF THE HEALTH CARE REFORM LAW IN THE 9TH CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT OF INDIANA

COMMITTEES ON ENERGY AND COMMERCE, WAYS AND MEANS, AND EDUCATION AND THE WORKFORCE, DEMOCRATIC STAFF REPORT, JULY 2013

The landmark Affordable Care Act (ACA) began delivering important new benefits and protections to tens of millions of American families almost immediately after it was signed into law by President Obama. But the largest benefits of the law will become available to consumers on October 1, 2013, when health insurance marketplaces open in all 50 states. These marketplaces will offer individuals, families, and small businesses an efficient, transparent, one-stop shop to compare health insurance policies, receive financial assistance, and sign up for high-quality, affordable, and secure insurance coverage.

This fact sheet summarizes new data on the significant benefits of the health care reform law in Rep. Young's district. It also provides the first picture of the impacts of the law in districts redrawn or newly created following the 2010 Census. As a result of the law:

8,300 young adults in the district now have health insurance through their parents' plan.

More than 9,300 seniors in the district received prescription drug discounts worth $13.7 million, an average discount of $680 per person in 2011, $720 in 2012, and $700 thus far in 2013.

110,000 seniors in the district are now eligible for Medicare preventive services without paying any co-pays, coinsurance, or deductible.

213,000 individuals in the district—including 45,000 children and 86,000 women—now have health insurance that covers preventive services without any co-pays, coinsurance, or deductible.

135,000 individuals in the district are saving money due to ACA provisions that prevent insurance companies from spending more than 20% of their premiums on profits and administrative overhead. Because of these protections, over 33,800 consumers in the district received approximately $4.4 million in insurance company rebates in 2012 and 2011—an average rebate of $157 per family in 2012 and $99 per family in 2011.

Up to 40,000 children in the district with preexisting health conditions can no longer be denied coverage by health insurers.

255,000 individuals in the district now have insurance that cannot place lifetime limits on their coverage and will not face annual limits on coverage starting in 2014.

Up to 91,000 individuals in the district who lack health insurance will have access to quality, affordable coverage without fear of discrimination or higher rates because of a preexisting health condition. In addition, the 35,000 individuals who currently purchase private health insurance on the individual or small group market will have access to more secure, higher quality coverage and many will be eligible for financial assistance.

I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. BUTTERFIELD).

Mr. BUTTERFIELD. Let me thank you, Mr. MCDERMOTT, for yielding time, and thank you for you leadership on this issue. I've watched you for years doing your work, and you are consistent. I thank you so very much.

Mr. Speaker, I am opposed to this bill. You know, I've kind of lost track. I think it's 38 times that the Republican-controlled House has voted to repeal the Affordable Care Act, either in whole or in part.

Why are my colleagues wasting valuable time legislating on what amounts to nothing more than a talking point and something they know has no chance, no chance of becoming law?

Why is discrediting this President at the top of their agenda?

Let me remind my colleagues that there is real work to be done here on this floor on behalf of the American people. Maybe my friends somehow forget student loan interest rates doubled on July 1. Maybe they forget that they rammed through a farm bill that, for the first time since 1973, was without a nutrition title, leaving the door open for food banks to be closed and for millions of needy Americans to go hungry.

But, no, they didn't forget. I suggest that many of them just do not care.

Today, for the 38th time, Mr. Speaker, we vote on a bill that would delay better health care, delay fixing the problem of uncompensated care from emergency room visits, and delay access to good, affordable health care for millions of good Americans.

Therefore, I come to the floor today to urge my colleagues to oppose H.R. 2668. I ask you to vote ''no'' on this ill-conceived legislation.

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I would remind my friend that it's the President who has delayed the employer mandate in this arena. All we're looking for is fairness and equality for the American people.

I'm pleased to yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. PAULSEN), a member of the Ways and Means Committee.

Mr. PAULSEN. Mr. Speaker, from the beginning, it was clear to many Americans that ObamaCare was far too burdensome, far too complex, and far too bureaucratic to be successfully implemented. And now it appears the Obama administration agrees.

Just a few weeks ago, the administration announces on a blog post a 1-year delay of the employer mandate, admitting that it is unworkable.

Now, I've advised hundreds of businesses in Minnesota and have heard loud and clear the concerns that Obama's mandates and rules mean increased costs, higher taxes, fewer hours for workers, lost jobs and layoffs. But it's not fair that the administration is choosing to let the individual mandate take effect, letting millions of average Americans be hit with a mandate and new financial penalties.

Why is the administration only concerned about protecting business, but not hardworking American taxpayers?

Today we have an opportunity to also delay the individual mandate in order to protect all Americans. This is an issue of fairness. Average Americans are struggling under this law and they need relief. They need protection, and they need real health care reform.

Mr. MCDERMOTT. Mr. Speaker, I submit for the RECORD the report on the Third Congressional District of Minnesota and the people who will benefit from this act.

BENEFITS OF THE HEALTH CARE REFORM LAW IN THE 3RD CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT OF MINNESOTA

COMMITTEES ON ENERGY AND COMMERCE, WAYS AND MEANS, AND EDUCATION AND THE WORKFORCE, DEMOCRATIC STAFF REPORT, JULY 2013

The landmark Affordable Care Act (ACA) began delivering important new benefits and protections to tens of millions of American families almost immediately after it was signed into law by President Obama. But the largest benefits of the law will become available to consumers on October 1, 2013, when health insurance marketplaces open in all 50 states. These marketplaces will offer individuals, families, and small businesses an efficient, transparent, one-stop-shop to compare health insurance policies, receive financial assistance, and sign up for high-quality, affordable, and secure insurance coverage.

This fact sheet summarizes new data on the significant benefits of the health care reform law in Rep. Paulsen's district. It also provides the first picture of the impacts of the law in districts redrawn or newly created following the 2010 Census. As a result of the law:

3,300 young adults in the district now have health insurance through their parents' plan.

More than 8,800 seniors in the district received prescription drug discounts worth $12.2 million, an average discount of $620 per person in 2011, $680 in 2012, and $1,070 thus far in 2013.

108,000 seniors in the district are now eligible for Medicare preventive services without paying any co-pays, coinsurance, or deductible.

220,000 individuals in the district—including 54,000 children and 87,000 women—now have health insurance that covers preventive services without any co-pays, coinsurance, or deductible.

150,000 individuals in the district are saving money due to ACA provisions that prevent insurance companies from spending more than 20% of their premiums on profits and administrative overhead. Because of these protections, over 16,600 consumers in the district received approximately $1.4 million in insurance company rebates in 2012 and 2011—an average rebate of $303 per family in 2012 and $160 per family in 2011.

Up to 40,000 children in the district with preexisting health conditions can no longer be denied coverage by health insurers.

282,000 individuals in the district now have insurance that cannot place lifetime limits on their coverage and will not face annual limits on coverage starting in 2014.

53,000 individuals in the district who lack health insurance will have access to quality, affordable coverage without fear of discrimination or higher rates because of a preexisting health condition. In addition, the 42,000 individuals who currently purchase private health insurance on the individual or small group market will have access to more secure, higher quality coverage and many will be eligible for financial assistance.

I now yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. DINGELL). He's been here for a number of years, always fighting for health care, and he is living proof that the price of liberty is eternal vigilance. He's here today fighting for health care, just like he did the first day he got here.

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

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I thank my good friend for the time; and I rise in strong opposition to the seriously misnamed H.R. 2668, Fairness for American Families Act. It's a lot of baloney. This is nothing more than a sorry political stunt that would undermine the critical portions of the Affordable Care Act, which is already bringing enormous benefits to the American people.

Delaying the individual mandate by 1 year will simply undercut ACA when it is the time that we must be focusing on fully implementing the law. Just today, we found that the health insurance premiums in New York are going to fall by an average of 50 percent when the exchanges are up and running. Other States can do the same thing, and that is the experience which we're finding across the country. This is happening elsewhere.

□ 1645

I would point out that repealing the individual mandate is going to cost Americans additional health care costs, not decrease them.

Let us move forward with the implementation. I ask my Republicans colleagues to cooperate with us in that goal. I ask them to work with us to better the welfare of the American people by seeing to it that this comes into law. The Congress has spoken and the American people approve. I say that it is time for us to provide real benefits to the American people rather than continue playing these sorry and tired political games.

I say shame on those of us who are wasting the time of this body. Let us address the problems of the economy. Let us deal with jobs, employment. Let us deal with student loans, where the interest rate is doubling. Let us see to it that we implement this law which will do away with things that are so hurtful to the American people, such as having Americans unable to get insurance because they have a preexisting condition or where insurance companies can cancel a policy because people are getting sick. It is time for us to deal with the real problems.

Einstein observed that insanity is doing the same thing over and over again with the full expectation that the results are going to be different, but getting the same result. I say this country needs better leadership, better understanding, and a Congress that will work on behalf of the American people. As I look around, I do not see that on this floor today.

Again, I say shame. This is a terrible, terrible waste of the people's money and the people's time. It costs a lot for us to make this Congress meet and to conduct its business, and we are wasting that time now with this kind of nonsensical legislation.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to both H.R. 2667, the Authority for Mandate Delay Act, and H.R. 2668, the Fairness for American Families Act. Here we are once again taking another cheap shot at the Affordable Care Act (ACA), rather than working to continue providing its benefits to the American people. Both pieces of legislation are political stunts which will not help Americans get access to quality, affordable health care

There is no need for passage of H.R. 2667 since the President has already acted to delay by one year the employer responsibility requirements under ACA. Given the fact that this type of change has long been sought by my friends on the other side of the aisle and their allies, you would think they would be praising the President for taking this action. Instead, they have done nothing but used this as another opportunity to score cheap political points, which is very telling.

Although I wish the employer responsibility provision would be implemented on time, the fact of the matter is that this delay will have very little practical impact. Over ninety six percent of large employers already offer health coverage to their employees. It is important that we take our time in getting these new reporting requirements right, which is exactly what the President is doing. Since the President has already acted in this manner, H.R. 2667 is duplicative and unnecessary.

H.R. 2668 also should be rejected by this body. The individual mandate is the cornerstone of the ACA, and the Supreme Court has affirmed its constitutionality. Simply put, delaying the implementation of the individual mandate is just a back door attempt to undermine the entire law. The Affordable Care Act has already brought many benefits to the American people. Thanks to the law, 206,000 people in my district have access to preventative services without a co-pay, and 8,500 young adults have health insurance through their parents' plan. Adopting this bill today would jeopardize this progress we have made in recent years.

Today we received news that health insurance premiums will fall by an average of 50 percent in New York once their exchanges are up and running in 2014. The individual mandate is a key reason for this. For years, New York had a prohibition on discriminating against individuals with a pre-existing condition. However, the State did not require all individuals to purchase insurance, which caused rates to skyrocket. The individual mandate, combined with the new health insurance marketplaces, are in large part responsible for this precipitous decline in insurance rates in New York. We should ensure that these results are replicated in my home State of Michigan and across the rest of the country. Repealing the individual mandate will increase Americans' health care costs, not decrease them.

I hope we can come together and work in a bipartisan manner to improve our health care system and provide real benefits to the American people. Until that day comes, I urge my colleagues to join me in voting against these two pieces of legislation, as they are nothing more than political stunts which do nothing to address the problems we face as a Nation.

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. I am pleased to yield 1 minute to a fellow physician colleague in the United States House, the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. ROE).

Mr. ROE of Tennessee. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I rise in strong support of the Fairness for American Families Act. As chairman of the Health, Employment, Labor, and Pension Subcommittee, I've held three hearings outside the Beltway—one in North Carolina—where we talked to businesses and individuals about the effect of the Affordable Care Act on them and their businesses.

Let me just tell you about some people that I heard from. One was a divorced server in a restaurant that had her hours cut from 40 to 29 so that the company could stay in business. This woman now is missing an entire week's worth of hours every single month. She can't pay her bills unless she gets another job. The same problem for adjunct professors at the local community college.

And now, the audacity of what we've done is we've forced businesses to cut these hours, where they make less money, and then penalize you when you don't buy something. That's wrong. The right thing to do is to delay this for both individuals and businesses so they can work out the problems. That was the President's suggestion. I strongly support this bill.

Mr. MCDERMOTT. Mr. Speaker, according to a report on the First Congressional District of Tennessee, 5,800 young adults have insurance on their parents' plan, 13,000 seniors receive prescription drug benefit reductions, and 168,000 seniors are now eligible for preventive care that's free. And on and on it goes.

BENEFITS OF THE HEALTH CARE REFORM LAW IN THE 1ST CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT OF TENNESSEE

COMMITTEES ON ENERGY AND COMMERCE, WAYS AND MEANS, AND EDUCATION AND THE WORKFORCE, DEMOCRATIC STAFF REPORT, JULY 2013

The landmark Affordable Care Act (ACA) began delivering important new benefits and

protections to tens of millions of American families almost immediately after it was signed into law by President Obama. But the largest benefits of the law will become available to consumers on October 1, 2013, when health insurance marketplaces open in all 50 states. These marketplaces will offer individuals, families, and small businesses an efficient, transparent one-stop shop to compare health insurance policies, receive financial assistance, and sign up for high-quality, affordable, and secure insurance coverage.

This fact sheet summarizes new data on the significant benefits of the health care reform law in Rep. Roe's district. It also provides the first picture of the impacts of the law in districts redrawn or newly created following the 2010 Census. As a result of the law:

5,800 young adults in the district now have health insurance through their parents' plan.

More than 13,100 seniors in the district received prescription drug discounts worth $16.9 million, an average discount of $580 per person in 2011, $630 in 2012, and $680 thus far in 2013.

168,000 seniors in the district are now eligible for Medicare preventive services without paying any co-pays, coinsurance, or deductible.

177,000 individuals in the district—including 34,000 children and 75,000 women—now have health insurance that covers preventive services without any co-pays, coinsurance, or deductible.

168,000 individuals in the district are saving money due to ACA provisions that prevent insurance companies from spending more than 20% of their premiums on profits and administrative overhead. Because of these protections, over 26,000 consumers in the district received approximately $3.7 million in insurance company rebates in 2012 and 2011—an average rebate of $69 per family in 2012 and $201 per family in 2011.

Up to 36,000 children in the district with preexisting health conditions can no longer be denied coverage by health insurers.

190,000 individuals in the district now have insurance that cannot place lifetime limits on their coverage and will not face annual limits on coverage starting in 2014.

Up to 103,000 individuals in the district who lack health insurance will have access to quality, affordable coverage without fear of discrimination or higher rates because of a preexisting health condition. In addition, the 28,000 individuals who currently purchase private health insurance on the individual or small group market will have access to more secure, higher quality coverage and many will be eligible for financial assistance.

I yield 1 minute to the leader of the Democratic Party, the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI).

Ms. PELOSI. I thank the gentleman for yielding. I thank him also for his leadership on this health care issue. I've watched him lead this debate for nearly three decades, and I'm so pleased that you are here to defend the Affordable Care Act on the floor today, as our Republican colleagues try for the 38th time to repeal it. It is nothing more than a waste of time. This matter has been settled in Congress, at the Supreme Court, and at the ballot box. It is the law of the land.

Mr. Speaker, this bill that is on the floor today is something that the President has very clearly said he will veto. Yet Republicans still want to vote for the 38th time to repeal the Affordable Care Act while we're still waiting for the first time to vote for a jobs bill.

The American people expect and deserve this Congress to work together to grow the economy, creating jobs, and strengthening the middle class, the backbone of our democracy. It's been over 6 months since this Congress took office. It's been over 3 months since the Senate passed a budget bill. For all of that time, Democrats have proposed a budget that would reduce taxes on the middle class, strengthen the middle class, reduce the deficit, create jobs, and grow the economy. And for 6 months the Republicans have said ''no.'' Instead, for 38 times they have wanted to waste the public's dollar repealing, once again, the Affordable Care Act.

What does a vote for this bill mean? A vote for this bill means that—just on the provisions already in place—you are voting so that children with a preexisting medical condition can now face discrimination. Because you will eliminate the end of that discrimination. Right now, children no longer face discrimination on the basis of a preexisting condition. A vote for the bill eliminates that.

Right now, young adults are gaining coverage through their parents' plans. A vote for this bill strikes that down. Right now, seniors are paying less for prescription drugs and getting better treatment at a lower cost. A vote for this bill strikes that down. Americans no longer face lifetime limits on care. A vote for this bill eliminates that. Families are receiving rebates from insurance companies because of the medical loss ratio. It's very important in this bill. Insurance companies were overly profiting at the expense of policyholders. This is a vote for the insurance companies and against policyholders. Soon, being a woman will no longer be considered a preexisting medical condition. The Republicans don't like that.

And when I say don't like, what will also be coming up in the bill is it will take away access to affordable coverage for 129 million people with a preexisting medical condition. Just think of it. Do any of you know anyone with heart disease, cancer, diabetes, or a child born prematurely? That's a preexisting condition forever—one that also has lifetime limits on it, if you have your way.

It takes away the guarantee that women pay the same premiums as men for the same coverage. Women have so much to gain in this bill because for so long we have been discriminated against on the basis of being a woman. You want to take that away from us again. It takes away the new cap on America's out-of-pocket health care costs. The list goes on and on about what is the law now that will be taken away and what will become the law in fewer than 6 months that was very helpful for America's families.

The gentleman told us a story about a small businessman. We always say the plural of anecdote is not data, but we all have our stories to tell. They are illustrative. Ninety-six percent of America's businesses are not affected by this law.

Mr. Speaker, last year, in San Francisco, I met with Julie and Matt, parents of a little 2-year-old girl, Violet. Violet was born with a rare and life-threatening form of epilepsy. For Violet and her family, the Affordable Care Act was life-changing. Before the act, Violet had a preexisting condition. So she would be discriminated against in terms of health insurance. Violet had lifetime and annual limits on the coverage that she could get. A little child with such an early preexisting condition could possibly exhaust her lifetime limits before she was in third grade.

Imagine being in their shoes. Imagine Julie and Matt watching this debate, following the work of Congress, and what it means to them. What it means to them is the health of their child, the financial security of their family, and hope for the future. Imagine the fear, the uncertainty, the frustration they feel when they hear this debate. Imagine what it would be like to witness it 38 times and the threat that it is to your family's security.

So there are Violet and other children like her. We hear stories over and over again. Whatever we're doing, I always like to envision what it means to children and what it does for our children. This means a great deal to our children and to their families. It honors the vows of our Founders of life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. A healthy life, the liberty to pursue your happiness, to be whatever you want—an artist, be self-employed to start a business, to change jobs. To be able to follow your passion, not policy. And not to be confined because there's a preexisting condition in your family or to be confined because of fear of someone getting ill.

Really, what is important today is what it does or how it damages the health security of America's families. But it's also the missed opportunity. When, if ever, do the Republicans intend to bring a bill to the floor that will create jobs for our country? When are we going to have a budget that does just that?

You said you wanted the Senate to pass a bill and then we would go to conference. That's called regular order. The Senate passed a bill 3 months ago. And still, the Republicans resist. What are you afraid of? Are you afraid that the public will see the contrast between a Democratic budget, which invests in people, which builds the infrastructure of America, which has provisions to bring jobs home to America, and that strengthens the middle class instead of the exploitation of the middle class that is contained in the Republican budget?

So all this is a smokescreen. It's just make-work projects. It's just subterfuge. Let's do anything other than what the American people expect us to do here. They expect us to work together. They expect us to compromise.

They expect us to find solutions. They expect us to get results for them. They expect us to act the way we used to here and be respectful of each other's views, instead of having a Republican anti-government, ideological agenda which says nothing—nothing—is our success, to do nothing is to succeed, and never is our timetable.

So let's not waste the public's time, and the taxpayers' dollar on initiatives that are going no place. They're political stunts and an excuse for a legislative agenda that is not worthy of this House of Representatives, that is not deserving of the respect of the American people, and the form of this legislation will not have my support.

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. * * * The fact of the matter is that this bill, understanding that ObamaCare is a huge, destructive element in job destruction—

Mr. BECERRA. Mr. Speaker, I ask that the gentleman's words be taken down.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will suspend. The gentleman will be seated.

The Clerk will report the words.

□ 1700

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw my previous statement.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I'm pleased to yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. HURT).

Mr. HURT. Mr. Speaker, in response to the minority leader's statement, I would suggest that this is in fact a jobs bill. This is a bill about health care. It is about the quality of health care. It is also about preserving jobs for this country.

I rise in support of the Fairness for Families Act, a House initiative that would delay the enforcement of the individual insurance mandate, a central element of the President's health care law. This bill would provide hard-working individuals and families with the same relief that the Obama administration recently gave to American employers.

As I travel throughout our district, I consistently hear about the law's devastating effect it has on our families, our workforce, and our struggling economy. Whether it's the community college in Danville that is cutting employee hours because it simply cannot afford to comply with the law or the family in Charlottesville that is coping with skyrocketing insurance premiums, there is no question that the people of Virginia's Fifth District continue to be negatively impacted by this law.

While the administration continues to praise this legislation, the American people are left with nothing but broken promises.

At a time when too many across this country are out of work, it only makes sense that we act to reduce the burden on individuals and families by suspending this mandate while continuing our efforts to repeal this flawed law and replace it with market-oriented policies that will lower costs for all Americans.

Mr. MCDERMOTT. Mr. Speaker, I would like to insert letters from consumer groups opposing the bill—Easter Seals, American Diabetes Association, American Heart Association, and others.

I also would like to enter into the RECORD the report on the Fifth Congressional District of Virginia and those who will benefit from the Affordable Care Act.

BENEFITS OF THE HEALTH CARE REFORM LAW IN THE 5TH CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT OF VIRGINIA

COMMITTEES ON ENERGY AND COMMERCE, WAYS AND MEANS, AND EDUCATION AND THE WORKFORCE, DEMOCRATIC STAFF REPORT, JULY 2013

The landmark Affordable Care Act (ACA) began delivering important new benefits and protections to tens of millions of American families almost immediately after it was signed into law by President Obama. But the largest benefits of the law will become available to consumers on October 1, 2013, when health insurance marketplaces open in all 50 states. These marketplaces will offer individuals, families, and small businesses an efficient, transparent one-stop shop to compare health insurance policies, receive financial assistance, and sign up for high-quality, affordable, and secure insurance coverage.

This fact sheet summarizes new data on the significant benefits of the health care reform law in Rep. Hurt's district. It also provides the first picture of the impacts of the law in districts redrawn or newly created following the 2010 Census. As a result of the law:

5,900 young adults in the district now have health insurance through their parents' plan.

More than 11,400 seniors in the district received prescription drug discounts worth $15.6 million, an average discount of $590 per person in 2011, $720 in 2012, and $800 thus far in 2013.

165,000 seniors in the district are now eligible for Medicare preventive services without paying any co-pays, coinsurance, or deductible.

201,000 individuals in the district—including 37,000 children and 87,000 women—now have health insurance that covers preventive services without any co-pays, coinsurance, or deductible.

188,000 individuals in the district are saving money due to ACA provisions that prevent insurance companies from spending more than 20% of their premiums on profits and administrative overhead. Because of these protections, over 57,300 consumers in the district received approximately $4.6 million in insurance company rebates in 2011 and 2012—an average rebate of $115 per family in 2011 and $88 per family in 2012.

Up to 37,000 children in the district with preexisting health conditions can no longer be denied coverage by health insurers.

235,000 individuals in the district now have insurance that cannot place lifetime limits on their coverage and will not face annual limits on coverage starting in 2014.

Up to 91,000 individuals in the district who lack health insurance will have access to quality, affordable coverage without fear of discrimination or higher rates because of a preexisting health condition. In addition, the 51,000 individuals who currently purchase private health insurance on the individual or small group market will have access to more secure, higher quality coverage and many will be eligible for financial assistance.

JULY 16, 2013.

Hon. JOHN BOEHNER,
Speaker of the House, U.S. House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

Hon. NANCY PELOSI,
Minority Leader, U.S. House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR SPEAKER BOEHNER AND MINORITY LEADER PELOSI: Today, millions of Americans face barriers to health insurance coverage. Many go without insurance because it is simply unaffordable. Others have life-threatening chronic diseases such as cancer, diabetes, heart disease or stroke and are denied insurance due to pre-existing conditions. Starting in 2014, the Affordable Care Act will remove these tough barriers to health insurance.

New patient protections will require insurers to cover people with pre-existing conditions, eliminate limits on the coverage a patient can receive, and ban the practice of charging women and people with health conditions more for their coverage. In fewer than 80 days, the doors to new insurance marketplaces will be open to enroll uninsured people and the marketplaces, along with tax credit subsidies, will help more Americans afford life-saving care

However, for these important protections to stay in place without disrupting the health care market—and driving up costs for everyone—the insurance market must include a mix of both healthy and sick people. We already know what a health care system without a minimum coverage requirement looks like: many healthy Americans opt not to buy health coverage until they are ill, and costs skyrocket as insurance pools fill with people in urgent need of treatment and care. People with pre-existing conditions are charged exorbitant rates for health coverage, putting critical care out of reach for many American families. As a result, many people with a chronic illness must resort to emergency room care, which lowers their chances of surviving their illness and drives up costs system-wide.

We are therefore opposed to H.R. 2668, legislation that would delay the minimum coverage provision that is instrumental to the effectiveness of the patient protections. By ensuring near universal coverage, the new patient protections help end cherry-picking and cost shifting in the current health care market, which drives up costs for everyone. Last year the Supreme Court upheld the constitutionality of the minimum coverage provision and our organizations support its scheduled implementation.

We also believe that H.R. 2667 is unnecessary and detracts from the more critical job we all must undertake to help more Americans gain access to high quality, affordable, health insurance.

The undersigned organizations believe that we all have a duty to spread the word about the new health insurance options that will allow people to compare prices and shop for health insurance where they live. That is why our respective organizations are opposed to votes that hamper the implementation of the law or wrongly direct attention away from the important job of informing people about new coverage options.

We look forward to working with you to help you and your constituents get information about the new options for fairer, more comprehensive, and more affordable health care coverage.

Sincerely,

AMERICAN DIABETES ASSOCIATION.
AMERICAN HEART ASSOCIATION.

CONSUMERS UNION.
FAMILIES USA.
NATIONAL PARTNERSHIP FOR WOMEN & FAMILIES.
NATIONAL WOMEN'S LAW CENTER.

AMERICAN ACADEMY OF FAMILY PHYSICIANS,
July 15, 2013.

INSURANCE COVERAGE REQUIREMENT IS FOUNDATION OF IMPROVING ACCESS, QUALITY AND COST CONTAINMENT IN HEALTH CARE

Statement attributable to: Jeff Cain, MD, President, American Academy of Family Physicians.

The Affordable Care Act's requirement that individuals have health insurance—either through their employer, a federal or state health care program, or as an individual purchaser—is the foundation of improving access to care and vital to ensuring everyone has health care coverage. For that reason, the American Academy of Family Physicians strongly supports the health coverage requirement for individuals. We urge Congress to preserve this element of health care reform.

The cost of providing care to uninsured patients is a major driver of skyrocketing costs of health care. Health professionals struggle with economic losses that result from providing care to uninsured patients. Individuals whose usual source of care is the emergency room have no access to comprehensive, coordinated services that prevent unnecessary often-uncompensated ER use and hospitalizations. Worse, the professionals who see these patients for incident-specific health issues and do not know the patient's medical history must repeat expensive tests and procedures. The cost of these fragmented and costly interventions are passed on through rate increases to the insured, which in turn drives up the cost for employers, governments, and individuals.

One way to end this increasingly expensive cycle is to require everyone to have health insurance. The AAFP has consistently called for ensuring that everyone has access to health insurance and care provided in a patient-centered medical home. The Affordable Care Act does just that with its requirement that individuals who don't get health benefits through work buy coverage—with appropriate subsidies if necessary—or receive health care through Medicaid.

If Congress hopes to improve the quality of health care and rein in escalating costs, it must end the fragmented, duplicative system that results from lack of health insurance. Ensuring that all individuals have health care coverage is not only good health care policy, but it is also good economic policy. Without a coverage requirement, many patients will continue to have no coverage, other patients will see insurance premiums rise due to covering the cost of uninsured patients, businesses will continue to grapple with rising health care costs, and health professionals, will have to absorb significant financial losses due to providing uncompensated care.

NATIONAL WOMEN'S LAW CENTER CRITICAL OF HOUSE BILLS AIMED AT HAMPERING HEALTH CARE LAW

WASHINGTON, DC.—The House of Representatives is slated to vote today on H.R. 2667 and H.R. 2688, two bills aimed at undermining the Affordable Care Act (ACA).

The following statement is from Marcia D. Greenberger, Co-President of the National Women's Law Center:

''Thanks to the ACA, millions more American women will have access to affordable health insurance options when enrollment in health insurance marketplaces begins in October. But rather than help the American people learn about new coverage options and their benefits, the House leadership is working relentlessly to hamper, if not totally prevent implementation of the law. Their efforts could cost uninsured and underinsured women and their families dearly, taking away the critically important health and financial security promised by the ACA's landmark reforms.

''We urge the House of Representatives to put aside any attempts to roll back the ACA and get on with the urgently-needed work of ensuring its success.''

NATIONAL COMMITTEE TO PRESERVE SOCIAL SECURITY & MEDICARE,
Washington, DC, July 16, 2013.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE: On behalf of the millions of members and supporters of the National Committee to Preserve Social Security and Medicare, I urge you to vote against H.R. 2668 and any legislation that would delay the individual responsibility provision to obtain health insurance. The individual requirement is a critical component of the Affordable Care Act (ACA). Without it, the intent of the law—to offer affordable coverage to the uninsured—would be undermined.

This differs from the Administration's decision to delay for one year the requirement for large employers to offer employee health insurance or pay a penalty, made to accommodate the business community's request for additional time to prepare for the new system. Currently, the majority of employers already provide health insurance to recruit and retain employees, and the employer delay will not change this. For large employers that do not offer health coverage or plan to delay providing coverage, such as some retail and restaurant chains, their employees will be able to purchase a health plan in one of the subsidized marketplaces. Because federal subsidies will be available to those with low-to-moderate incomes to purchase insurance through the exchanges, some employees may end up with less expensive and more robust health plans from the exchanges than they would have received from their employers.

In contrast, delaying the individual requirement to purchase health insurance will undercut the ability of the ACA marketplace exchanges to offer affordable health coverage. Requiring individuals to purchase health insurance is necessary because it spreads health risks across the entire population, thus healthier and/or younger individuals would help keep overall expenditures lower. Younger enrollees benefit from risk sharing between generations as they age and require more health care.

According to a recent Kaiser Family Foundation poll, more than seven in ten young adults stated that it is very important for them to have health insurance. However, the high cost of insurance was the biggest barrier for purchasing insurance. The same poll found that about half of those under age 65 believe that they or household members have a pre-existing condition, and a quarter of them were denied health insurance or paid higher premiums because of it. In order to reverse these wrongs, the individual insurance requirement is needed to create a health system that will put affordable coverage in reach of young and old alike.

We support the Affordable Care Act, and urge you to vote against H.R. 2668 and any legislation that would delay the individual responsibility requirement. Millions of American are counting on it and need affordable health coverage as soon possible.

Sincerely,

MAX RICHTMAN
President and CEO.

SERVICE EMPLOYEES INTERNATIONAL UNION,
Washington, DC, July 16, 2013.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE: On behalf of the more than 2.1 million members of the Service Employees International Union (SEIU), including more than 1 million nurses, doctors, lab technicians, nursing home workers, home care workers and others, I urge you to oppose the Authority for Mandate Delay Act (H.R. 2667) and the Fairness for American Families Act (H.R. 2668). Rather than a productive, bipartisan effort to ensure successful implementation of the Affordable Care Act, these bills are yet another misguided political effort to undermine the law and chip away at the protections the law provides.

The Affordable Care Act makes healthcare more available and affordable for millions of Americans. Right now, there are more than 100 million Americans—of all ages, occupations, incomes and political parties—who are benefiting from the Affordable Care Act. Because of this law, insurance companies are prohibited from rescinding insurance coverage based on a pre-existing condition, seniors can afford lifesaving prescriptions, young people can stay on their parents' plans until age 26, and progress is being made around the country to give Americans new options to purchase affordable health coverage.

Sadly, rather than engaging in bipartisan efforts to ensure successful implementation, some seek to score political points to undermine support for the law. These bills—like the dozens of others—serve nothing more than to distract from the core work SEIU is committed to: making sure people know about the new options available to them for more accessible, affordable coverage where they live.

Despite the delay tactics and millions of dollars spent to derail the Affordable Care Act, the law is moving forward and new healthcare markets will be ready to offer high-quality, lower-cost healthcare coverage to middle-class Americans as of January 1, 2014. SEIU will continue to work together with organizations from all walks of life—including labor, small businesses and responsible employers, healthcare providers and advocates, faith leaders and elected officials—to make sure Americans are informed when it comes to their healthcare choices under the law.

H.R. 2667 and H.R. 2668 are part of a concerted strategy to refight political battles of the past, rather than bipartisan efforts to continue moving this law forward. We urge you to oppose these misguided bills. Votes on these bills may be added to SEIU's Congressional scorecard at www.seiu.org. If you have any questions, please contact Steph Sterling, Legislative Director.

Sincerely,

MARY KAY HENRY,
International President.

AMERICAN PUBLIC HEALTH ASSOCIATION,
Washington, DC, July 16, 2013.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE: On behalf of the American Public Health Association, a diverse community of public health professionals who have championed the health of all people and communities around the world for more than 140 years, I write in opposition to the Fairness for American Families Act,

legislation to delay the individual mandate under the Affordable Care Act (H.R. 2668).

Implementation of the ACA is critical to addressing the biggest challenges facing our health system including the escalating costs associated with our health care system, uneven quality and deaths due to medical errors, discriminatory practices by health insurance providers and the shrinking ranks of the nation's primary care providers. The ACA is helping to shift our health system from one that focuses on treating the sick to one that focuses on keeping people healthy. The individual mandate is central to reducing the number of uninsured Americans, controlling health care costs and ensuring the availability of affordable health insurance coverage. Delaying this key provision will only undermine our progress in creating a healthier nation.

The ACA will provide an additional 30 million uninsured individuals with affordable and comprehensive health insurance coverage. Since its enactment, the law has provided 71 million Americans with access to preventive health care services such as vaccines, disease screenings, well-child visits and tobacco cessation counseling without copays or deductibles. More than 34 million seniors have also accessed preventive services without cost through the Medicare program. More than 3 million young adults up to age 26 are able to stay on their parents' health insurance plans and nearly 18 million children with pre-existing conditions are protected from insurance coverage denials. In addition, the ACA provides critical mandatory funding through the Prevention and Public Health Fund for community-based prevention and wellness activities including efforts to control the obesity epidemic, reduce tobacco use and modernize vaccination systems.

Protecting the ACA and working to effectively implement this critical law will remain a top priority for APHA and we will consider including this vote in our 2013 annual congressional vote record.

We ask you to oppose this and future efforts to delay or repeal the full implementation of the ACA and we look forward to working with you to protect and improve the health of the American people.

Sincerely,

GEORGES C. BENJAMIN,
MD, FACP, FACEP (E),
Executive Director.

EASTER SEALS,
OFFICE OF PUBLIC AFFAIRS,
Washington, DC, July 16, 2013.

DEAR MEMBER OF CONGRESS: Easter Seals is asking you to oppose the Authority for Mandate Delay Act (H.R. 2667), legislation to codify the recent administration-issued delay in the implementation of the employer mandate included in the Affordable Care Act, and the Fairness for American Families Act (H.R. 2668), legislation to delay the implementation date of the individual mandate, also part of the Affordable Care Act. The structure of this law allows access to appropriate and high quality health care services which are essential for people with disabilities to live, learn and work and play in their communities.

The goal of the health care reform law is to assure that all people have access to quality, affordable health care that meets their individual needs. It is through the types of changes included in the Affordable Care Act that we can hope to enable all Americans, including people with disabilities and chronic conditions, to be healthy, functional, live as independently as possible and participate in their communities.

The circumstances facing people without insurance, or those that are under-insured, have not changed since passage of this law in March of 2010, even if some might say the political landscape has become more complex. We strongly urge you to reject steps to dismantle this tightly-crafted process before it has had a chance to be put into place. The law, if given the time and tools to be successful, can make great strides to provide affordable, quality health care to those who have difficulty attaining or retaining insurance coverage.

Easter Seals looks forward to working with you as the effort to ensure quality health care is available to more Americans moves forward.

Sincerely,

KATHERINE BEH NEAS,
Vice President, Government Relations.

Mr. MCDERMOTT. I now yield 5 minutes to the minority whip, the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER).

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I rise to speak the truth. This bill and the other bill are not real; they are purely partisan politics. They have nothing to do with reality. My friends and Mr. Speaker, the American people ought to know that is the truth.

These bills take time, with no effect. And everybody in this House—the majority leader and 434 of the rest of us—know these bills are going nowhere. They are, in fact, the 38th and 39th effort to repeal the Affordable Care Act, an attempt which has been made some 37 times already with no substantive alternative to assure quality, affordable health care for all Americans. My friends, that is the truth.

This is a game. This is political messaging, nothing more, nothing less. It is a ''gotcha'' game.

The President has already taken action to make sure that businesses—some 4 percent of the businesses in America, by the way, are affected by what the President did and your purported bill—to make sure that they can do the paperwork properly. The administration took the right action.

Your first bill is not necessary and you know it. It is a setup so that your second bill, which takes away the individual mandate—which America ought to know, Mr. Speaker, would undermine the very benefits that are today being enjoyed by seniors, by young people, by children with preexisting conditions, and by so many millions of Americans enjoying the benefits today. But without the individual mandate, as the Heritage Foundation pointed out so many years ago—a position they have now changed, of course—was absolutely essential to make sure that we could bring costs down. The New York Times of course, today, ironically, said on its front page that there is a possibility that premiums are going to be reduced 50 percent.

So, Mr. Speaker, I would tell my friends in the press, in the media, don't take any of these votes for real. They're ''gotcha'' votes so that maybe some people will vote ''yes'' to confirm the President's opinion and then say, But we don't want to undermine the Affordable Care Act—as all of you who have voted so often have expressed your willingness and intent to do. But then they will vote ''no'' on the individual mandate, and you will say, of course, My, my, my; they were for businesses but against all you individuals. That RNC ad I'm sure is written already. That's what this is about, ''gotcha'' politics.

Isn't it a shame. Isn't it a shame, when millions of Americans have no health care, when millions of Americans have no jobs, when people are being furloughed in the defense sector, undermining the security of our country—in Virginia and in Maryland—undermining our national security, that we spend our time here on this floor with ''gotcha'' politics, with no expectation whatsoever that either of these bills will ever become law.

This is simply messaging. This is simply saying for the people who have been, for the last 4 years, trying to repeal the Affordable Care Act. And so many people were absolutely positive that President Obama was going to go down to defeat on the horns of the dilemma of the Affordable Health Care Act. It didn't happen. The American people said, No, we don't buy that argument. We believe providing Americans with health care is an important objective. We believe in making sure that kids and individuals with preexisting conditions can get health care, making sure that seniors won't be driven into poverty by paying for expensive drugs to keep them alive, making sure that people get preventive health care and are not disincentivized in doing that by additional costs.

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

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

Mr. HOYER. I thank my friend.

Ladies and gentlemen, we really need to come together and talk about how we reasonably move forward.

Speaker BOEHNER said, when the President was reelected, well, the Affordable Care Act is here. But you continue, you continue this very day, to pretend you're going to repeal the Affordable Care Act. That's maybe what your constituents want. That's maybe good politics for you, but it's lousy substance. That's the truth.

This is a ''gotcha'' vote. The press ought to disregard and constituents ought to disregard anything other than this is a vote to end the Affordable Care Act. Reject it. Reject it. Reject this politics as usual.

Mr. Speaker, today's votes are a sad and unnecessary gimmick.

What Republicans are focusing on with these bills is not real—it's part of a political game that comes at the cost of spending time on the actual challenges we face, like creating jobs and replacing the sequester.

I'm not surprised that Republicans continue to force votes to repeal the Affordable Care Act, because that's been their position all along.

Today's votes are more of the same—efforts to undermine a law that has

been enacted by Congress, upheld by the Supreme Court and reaffirmed with the reelection of President Obama.

The Administration has already announced they are delaying employer penalties by one year, while they continue to work with America's businesses to simplify reporting requirements.

They have already taken the needed steps to give the four percent of employers impacted by this policy more time to adapt their health coverage to new requirements—making today's legislation both redundant and irrelevant.

With respect to the individual responsibility requirement—no delay is needed.

Consumers will soon be able to use new insurance marketplaces to purchase insurance products that cover pre-existing conditions, do not impose arbitrary limits on your coverage, and do not charge women higher premiums than men for the exact same policy.

Many will be eligible for tax credits to help them cover the cost of insurance as well.

Today's legislation will only serve to increase both premiums and the number of uninsured.

It's time Republicans stop playing games with America's health care and focus the People's House on the issues the people care about: replacing the sequester and creating jobs.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair would remind all Members to direct their remarks to the Chair.

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I'm pleased to yield 1 minute to the majority leader of the United States House of Representatives, the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. CANTOR).

Mr. CANTOR. I thank the gentleman from Georgia for his leadership.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to support the Fairness for American Families Act.

You know, Mr. Speaker, it's interesting here on the floor to hear the leadership of the minority continue their cries of objection based on claims of politics and process. Now we're talking about substance here. Instead, what we hear are objections about our position, somehow insinuating that we don't care about people's health care. Well, Mr. Speaker, I would say it is exactly the opposite. We're talking about substance and we're talking about ways that we can improve the prospects for quality health care for Americans.

For several years, Republicans have been warning the American people about the devastating impact ObamaCare will have on both jobs and health care, and it now appears that Democrats—and even the President himself—are beginning to agree. The decision by the administration earlier this month to delay the employer mandate to 2015 is a clear signal that even the administration doesn't believe the country is ready to sustain the painful impact this law will have. Fortunately, others, including some of the law's most ardent supporters, are starting to realize the same.

Just this week, Democratic leaders of the House and Senate were sent a letter from the presidents of three major unions warning that if changes were not made to the Affordable Care Act, it would ''destroy the foundation of the 40-hour workweek that is the backbone of the American middle class.''

Now, Mr. Speaker, to me, that's real. That's not just games. That's real.

Now, continuing, these union leaders claim that if the Affordable Care Act was enacted without being modified, it would ''destroy the very health and well-being of our members, along with millions of other hardworking Americans.''

These consequences resulting from employees having their hours cut and their health benefits jeopardized represent what these leaders described as ''nightmare scenarios.''

Mr. Speaker, I'd submit again, that's real. That's not just games.

It is now explicitly clear to people across political lines that promises were made and now broken, and ObamaCare is not working. Now, this is the direction we need to take. This is the common ground. If we have bipartisan agreement that things just aren't working under ObamaCare, let's work to improve the situation for Americans.

Why is it that working Americans have to suffer the financial burdens of an overreaching, government-run health care system while the same consequences for big business are delayed a year? The White House won't offer an answer to that because, I believe, they've run out of excuses. They've run out of ideas, and now they're starting to backpedal.

□ 1715

The Fairness for American Families Act will extend the delay of these mandates to all Americans. No family's health, well-being, or employment should suffer while businesses get a break. I sincerely hope that my colleagues on the other side of the aisle would join us in this effort to bring basic fairness to everyone.

I would like to thank Congressman TODD YOUNG from Indiana for his hard work on this issue, and I urge my colleagues in the House to support this legislation.

Mr. MCDERMOTT. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 30 seconds to report on the Seventh Congressional District of Virginia, where the promises have been kept:

4,500 young adults have health insurance on their parents' plan;

10,000 seniors have received help with their drug costs;

112,000 seniors are now eligible for preventive care at no cost;

288,000 people in the Seventh District now have insurance that does not have lifetime limits.

The promises have been kept in the Seventh District.

BENEFITS OF THE HEALTH CARE REFORM LAW IN THE 7TH CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT OF VIRGINIA

COMMITTEES ON ENERGY AND COMMERCE, WAYS AND MEANS, AND EDUCATION AND THE WORKFORCE, DEMOCRATIC STAFF REPORT, JULY 2013

The landmark Affordable Care Act (ACA) began delivering important new benefits and protections to tens of millions of American families almost immediately after it was signed into law by President Obama. But the largest benefits of the law will become available to consumers on October 1, 2013, when health insurance marketplaces open in all 50 states. These marketplaces will offer individuals, families, and small businesses an efficient, transparent one-stop shop to compare health insurance policies, receive financial assistance, and sign up for high-quality, affordable, and secure insurance coverage.

This fact sheet summarizes new data on the significant benefits of the health care reform law in Rep. Cantor's district. It also provides the first picture of the impacts of the law in districts redrawn or newly created following the 2010 Census. As a result of the law:

4,500 young adults in the district now have health insurance through their parents' plan.

More than 10,000 seniors in the district received prescription drug discounts worth $13.6 million, an average discount of $580 per person in 2011, $730 in 2012, and $800 thus far in 2013.

112,000 seniors in the district are now eligible for Medicare preventive services without paying any co-pays, coinsurance, or deductible.

236,000 individuals in the district—including 56,000 children and 95,000 women—now have health insurance that covers preventive services without any co-pays, coinsurance, or deductible.

222,000 individuals in the district are saving money due to ACA provisions that prevent insurance companies from spending more than 20% of their premiums on profits and administrative overhead. Because of these protections, over 67,300 consumers in the district received approximately $5.4 million in insurance company rebates in 2011 and 2012—an average rebate of $115 per family in 2011 and $88 per family in 2012.

Up to 43,000 children in the district with preexisting health conditions can no longer be denied coverage by health insurers.

288,000 individuals in the district now have insurance that cannot place lifetime limits on their coverage and will not face annual limits on coverage starting in 2014.

Up to 74,000 individuals in the district who lack health insurance will have access to quality, affordable coverage without fear of discrimination or higher rates because of a preexisting health condition. In addition, the 42,000 individuals who currently purchase private health insurance on the individual or small group market will have access to more secure, higher quality coverage and many will be eligible for financial assistance.

Mr. Speaker, I now yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. BECERRA).

Mr. BECERRA. Mr. Speaker, ''The Least Productive Congress Ever,'' that's the title of an article in today's Washington Post. Here is how the article begins:

Congress, in case you have been living on another planet for the last few years, doesn't do all that much these days.

So we are, debating again—for the 38th time—a bill to repeal all or part of our Nation's health security law. We've heard this broken record 37 times before and it sounds the same and it goes nowhere.

But there is more consequence to this partisan agenda than just wasting the American people's time and adding to the record of the least productive Congress ever. Wasting the American people's time 38 times wastes the American taxpayers' money. According to CBS News reports, this obsession to vote over and over and over 38 times on these partisan bills has cost the American taxpayers more than $50 million. That's an expensive ticket for political theater.

So what are the facts on this legislation? The Congressional Budget Office, our country's fiscal watchdog, says this about H.R. 2668: ''Health insurance premiums''—under this legislation—''for individually purchased coverage would be higher under H.R. 2668. In addition, the number of people with health insurance coverage would be reduced.''

Translated, the cost for health insurance and health care for Americans will go up and the number of Americans with insurance coverage will go down under this legislation.

Here is today's New York Times—and it says it all on the front page: ''Many New Yorkers Will See Big Savings on Health Plans Under the Current Law.'' How does it start? The article says:

> Individuals buying health insurance on their own will see their premiums tumble next year in New York State as changes under the Federal health care law take effect.

The facts: health care insurance costs are going down. But this bill will repeal all or part of the health care security law.

This Congress is the least productive Congress ever, because instead of voting on a jobs agenda and growing our economy, this House is voting for the 38th time to do nothing. This House is out of touch with the American people. It is time this House caught up with the American people and work in bipartisanship to get Americans back to work and provide them more health security, not less.

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I would now like to insert into the RECORD a letter of today from the National Federation of Independent Business.

NFIB,
THE VOICE OF SMALL BUSINESS,
Washington, DC, July 17, 2013.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE: On behalf of the National Federation of Independent Business (NFIB), the nation's leading small business advocacy organization, I am writing in strong support of H.R. 2668, the Fairness for American Families Act A vote in favor of H.R. 2668 will be considered an NFIB Key Vote for the 113th Congress

H.R. 2668 would delay the requirement that nearly all Americans purchase minimum essential health insurance coverage or pay a tax penalty until 2015. The delay of the individual mandate is needed due to the administrative delay of the employer mandate. The delay would alleviate confusion for small business owners, self-employed individuals and small-business employees. Delaying problematic provisions provides temporary relief for individuals and small businesses, while also validating the underlying problems inherent in the law and its implementation. Perhaps most importantly, delay provides Congress additional time to correct problematic provisions in the law.

In NFIB v. Sabelius NFIB opposed the individual mandate because we believe the Commerce Clause of the U.S. Constitution does not give Congress the authority to require Americans to purchase a product. Unfortunately, the Supreme Court determined the mandate was proper as a ''tax'' under Congress'' taxing power. Whether a ''mandate'' or a ''tax'' penalty, this provision requires small-business owners to spend money—buy health insurance or pay a tax penalty. This is money they could have used to grow their business and hire more workers.

Without significant changes, this law will continue to cause problems for the small-business economy. Small-business owners support continued efforts to remedy the most harmful provisions in the law that are already impacting their businesses and their employees. Some fundamental reforms include:

H.R. 2575, the Save American Workers Act, which would change the definition of full-time employee from 30 hours per week to 40 hours per week;

H.R. 903, the American Job Protection Act, which would repeal the employer mandate that is already preventing business expansion and job creation;

H.R. 763, the Jobs and Premium Protection Act, which would repeal the small business health insurance tax (HIT) that will increase premiums for the health insurance plans that self-employed individuals and small businesses purchase.

NFIB is dedicated to working with lawmakers to find solutions that work for small business and will consider a vote in favor of H.R. 2668 an NFIB Key Vote for the 113th Congress.

Sincerely,

SUSAN ECKERLY,
Senior Vice President, Public Policy.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 1½ minutes to the chairwoman of the Republican Conference, the gentlelady from Washington State (Mrs. MCMORRIS RODGERS).

Mrs. MCMORRIS RODGERS. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of the Fairness for American Families Act, to protect families and individuals from a health care law that is unworkable and is making it harder and worse on our health care system.

I support this bill delaying the individual mandate because it protects everyday hardworking American families—like my family at home and yours all across this country—from higher premiums, fewer choices of doctors, and lower quality of health care.

We see time and time again this President at work picking winners and losers and ignoring his constitutional duty to uphold the law—even his signature law. Each time, individuals lose, families lose—America loses.

The administration's decision to delay the employer mandate is no different. How is it fair to delay an unworkable law for big businesses but not for individuals and families—the very people that are going to have to pay the price because of this unworkable health care law?

The fact is this law is making it worse; worse for health care, worse for the economy, worse for America.

I urge my colleagues, Republicans and Democrats, support this bill, do what is fair for the American people and their families.

Mr. MCDERMOTT. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 30 seconds so that I can inform the body of the effect on the Fifth Congressional District of the State of Washington:

7,000 adults, young adults, are on their parents' plan;

5,600 seniors have had benefits around their drug costs;

89,000 who have lacked health insurance now have it.

All of this is because of the Affordable Care Act.

BENEFITS OF THE HEALTH CARE REFORM LAW IN THE 5TH CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON

COMMITTEES ON ENERGY AND COMMERCE, WAYS AND MEANS, AND EDUCATION AND THE WORKFORCE, DEMOCRATIC STAFF REPORT, JULY 2013

The landmark Affordable Care Act (ACA) began delivering important new benefits and protections to tens of millions of American families almost immediately after it was signed into law by President Obama. But the largest benefits of the law will become available to consumers on October 1, 2013, when health insurance marketplaces open in all 50 states. These marketplaces will offer individuals, families, and small businesses an efficient, transparent one-stop shop to compare health insurance policies, receive financial assistance, and sign up for high-quality, affordable, and secure insurance coverage.

This fact sheet summarizes new data on the significant benefits of the health care reform law in Rep. McMorris Rodgers's district. It also provides the first picture of the impacts of the law in districts redrawn or newly created following the 2010 Census. As a result of the law:

7,900 young adults in the district now have health insurance through their parents' plan.

More than 5,600 seniors in the district received prescription drug discounts worth $7.5 million, an average discount of $620 per person in 2011, $660 in 2012, and $1,070 thus far in 2013.

113,000 seniors in the district are now eligible for Medicare preventive services without paying any co-pays, coinsurance, or deductible.

180,000 individuals in the district—including 36,000 children and 75,000 women—now have health insurance that covers preventive services without any co-pays, coinsurance, or deductible.

167,000 individuals in the district are saving money due to ACA provisions that prevent insurance companies from spending more than 20% of their premiums on profits and administrative overhead. Because of these protections, over 700 consumers in the district received approximately $100,000 in insurance company rebates in 2012 and 2011—an average rebate of $512 per family in 2012 and $185 per family in 2011.

Up to 36,000 children in the district with preexisting health conditions can no longer be denied coverage by health insurers.

203,000 individuals in the district now have insurance that cannot place lifetime limits on their coverage and will not face annual limits on coverage starting in 2014.

89,000 individuals in the district who lack health insurance will have access to quality, affordable coverage without fear of discrimination or higher rates because of a preexisting health condition. In addition, the 45,000 individuals who currently purchase private health insurance on the individual or small group market will have access to more

secure, higher quality coverage and many will be eligible for financial assistance.

Mr. Speaker, I now yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GENE GREEN).

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker and Members, I rise in strong opposition to the further Republican attempts to undermine the Affordable Care Act.

The administration recently announced that due to logistical issues they were delaying the employer mandate for a year. I do not support this measure, but it is within their authority to do it.

However, the decision of the Department of Treasury does not justify delaying the implementation of other portions of the law. Implementing this law is too important for America's well-being and their economic security to delay it. Low-cost, high-quality health care is right around the corner. If we delay the individual mandate, the risk pools will be skewed so that the coverage is less affordable for those who choose to purchase it.

Delaying the employer mandate will have a higher impact on States like mine that are refusing to expand Medicaid. If an employee makes between 100 percent and 133 percent of the Federal poverty level, they will receive no Medicaid, no subsidies, and now employers won't have to cover them for another year.

I am told that this is a small number, but in a district like ours, which has the highest rate of working uninsured in the country, this is a big problem. Up to 260,000 individuals in our district who lack health insurance will have access to quality, affordable care without fear of discrimination or higher rates because of a preexisting condition.

Our country has waited too long for real health care reform—coverage that our industrial competitors and partners provide. I oppose both these bills.

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I would like to enter into the RECORD a letter dated July 15, 2013, from Matt Kibbe, the president and CEO of FreedomWorks in support of H.R. 2668.

FREEDOMWORKS,
Washington, DC, July 15, 2013.

KEY VOTE YES ON DELAYING OBAMACARE'S INDIVIDUAL MANDATE

As one of our millions of FreedomWorks members nationwide, I urge you to contact your Representative and urge him or her to vote YES on H.R. 2668, the Fairness for American Families Act. Sponsored by Rep. TODD YOUNG (R–IN), this bill—which the House is expected to take up this week—would delay ObamaCare's ''individual mandate.''

Beginning on January 1, 2014, ObamaCare will require most U.S. citizens to purchase government-controlled health insurance. This ''individual mandate'' is, by the Administration's own admission, the ''linchpin'' of the Washington takeover of health care. If the mandate were to go away, the whole costly and intrusive scheme would unravel.

The individual mandate is a latter-day ''intolerable act.'' Despite the Supreme Court's erroneous 2012 ruling, Congress lacks authority under the Constitution to impose such a mandate on U.S. citizens. And even if it were constitutional, the mandate is immoral because it violates individual liberty, is not necessary to ''help the uninsured'' (there are less coercive and less costly ways to do so), and is terribly unfair, both in its effects and how it is being implemented.

The unfairness of the mandate is this: its costly burden falls most heavily on just one segment of the population: young adults in their twenties and thirties. They are the group most likely to be uninsured. Indeed, two-thirds of the uninsured are in their twenties and thirties. ObamaCare causes their insurance premiums to rise exponentially, in some cases doubling or even tripling. These Americans are uninsured because health insurance costs too much. ObamaCare's mandate is unfair to them, because it forces them to buy a product that is already too expensive, relative to their needs.

But the law is also unfair to everyone, not just millennials, in terms of how it is being implemented. The Obama Administration recently made a unilateral (and illegal) decision to cancel the ''employer mandate'' (which requires employers with more than 50 employees to offer and heavily subsidize health insurance to their workers). But it left the individual mandate in place for the rest of us. The Administration had already displayed rank unfairness by granting more than 1,200 waivers from ObamaCare provisions to its labor union allies and corporate cronies. It has now given Big Business the ultimate waiver, a complete exemption from the mandate, while making sure that Big Insurance gets its own ''ultimate gift'' from Big Government: a compulsory customer base. No wonder more than 70 percent of Americans oppose the individual mandate, and just 12 percent support it.

The only cure for the manifold ailments of ObamaCare is to immediately defund or repeal it entirely, and to replace it with patient-centered health care that will actually lower costs and improve quality and access for all. Until then, basic fairness demands that individuals be granted the same favor as the Administration has given to businesses. The individual mandate must be delayed for as long as possible. H.R.2668 would delay the mandate for the same length of time that the Administration claims to be ''delaying'' the employer mandate: one year. That's a start.

I urge you to call your Representative and ask him or her to vote YES on H.R. 2668, to delay ObamaCare's individual mandate. We may count their vote as a KEY VOTE when calculating the FreedomWorks Economic Freedom Scorecard for 2013. The Scorecard is used to determine eligibility for the FreedomFighter Award, which recognizes members of Congress with voting records that support economic freedom.

Sincerely,

MATT KIBBE,
President and CEO.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased now to yield 2 minutes to the chairwoman of the House Administration Committee, the gentlelady from the great State of Michigan, CANDICE MILLER.

Mrs. MILLER of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, it appears that the Obama administration has finally come to the conclusion that the employer mandate in ObamaCare is a job killer.

Many have speculated that the Obama administration's decision to delay the employer mandate until after the 2014 election was due to fears that job cuts and hour reductions that would result from the mandate's implementation would negatively impact the President's party at the polls.

It does seem that those fears are justified. Recently, the Teamsters and other labor groups wrote to Senate Majority Leader HARRY REID and House Democrat Leader NANCY PELOSI stating that the implementation of ObamaCare put at risk the 40-hour workweek, the health care, and the take-home pay of their members.

Mr. Speaker, I agree with the Teamsters that the employer mandate is a job killer. Eliminating the employer mandate would not stop the individual mandate which requires every American to purchase government-approved insurance that they may not want, that they can't afford, and may not be provided by their employers or otherwise they have to pay a penalty. Is that fair to American families?

The legislation, Mr. Speaker, that we are considering today would give every American—every American—the same 1-year reprieve from ObamaCare that the President has offered to businesses. Because we extend this help to all of the American people, the President has threatened to veto this bill.

Mr. Speaker, the President is not a king. He is the President. He does not have the authority to change the law and to delay the employer mandate on his own. Congress must give him that authority.

I would say to the President that we will delay the job-killing employer mandate, as he has asked, and we will also extend the same relief to all of the American people.

The President and Members of Congress who vote against this bill will have to explain to the American people why they heard the concerns of business but not those of the people. We have heard the people, we share their concerns, we stand with them, and I would urge all of my colleagues to stand with them as well and to support this very vital legislation.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair would remind all Members to direct their remarks to the Chair and also to refrain from improper references toward the President.

Mr. MCDERMOTT. Mr. Speaker, I would like to enter into the RECORD a report on the effects of the Affordable Care Act on the Tenth District of Michigan.

BENEFITS OF THE HEALTH CARE REFORM LAW IN THE 10TH CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT OF MICHIGAN

COMMITTEES ON ENERGY AND COMMERCE, WAYS AND MEANS, AND EDUCATION AND THE WORKFORCE, DEMOCRATIC STAFF REPORT, JULY 2013

The landmark Affordable Care Act (ACA) began delivering important new benefits and protections to tens of millions of American families almost immediately after it was signed into law by President Obama. But the largest benefits of the law will become available to consumers on October 1, 2013, when health insurance marketplaces open in all 50 states. These marketplaces will offer individuals, families, and small businesses an efficient, transparent, one-stop shop to compare health insurance policies, receive financial

assistance, and sign up for high-quality, affordable, and secure insurance coverage.

This fact sheet summarizes new data on the significant benefits of the health care reform law in Rep. Miller's district. It also provides the first picture of the impacts of the law in districts redrawn or newly created following the 2010 Census. As a result of the law:

4,900 young adults in the district now have health insurance through their parents' plan.

More than 8,900 seniors in the district received prescription drug discounts worth $11.8 million, an average discount of $610 per person in 2011, $780 in 2012, and $630 thus far in 2013.

130,000 seniors in the district are now eligible for Medicare preventive services without paying any co-pays, coinsurance, or deductible.

210,000 individuals in the district—including 47,000 children and 86,000 women—now have health insurance that covers preventive services without any co-pays, coinsurance, or deductible.

177,000 individuals in the district are saving money due to ACA provisions that prevent insurance companies from spending more than 20% of their premiums on profits and administrative overhead. Because of these protections, over 17,100 consumers in the district received approximately $2.5 million in insurance company rebates in 2012 and 2011—an average rebate of $138 per family in 2012 and $214 per family in 2011.

Up to 41,000 children in the district with preexisting health conditions can no longer be denied coverage by health insurers.

243,000 individuals in the district now have insurance that cannot place lifetime limits on their overage and will not face annual limits on coverage starting in 2014.

Up to 73,000 individuals in the district who lack health insurance will have access to quality, affordable coverage without fear of discrimination or higher rates because of a preexisting health condition: In addition, the 39,000 individuals who currently purchase private health insurance on the individual or small group market will have access to more secure, higher quality coverage and many will be eligible for financial assistance.

Mr. MCDERMOTT. Mr. Speaker, I now yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Illinois (Ms. SCHAKOWSKY).

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY. Mr. Speaker, there's a word in Yiddish, ''chutzpah,'' that generally translates to ''nerve.'' It has been described as that quality enshrined in a man who, having killed his mother and father, throws himself on the mercy of the court because he's an orphan.

But ''chutzpah'' is also a pretty accurate description of the antics of the Republican Party today that—after throwing up roadblock after roadblock, obstruction after obstruction to ObamaCare, is now trying to delay access to care for millions of Americans on the grounds that we're not ready.

Despite Republican obstructionism we are going to be ready, we are ready—and not a day too soon—for those who have been locked out of coverage, hit by annual benefit limits, or faced preexisting condition exclusions. Imagine the worry that is lifted off of the shoulders of Americans that have preexisting conditions that won't exist once we pass this.

This is just another Republican attempted roadblock to progress, another obstructionism. It is ''chutzpah.''

Mr. Speaker, it is time for the Republicans to stop efforts that will prevent Americans from getting the health care they need.

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, how much time remains on each side?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Georgia has 18½ minutes remaining. The gentleman from Washington has 9 minutes remaining.

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 1 minute to the chairman of the Judiciary Committee, the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. GOODLATTE).

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, it is with great pleasure that I acknowledge the great work of the gentleman from Georgia on this issue and thank him.

Mr. Speaker, all across the country, Americans are asking one question: Why wasn't the mandate on them delayed? If the systems aren't in place for businesses to abide by this law by the deadline, why does the administration think that the systems will be in place for the individual mandate? If a delay is good for businesses, why isn't it good for the families in the 6th District of Virginia and across the Nation?

When Members refer to ObamaCare as a train wreck, they only quote one of its chief architects. This announcement proves even the administration knows ObamaCare is headed towards devastation. Let's get businesses, as well as American families, off this train headed towards disaster. We need to delay the employer mandate, we also need to delay the individual mandate, but most importantly, the American people need a full repeal of this train wreck legislation.

Mr. MCDERMOTT. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman who helped write this bill 4 years ago and is here today to defend it, the gentleman from California (Mr. MILLER).

□ 1730

(Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to this latest Republican attempt to sabotage our Nation's health reform law.

If these bills pass today, fortunately, they will not become law. It is just another waste of this body's time, and Americans are sick of it. The 38th time will not be the charm—the 38th time that we've redundantly voted to try to repeal the Affordable Care Act. Rather, these votes underscore the lengths the Republicans and other opponents will go to take away the basic health insurance protections of the American people.

For 3 years, many of the opponents of ObamaCare have invested heavily in its failure. They've tried to deny funding to agencies to do their jobs as instructed by Congress. They've spread outright lies and misinformation to purposely confuse the American people. They've obstructed education efforts to make sure that their constituents don't understand the new rights and benefits under the law. But investing in failure is dangerous. It's dangerous for America's families; it's dangerous for the Nation's businesses; it's dangerous for the Nation's economy.

The Affordable Care Act is the law of the land, and it is here to stay. Early evidence suggests that the health care law is already having a positive impact on the lives of millions of Americans.

Millions of young adults are getting health insurance through their parents' policies when, before, they were kicked off arbitrarily by insurance companies; and now, with the individual mandate, millions of individual Americans will be able to afford the health insurance that they can't afford today without this legislation—without the law of the land, the Affordable Care Act.

Children with preexisting conditions can no longer be denied health coverage or lifesaving treatment.

Billions more of taxpayer dollars are being recovered through Medicare fraud.

National health costs have dramatically slowed over the last several years.

Health premiums as part of the State insurance exchanges are coming in lower than anyone predicted—most recently reported in New York State—for individuals, who will get their insurance because of the individual mandate; and for the first time, it will be affordable to those individuals since they've been required to have it.

And, in January, the preexisting conditions that determine health coverage or costs will be banned. No longer will you be able to rule people out because of their preexisting health conditions.

This is all good news, and it stands in stark contrast to the claims that we've been hearing from the other side for 3 years.

Why on Earth would any responsible elected official try to hide the rights and benefits from the American people?

My friends on the other side of the aisle are preoccupied with dismantling government when it protects the vulnerable or the average American, but they will move heaven and Earth to protect the most powerful or to try to score some fleeting political point. It's wrong and it's irresponsible.

Mr. Speaker, playing politics with the Affordable Care Act has become something of an Olympic sport for the majority. These votes are nothing new. They are about sabotaging the law of the land in order to satisfy a narrow, radical element of the majority's party.

Now is not the time to reverse course. Now is not the time to go back to the days when insurance companies were in charge—when people were thrown off their policies, when policies were taken away in the middle of treatment, when their children were not allowed to participate, and when individuals could not afford the policies at that time. Today, they will be able to.

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I insert in the RECORD a notice from the National Taxpayers Union, dated July 15, 2013, in support of both H.R. 2667 and H.R. 2668.

NATIONAL TAXPAYERS UNION,
Alexandria, VA, July 15, 2013.

NATIONAL TAXPAYERS UNION VOTE ALERT

NTU urges all Representatives to vote ''YES'' on H.R. 2667, the ''Authority for Mandate Delay Act'' and H.R. 2668, the ''Fairness for American Families Act.'' These bills would delay for one year the Affordable Care Act's health insurance mandates for employers and individuals, respectively. While the primary goal of Congress ought to be full repeal of the Affordable Care Act (a.k.a. ''Obamacare''), in the meantime it is imperative for legislators to recognize and address the numerous problems associated with the law.

The Obama Administration acknowledged the detrimental effects that the employer mandate will have on businesses, workers, and the economy at large when it unilaterally elected to delay this provision for one year. With the legality of this move very much in question, the House of Representatives is wisely moving to codify the change by passing H.R. 2667. This would greatly assist—albeit only in the short-term—the many businesses that are already cutting employee hours or jobs as a result of the law.

At the same time that businesses are making difficult staffing decisions, individuals are poised to be hit by Obamacare's requirement to purchase health insurance. In 2014, the penalty for failing to do so is $285 per family or 1 percent of household income, whichever is greater. By 2016, the penalty jumps to $2,085 per family or 2.5 percent of household income, whichever is greater. As the Supreme Court ruled last year, this penalty is a tax. For many families continuing to struggle due to the weak economy, the burdens from the individual mandate will become increasingly difficult to bear. H.R. 2668 would delay the provision for a year, which would provide much-needed, temporary relief to these families.

Passage of H.R. 2667 and H.R. 2668 would help alleviate some of the harmful effects that the Affordable Care Act will impose on businesses and individuals. Enactment of these bills would be an important step toward more significant legislative goals, such as permanent repeal of both mandates and the Affordable Care Act in its entirety.

Rollcall votes on H.R. 2667 and H.R. 2668 will be included in our annual rating of Congress and ''yes'' votes will be considered the pro-taxpayer position.

If you have any questions, please contact NTU Federal Affairs Manager Nan Swift.

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. SCHOCK), another member of the Ways and Means Committee.

Mr. SCHOCK. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Georgia.

Wow, I'm sure our listening audience at home wonders who to believe. We are hearing charges of politics. We are hearing claims of chutzpah.

My friends on the other side of the aisle, this isn't politics—this is lawmaking.

Has our Republic stooped so low that you would go out and raise millions of dollars and waste thousands of hours of your volunteer time to be elected to a body only to see that power which is given by the Constitution to do that which you were elected to do instead given to the executive branch—to the President?

If you believe as the President believes, which is that this law is not ready to be implemented—which is that, for various reasons, HHS and other agencies are not able to certify that the businesses are able to comply—then join us in doing what the President wants to do legally. Join us in giving the power to the President that which he is already claiming unilaterally, and do what your constituents have elected you to do, which is to actually do lawmaking.

Mr. Speaker, we heard claims earlier today that women were being discriminated against, that women's premiums were rising at a faster rate than men's. Let me tell you what this bill does to young people, who are really discriminated against because of ObamaCare.

Young people's premiums are going up over 400 percent because of a community rating provision in this bill. Young people are paying a disproportionate, growing cost of health care in this country because of a discrimination factor in this bill called ''community rating.'' Young people who have gone to college, who have busted their tails to get a degree, don't want to stay on their mom and dad's insurance until they're 26. That's not why I went to college. I don't think that's why you went to college. They go to college to get a job, and this ObamaCare legislation and so many others of the President's policies are killing jobs in America. It's why half of the people who graduated from college last May are still unemployed or underemployed.

For so many reasons, this bill needs to be postponed, which is what this legislation does. I urge its passage and a ''yes'' vote.

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

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, how much time remains?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Georgia has 15½ minutes remaining, and the gentleman from Washington has 6 minutes remaining.

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 1 minute to a member of the Energy and Commerce Committee, a fellow physician from the State of Georgia (Mr. GINGREY).

Mr. GINGREY of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I have in my hand a pocket Constitution, which says here in Article I, Section 1:

> All legislative powers herein granted shall be vested in a Congress of the United States, which shall consist of a Senate and House of Representatives.

It doesn't say anything in there about the President.

Mr. Speaker, if you've noticed a lot of times, the weaker one's argument, the louder the volume, and I'm hearing a lot of volume from the other side of the aisle, including from their leadership. They have a weak argument, Mr. Speaker—there is no question about it—in saying that the bill has already passed.

If the bill has already passed, what right does the President have to change the law without coming back to the Congress?

We are giving them the opportunity to do that. Of course, we are also giving the young people in this country the opportunity to get the same break that these large Fortune 500 companies may be getting in regard to delaying the employer mandate for 1 year. Let's do the same thing for these young people who are no longer 26. They're 26½; they're not living in the basement anymore; they have a job. Let's give them the same 12-month break that we're giving to employers.

Pass this bill. It's a good bill. We have the authority to do it, not the President.

Mr. MCDERMOTT. I yield myself 30 seconds.

There are 8,300 young adults who are still getting insurance on their parents' plans; more than 8,500 seniors are receiving prescription drug discounts; 86,000 seniors are now receiving preventative care without having to pay for it under the Medicare program; 195,000 now have health insurance that covers preventative care with no copays and insurance; and on and on and on it goes.

I enter into the RECORD the health care reform law as it affects the 11th Congressional District of Georgia.

BENEFITS OF THE HEALTH CARE REFORM LAW IN THE 11TH CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT OF GEORGIA

COMMITTEES ON ENERGY AND COMMERCE, WAYS AND MEANS, AND EDUCATION AND THE WORKFORCE, DEMOCRATIC STAFF REPORT, JULY 2013

The landmark Affordable Care Act (ACA) began delivering important new benefits and protections to tens of millions of American families almost immediately after it was signed into law by President Obama. But the largest benefits of the law will become available to consumers on October 1, 2013, when health insurance marketplaces open in all 50 states. These marketplaces will offer individuals, families, and small businesses an efficient, transparent one-stop shop to compare health insurance policies, receive financial assistance, and sign up for high-quality, affordable, and secure insurance coverage.

This fact sheet summarizes new data on the significant benefits of the health care reform law in Rep. Gingrey's district. It also provides the first picture of the impacts of the law in districts redrawn or newly created following the 2010 Census. As a result of the law:

8,300 young adults in the district now have health insurance through their parents' plan.

More than 8,800 seniors in the district received prescription drug discounts worth $12.6 million, an average discount of $620 per person in 2011, $760 in 2012, and $900 thus far in 2013.

86,000 seniors in the district are now eligible for Medicare preventive services without paying any co-pays, coinsurance, or deductible.

195,000 individuals in the district—including 47,000 children and 78,000 women—now have health insurance that covers preventive services without any co-pays, coinsurance, or deductible.

169,000 individuals in the district are saving money due to ACA provisions that prevent insurance companies from spending

more than 20% of their premiums on profits and administrative overhead. Because of these protections, over 19,900 consumers in the district received approximately $2.8 million in insurance company rebates in 2012 and 2011—an average rebate of $82 per family in 2012 and $134 per family in 2011.

Up to 43,000 children in the district with preexisting health conditions can no longer be denied coverage by health insurers.

248,000 individuals in the district now have insurance that cannot place lifetime limits on their coverage and will not face annual limits on coverage starting in 2014.

Up to 129,000 individuals in the district who lack health insurance will have access to quality, affordable coverage without fear of discrimination or higher rates because of a preexisting health condition. In addition, the 45,000 individuals who currently purchase private health insurance on the individual or small group market will have access to more secure, higher quality coverage and many will be eligible for financial assistance.

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

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to a gentlelady who, prior to coming to Congress, worked as a nurse and who is a pivotal member of the Ways and Means Committee, the gentlelady from Tennessee, DIANE BLACK.

Mrs. BLACK. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, the President has previously described his health care law as ''a new set of rules that treats everybody honestly and treats everybody fairly.''

Now, according to President Obama, if you're a big financial institution or a government contractor, you don't have to comply with ObamaCare's mandate next year; but if you're a Tennessee family who is trying to make ends meet, you do or you will get taxed. To add insult to injury, this President now has the audacity to say that he will veto the House legislation delaying the employer mandate and the individual mandate that we are considering today.

First of all, the employer mandate delay was proposed by him, so why would he veto his own idea? Secondly, why would he turn his back on the American families, who are merely asking for the same relief that he said he is going to give to Big Business?

President Obama's veto threat is a pathetic excuse for leadership, and I suggest that we call his bluff and pass this legislation to protect the American people and their livelihoods from ObamaCare. It is simply not fair of President Obama to give business an exemption from his costly health care law without making the same allowances for individuals and families.

I call on President Obama and congressional Democrats to do the right thing by supporting the Authority for Mandate Delay Act and the Fairness for American Families Act in order to protect the American people and to ensure fairness for all.

Mr. MCDERMOTT. Mr. Speaker, I enter into the RECORD the effect of the Affordable Care Act on the Sixth Congressional District of Tennessee.

BENEFITS OF THE HEALTH CARE REFORM LAW IN THE 6TH CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT OF TENNESSEE

COMMITTEES ON ENERGY AND COMMERCE, WAYS AND MEANS, AND EDUCATION AND THE WORKFORCE, DEMOCRATIC STAFF REPORT, JULY 2013

The landmark Affordable Care Act (ACA) began delivering important new benefits and protections to tens of millions of American families almost immediately after it was signed into law by President Obama. But the largest benefits of the law will become available to consumers on October 1, 2013, when health insurance marketplaces open in all 50 states. These marketplaces will offer individuals, families, and small businesses an efficient, transparent one-stop shop to compare health insurance policies, receive financial assistance, and sign up for high-quality, affordable, and secure insurance coverage.

This fact sheet summarizes new data on the significant benefits of the health care reform law in Rep. Black's district. It also provides the first picture of the impacts of the law in districts redrawn or newly created following the 2010 Census. As a result of the law:

5,600 young adults in the district now have health insurance through their parents' plan.

More than 9,800 seniors in the district received prescription drug discounts worth $12.7 million, an average discount of $590 per person in 2011, $640 in 2012, and $690 thus far in 2013.

134,000 seniors in the district are now eligible for Medicare preventive services without paying any co-pays, coinsurance, or deductible.

184,000 individuals in the district—including 40,000 children and 74,000 women—now have health insurance that covers preventive services without any co-pays, coinsurance, or deductible.

188,000 individuals in the district are saving money due to ACA provisions that prevent insurance companies from spending more than 20% of their premiums on profits and administrative overhead. Because of these protections, over 26,900 consumers in the district received approximately $3.9 million in insurance company rebates in 2012 and 2011—an average rebate of $69 per family in 2012 and $201 per family in 2011.

Up to 40,000 children in the district with preexisting health conditions can no longer be denied coverage by health insurers.

217,000 individuals in the district now have insurance that cannot place lifetime limits on their coverage and will not face annual limits on coverage starting in 2014.

Up to 101,000 individuals in the district who lack health insurance will have access to quality, affordable coverage without fear of discrimination or higher rates because of a preexisting health condition. In addition, the 37,000 individuals who currently purchase private health insurance on the individual or small group market will have access to more secure, higher quality coverage and many will be eligible for financial assistance.

I now yield 1½ minutes to the gentlelady from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE).

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Thank you to the manager—Dr. MCDERMOTT, I like to call him—who has been a mainstay of good health care in this Congress for a very long time. He is managing as well with the gentleman from Georgia, who has practiced medicine.

But we can have a disagreement. The vigorous disagreement that we have, I must say, Mr. Speaker, is with the weight of truth that falls on what we have done on behalf of ObamaCare, the Affordable Care Act.

I enjoy sledding. I enjoy the snow. When you get on a sled, it rolls down and you're happy, and you come to a successful end. We've rolled down, and we keep on rolling because the Affordable Care Act is allowing young people to have insurance. It's reducing the cost of prescription drugs for our seniors. It's allowing a State like Texas, which has the highest number of uninsured—some 121,000-plus in my district—to now have insurance. It allows about 10 community health facilities to be able to begin enrollment this coming September and to be able to outreach to those families, who will now have coverage for them and their children.

Let me be very clear. How many times do I have to say, no, you cannot have your way?

The Supreme Court has ruled. This is the law of the land, and there is no reason whatsoever to go back on a plan that has allowed the New York insurance rates to go down on health care. There is nothing wrong with the President engaging business. These are large companies that have said we just need to look at it so we can streamline it. That's to make it better. If they undermine the individual mandate, 13 million Americans will not have insurance.

How many times do I have to say ''no''?

The Affordable Care Act is going well. People are insured and Americans are healthier. Let's keep the Affordable Care Act. Vote ''no'' on the underlying bills.

When will you ever understand that it's over? It's over.

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. ROTHFUS).

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

Mr. ROTHFUS. I thank Dr. PRICE for his work on the Fairness for American Families Act, and I rise in support of the legislation.

Mr. Speaker, President Obama made many promises when promoting his health care law. He promised that, if you liked your coverage, you could keep it; he promised that it would lower the cost of premiums; he promised that it would create new jobs and promote economic growth.

Unfortunately, western Pennsylvania workers and families are experiencing just the opposite.

A mom who works at a food service company in Beaver County, Pennsylvania, called my office last week to talk for an hour about how the law is impacting her family. She just had her hours cut by almost half thanks to the employer mandate. Her husband's job security is also now at risk. The lost hours, income, and job security have made it difficult for them to afford the necessities of life, and it will make it almost impossible to send their daughter to college next year.

President Obama recently postponed the employer mandate. In so doing, he has conceded that the law is unworkable for businesses. If businesses deserve a break from ObamaCare, then why don't the rest of the American people?

We need workable, commonsense, and patient-centered reforms that increase access to care and reduce costs. Today's legislation is a necessary first step in achieving the kind of health care reform that the American people deserve.

□ 1745

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

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I'm pleased to yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. WENSTRUP), a gentleman who is engaged in the health profession.

Mr. WENSTRUP. Mr. Speaker, the unilateral decision by this administration to delay certain provisions of Federal legislation undermines the very rule of law. If President Obama can pick and choose what he wants to enforce within ObamaCare, what prevents him from doing the same with other legislation? That is my concern.

And while this administration is determined that their signature piece of legislation is too complicated for businesses, the individual mandate still stands. Businesses get a break, but individuals get no relief from the burdens of this law.

Why do hardworking individuals not deserve relief from the hardships of the Affordable Care Act? If the President and his allies in Congress stand by their decision to delay one mandate, is it not fair to delay the other?

Realistically, a permanent delay through the full repeal of ObamaCare and its mandates is the only workable solution.

Don't Americans deserve equality under the law and fairness for all?

Mr. MCDERMOTT. Mr. Speaker, I inquire as to whether the gentleman from Georgia is prepared to close.

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. As we have no more speakers, I am prepared to close.

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

I have in my hand here a letter signed by 30 economists from Harvard, Yale, MIT, Stanford, Rice, the University of Chicago, and everybody else, all of whom say we need a mandate. If this mandate were taken out of the law, the Affordable Care Act would be dead. What they say is that the individual mandate does not specify what care people receive; it simply requires people to pay a reasonable amount for any care that they may ultimately receive.

No less a conservative than Mitt Romney, the Republican nominee for President, noted when signing the Massachusetts equivalent of the individual mandate:

Some of my Libertarian friends balk at what looks like an individual mandate. But remember, someone has to pay for the health care that must, by law, be provided: either the individual pays or the taxpayers pay.

Everyone in this body spends $1,000 a year beyond their own health care costs paying for the uninsured in this country. People walk into the emergency room and they get taken care of because the hospital cannot refuse them and the doctor cannot refuse them, and so they're taken care of and then it's passed on to you and me.

The individual mandate says everybody should pay according to their ability.

Going on, Mr. Romney said:

A free ride on the government is not libertarianism.

Everywhere they've tried this without subsidies and mandates, it has failed. They say in the five States that have tried comprehensive insurance market reform without an individual mandate, healthy people choose to stay out of insurance, sick people took it up, and the premiums go up. That's exactly what the CBO says.

So what you are saying, by repealing the individual mandate, is you want to drive up the costs on the people who now have insurance. That's a very strange political position to be taking.

I must say, I listened to all these people who don't like the individual mandate and all this stuff. If you spend 2 years ranting about the Affordable Care Act and you run a campaign and spend hundreds of millions of dollars and rant against the Affordable Care Act, it's not surprising that people may be a little confused.

When I was in medical school in 1963, the American Medical Association spent 3 or 4 years ranting against Medicare; and when the people went out to enroll people for Medicare, they got the door slammed in their face. Old people said, I'm not going to have that kind of government health care in my house. Well, let me tell you something. If you tried to take Medicare out now, you would find you have taken on a really ugly junkyard dog. You're not going to take out Medicare in this country now.

You can confuse people for a while, but as they see and as I reported on everybody's district, it is already affecting kids who didn't have insurance because of a preexisting condition; it's affecting kids who didn't have insurance from their job and are now on their parents' insurance; it took away lifetime limits on care; it took away all the things that people worry about when they want health care security. They now have it, and you're saying let's take the individual mandate out and have the whole house come down, because that's what these economists have said.

I enter this letter into the RECORD, and I yield back the balance of my time.

WHY WE NEED THE INDIVIDUAL MANDATE

The Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act (ACA) requires people to buy health insurance when they can afford to do so. This ''individual mandate'' is essential to address two features of current health insurance markets: the fact that millions of people cannot afford health insurance coverage, and the fact that insurance companies frequently charge high or unaffordable premiums to people who need insurance most—those suffering from costly illness or injury.

This mandate is one of three pillars that together support ACA's private market approach. The first pillar is insurance market reform—ending the ability of insurance companies to discriminate against sick or injured people with high medical costs. Subsidies to help Americans of modest means gain access to affordable health coverage provide the second pillar. The individual mandate provides the third pillar. It requires people to obtain insurance so long as that coverage is affordable. The mandate expresses a basic obligation of citizenship as well as an economic reality. Without the mandate, some people will choose to gamble or to free-ride, undermining the fairness and financial stability of the health insurance system.

Few of the uninsured could personally finance medical treatment for a serious illness or injury. Moreover, this country embraces the fundamental principal that everyone should have to minimally decent medical treatment when needed, without regard to ability to pay. Federal legislation and the custom and practice of health care providers embody this principle. A healthy individual's decision to forego affordable insurance coverage thus imposes real costs on others, while raising premiums on many people with serious medical needs who require the most help.

The individual mandate does not specify what care people receive. It simply requires people to pay a reasonable amount for any care they may ultimately receive. No less a conservative than Mitt Romney noted, when signing Massachusetts' equivalent of the individual mandate: ''Some of my libertarian friends balk at what looks like an individual mandate. But remember, someone has to pay for the health care that must, by law, be provided: Either the individual pays or the taxpayers pay. A free ride on the government is not libertarian.''

The ACA's individual mandate is based on Massachusetts's successful 2006 reforms. That landmark effort covered about two-thirds of the formerly uninsured, while reducing premiums for individual purchasers by about 50% relative to national trends—with strong public support.

In contrast, insurance reform without subsidies and mandates has consistently failed. In the five states that have tried comprehensive insurance market reform without an individual mandate, healthy people chose to stay out of insurance, sick people took it up, and premiums increased. Only broad participation in insurance markets can end the cycle of insecure coverage and high costs.

The Obama Administration's recent decision to delay ACA's requirement that large- and medium-sized employers sponsor coverage for their employees or pay a penalty is independent of the individual mandate. The employer assessment is designed to bolster the ACA's financing and to ensure equity between large firms who do and do not provide insurance. This assessment will have only a very small impact on employers, since 97% of firms with more than 50 employees already offer insurance. The individual mandate stands in stark contrast, as nearly one in five non-elderly Americans is currently uninsured.

Delaying the employer assessment has almost no effect on the implementation of the ACA. The only important effect will be to raise one fewer year of revenue from this

component of the law. In contrast, delaying the individual mandate would cut at the core of the vision of private-market based insurance market reform.

Requests to delay the individual mandate are really requests to gut the Affordable Care Act. Millions of Americans face immediate health care needs and financial challenges addressed by health reform. They cannot wait.

Signers

Henry Aaron, Senior Fellow and Bruce and Virginia MacLaury Chair in Economic Studies, Brookings Institution; Kenneth J. Arrow, Professor Emeritus, Stanford University; Susan Athey, Professor of Economics, Stanford Graduate School of Business; Linda J. Blumberg, Senior Fellow, Health Policy Center, The Urban Institute; Len Burman, Director, Tax Policy Center, Urban Institute; Amitabh Chandra, Professor of Public Policy, Harvard University; Philip J. Cook, ITT/ Terry Sanford Professor of Public Policy, Duke University; David Cutler, Otto Eckstein Professor of Applied Economics, Harvard University; Claudia Goldin, Henry Lee Professor of Economics, Harvard University; Jonathan Gruber, Professor of Economics, Massachusetts Institute of Technology; Vivian Ho, Baker Institute Chair in Health Economics, Rice University; John Holahan, Institute Fellow, Urban Institute; Jill Horwitz, Professor of Law, University of California at Los Angeles; Genevieve M. Kenney Co-Director and Senior Fellow Health Policy Center, Urban Institute, Frank Levy, Lecturer, Department of Health Care Policy, Harvard Medical School; Peter H. Lindert, Distinguished Research Professor of Economics, University of California at Davis; Eric S. Maskin, Adams University Professor, Harvard University; Alan C. Monheit, Ph.D., Professor of Health Economics, Rutgers University School of Public Health; Richard Murname, Juliana W. and William Foss Thompson Professor of Education and Society, Harvard Graduate School of Education; Joseph Newhouse, John D. MacArthur Professor of Health Policy and Management, Harvard Medical School; Harold Pollack, Helen Ross Professor of Social Service Administration, University of Chicago; Matthew Rabin, Edward G. and Nancy S. Jordan Professor of Economics, University of California at Berkeley; James B. Rebitzer, Professor of Management, Economics, and Public Policy and Everett V. Lord Distinguished Faculty Scholar, Boston University School of Management; Meredith Rosenthal, Professor of Health Economics and Policy, Harvard School of Public Health; Christopher Ruhm, Professor of Public Policy and Economics, University of Virginia; Jonathan Skinner, James O. Freedman Presidential Professor of Economics, Professor of Community and Family Medicine, Dartmouth College; Katherine Swartz, Professor, Harvard School of Public Health; Paul N. Van de Water, Senior Fellow, Center on Budget and Policy Priorities; Kenneth E. Warner, Avedis Donabedian Distinguished University Professor of Public Health, Dept. of Health Management & Policy, University of Michigan School of Public Health; Stephen Zuckerman, Co-Director and Senior Fellow, Heath Policy Center, The Urban Instituted;

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

There are a lot of folks who've come to the floor on the other side of the aisle to speak about this piece of legislation. Curiously, there aren't any individuals who came from those States that have actually passed legislation to implore Congress not to continue with the individual mandate—Alabama, Arizona, Missouri, Ohio, individuals from the other side of the aisle who didn't come down to the floor.

We get asked by folks on the other side about where's the jobs bill? Well, in addition to all the remarkable pieces of legislation on jobs that we have indeed passed and sent over to the Senate and it then gains dust over there, this is a jobs bill. I don't know if our friends on the other side haven't talked to their employers back home. Employers large and small, all of them say, Look, this is damaging job creation. We had one before the committee on Ways and Means that my friend from Washington and I sit on just last week who said he wasn't going to be able to expand his business. He couldn't, because of this bill. So this is a piece of jobs legislation.

We have a number of folks on the other side who say, Look, this is just about politics. Mr. Speaker, you talk about politics. You've got the President saying that he's going to delay the reporting requirements for the employer mandate for a year. And, by the way, that just happens to be after the 2014 election. You talk about politics.

Then you talk about delay. Some of my friends on the other side, they act as if this is something that we have indeed supported in the past. This is delay. This isn't repeal. In fact, we appreciate that the administration has awakened to the challenge of this piece of legislation.

They've recognized that it doesn't work for businesses and job creators because of the uncertainty and fewer jobs being created, so they have promoted a delay of 1 year for the employer mandate. But that uncertainty remains for those employers, and they're not going to be able to hire significant individuals.

And that uncertainty and that oppression of government-run health care isn't just for business. It's also true for individuals.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, I would say that I just encourage my friends to read the bill. This is the bill, H.R. 2668. It's very short and easily read. It simply changes the year requirements for the individual mandate from 1 year, 2014, to a year's delay in 2015. That's all it does. It simply equalizes the treatment for individuals as for businesses.

I know that many of them haven't read the bill. If they did, they would recognize that this bill has no change in it for preexisting illnesses or injuries and the rules thereon. It has no change for 26-year-olds being covered on their parents' health insurance. It has no change for lifetime limits. It has no change for the medical loss ratio provision. It has no change for gender equity. It has no change for out-of-pocket limits, and it has no change for anybody's insurance being taken away.

All this bill does, Mr. Speaker, is simply say that individuals ought to be treated fairly and equally, just like businesses, that we ought to delay the individual mandate for a year.

I call on my colleagues to support and vote for H.R. 2668, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. TURNER. Mr. Speaker, the administration recently announced that the Obamacare employer mandate, requiring businesses to provide their workers with health insurance, will be delayed until 2015. This decision is proof that even this administration acknowledges that the Obamacare law has adverse affects on American families and small businesses.

At a time when the economy is still struggling to recover, we should be focused on reducing taxes on hardworking Americans and providing incentives for businesses to grow and create jobs. The Congressional Budget Office (CBO) estimates that the employer mandate will raise taxes on American businesses by $117 billion. In addition, the National Federation of Independent Business (NFIB) estimates that the employer mandate will result in 125,000 to 249,000 lost jobs as a result of higher insurance costs.

Unfortunately, the administration is still moving forward with the implementation of the individual mandate in 2014, which will have negative effects on the American people. The average individual premium is expected to increase somewhere between 20 and 30 percent in 2014. CBO also estimates that the individual mandate will increase taxes on American families by $55 billion.

Mr. Speaker, I support passage of H.R. 2667, the Authority for Mandate Delay Act, and H.R. 2668, the Fairness for American Families Act. At the same time, we must permanently repeal these burdensome mandates. That is why I authored H.R. 582, the Healthcare Tax Relief and Mandate Repeal Act, with 97 of my colleagues, to repeal the Obamacare individual and employer mandates, providing relief for American families and businesses.

Mr. Speaker, now is not the time to impose extra burdens on American families and businesses when our economy is struggling to get back on track. I strongly support repeal of the individual and employer mandates and I am committed to working with my colleagues to carefully and thoughtfully implement real healthcare reform.

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in opposition to H.R. 2667 and H.R. 2668, two cynical Republican bills that play politics with Americans' lives. Instead of spending our time voting on the 38th and 39th Republican attempts to delay, undermine, or repeal the Affordable Care Act, we should be focused on implementing the law of the land and supporting real solutions to getting Americans the health care we all need.

The requirement that individuals have health insurance is the foundation of the Affordable Care Act's ability to improve access to quality, affordable health insurance. H.R. 2668 would delay this requirement, threatening access to affordable health insurance for an estimated 129 million Americans with pre-existing health conditions.

The Affordable Care Act has already begun to improve Americans' access to health care. Insurance companies are now required to cover children with pre-existing conditions, and in 2014 insurers will be prohibited from discriminating against adults with pre-existing conditions as well. An estimated 3.1 million young adults now have health insurance through their parents' plans because of the Affordable Care Act, and 6.3 million seniors have saved $6.1 billion on their prescription drugs.

The patient protections and health system reforms that will go into effect in 2014 rely on the individual responsibility provision of the Affordable Care Act. This provision does not apply to those who cannot access affordable coverage, and it protects all Americans from sharp increases in health insurance premiums in the health insurance marketplaces.

H.R. 2667, which would delay the employer health insurance mandate, is unnecessary and detracts from the important work of ensuring that more Americans gain access to affordable, quality health insurance.

I urge my colleagues to oppose H.R. 2667 and H.R. 2668 to defend the advances already made under the Affordable Care Act and the benefits yet to come. These bills are not intended to help Americans access affordable health care. They are merely the most recent Republican efforts to undermine the Affordable Care Act.

The Affordable Care Act is the law of the land, and it is already helping Americans improve their health. We must come together to implement the law effectively and ensure that more Americans have the opportunity to access affordable health insurance and improve their health.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. All time for debate on H.R. 2668 has expired.

Pursuant to House Resolution 300, the previous question is ordered.

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

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 1(c) of rule XIX, further consideration of H.R. 2668 is postponed.

AUTHORITY FOR MANDATE DELAY ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 1(c) of rule XIX, further consideration of H.R. 2667 will now resume.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

MOTION TO RECOMMIT

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Speaker, I have a motion to recommit at the desk.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. ANDREWS. I most certainly am.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. ANDREWS moves to recommit the bill H.R. 2667 to the Committee on Ways and Means with instructions to report the same back to the House forthwith with the following amendment:

Add at the end the following new section:

SEC. 3. PROTECTING EMPLOYEES AND FAMILIES FROM LOSING THEIR EXISTING HEALTH INSURANCE COVERAGE.

Nothing in this Act shall be construed to allow employers to reduce insurance coverage for individuals and families who currently receive job-based health benefits.

Mr. CAMP. Mr. Speaker, I reserve a point of order against the motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. A point of order is reserved.

The gentleman from New Jersey is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Speaker, the purpose of this final amendment, which would not delay consideration of the bill, if passed, is to be sure that no one who's covered by their employer today suffers as a result of this bill. But make no mistake about it, the purpose of the underlying bill is to unravel the Affordable Care Act thread by thread and make sure that it collapses under its own weight. Make no mistake about it further, our purpose is forgotten around here if that's what this Congress does.

We are not a debating society. We are not a perpetual political campaign. We are a legislative body that makes decisions that affect the real lives of real people in very significant ways. It is very important that all Members understand the consequences of what is being done here today.

There are a lot of Americans whose lives are not being impacted here today:

Among the 11 million unemployed in this country, they are hoping that next week might be the first week they get a paycheck in a long time. This House, consistent with its practice, is doing nothing.

For the members of families with student loans, there are over 5 million of them who have seen their student loan rates double on the 1st of July. This House, consistent with its practice, is doing nothing for them today.

For the millions of Americans who are waiting for our economy to be lifted and their lives to be lifted out of the doldrums and the shadows of an antiquated immigration law, where the other body, with 68 percent voting in favor of a change in that law, consistent with its practice, this House is doing nothing, once again, for those Americans today.

But if this bill and its unraveling attempt passes, this House is doing a lot to affect a lot of other Americans:

If everyone doesn't participate in paying for the health care system, the woman who has breast cancer or the little boy who has asthma, they can be denied a health insurance policy because of their preexisting condition, or it will become so expensive they can't afford it. This bill affects them.

The person who overpaid for their health insurance policy, if they're one of the millions of Americans who've gotten a rebate since the Affordable Care Act went into effect to stop insurance companies from overcharging Americans, if these folks have their way and that's repealed, this bill will certainly affect them because they'll lose that rebate.

If they are among the millions of senior citizens who have been able to go for an annual checkup for a cancer screening, an annual checkup for their general health and not pay anything for it and find dreaded diseases before they take control of their lives and recover from those diseases, this bill most certainly will affect those Americans because it will repeal those benefits.

□ 1800

For those seniors who have been caught in the so-called doughnut hole created by—the Medicare program created by the then-majority a few years ago—who've seen their drug coverage costs drop because of rebates that help them offset that coverage, they will most certainly be affected by this bill because those rebates will disappear, and their coverage will go back up and cost them more again.

If they're one of the thousands or even millions of young people who are able to stay on their parents' health insurance policies until they're 26 years of age, their lives will be affected by this bill because they'll lose that benefit and it will evaporate.

This Congress has a real responsibility to Americans who want to see us move beyond this endless debate, this 38th attempted repeal of this law, who want to see us move beyond this and get to work on the real problems that confront the country. Let's put Americans back to work. Let's drop the cost of a college education. Let's fix our broken immigration system. Let's get to work on repairing the Voting Rights Act that was vandalized by the United States Supreme Court just a few weeks ago.

These are problems to which we should turn our attention, but here we are again, the 38th consecutive attempt to repeal the Affordable Care Act. The first 37 failed, and so will the 38th. The right vote for our constituents and the American people is to vote ''yes'' on this motion to recommit and ''no'' on this underlying bill.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. CAMP. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my point of order, and seek time in opposition to the motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The point of order is withdrawn.

The gentleman from Michigan is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. CAMP. Mr. Speaker, ObamaCare is already forcing workers to lose coverage. CBO has said that employers will drop health care coverage. CBO has said that employers will lay off workers and reduce coverage. That is already happening, and workers in this country are suffering.

Even the Teamsters union has said so in a letter to Leader REID and Leader PELOSI, and let me just read from one paragraph of this letter from the Teamsters union and other unions:

When you and the President sought our support for the Affordable Care Act, you pledged that if we liked the health plans we have now, we could keep them. Sadly, that promise is under threat. Right now, unless you and the Obama administration enact an equitable fix, the ACA will shatter not only our hard-earned health benefits, but destroy the foundation of the 40-hour work week that is backbone of the American middle class.

The only way to fix this is to reject this motion, delay the employer mandate, and vote for this bill.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the previous question is ordered on the motion to recommit.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to recommit.

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 9 of rule XX, the Chair will reduce to 5 minutes the minimum time for any electronic vote on the question of adoption.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 188, nays 230, not voting 15, as follows:

[Roll No. 360]

YEAS—188

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

NAYS—230

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

NOT VOTING—15

Bachmann
Campbell
Cramer
Flores
Grijalva
Grimm
Herrera Beutler
Hinojosa
Holt
Horsford
Lewis
McCarthy (NY)
Negrete McLeod
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

□ 1826

Messrs. STIVERS, JOYCE, and DENHAM changed their vote from ''yea'' to ''nay.''

Messrs. GARAMENDI and NOLAN changed their vote from ''nay'' to ''yea.''

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated for:

Mr. HINOJOSA. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 360, had I been present, I would have voted "yea."

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

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 264, nays 161, not voting 8, as follows:

[Roll No. 361]

YEAS—264

Aderholt
Alexander
Amash
Amodei
Bachmann
Bachus
Barber
Barletta
Barr
Barrow (GA)
Barton
Benishek
Bentivolio
Bera (CA)
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Bonner
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Braley (IA)
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Broun (GA)
Brownley (CA)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Burgess
Bustos
Calvert
Camp
Cantor
Capito
Carney
Carter
Cassidy
Chabot
Chaffetz
Coble
Coffman
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Conaway
Connolly
Cook
Cotton
Cramer
Crawford
Crenshaw
Culberson
Daines
Davis, Rodney
Delaney
DelBene
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Duckworth
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellmers
Enyart
Esty
Farenthold
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foster
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gallego
Garcia
Gardner
Garrett
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gibson
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Griffin (AR)
Guthrie
Hall
Hanna
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings (WA)
Heck (NV)
Hensarling
Himes
Holding
Hudson
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt
Issa
Jenkins
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Jordan
Joyce
Kelly (PA)
Kilmer
Kind
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kinzinger (IL)
Kirkpatrick
Kline
Labrador
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Lankford
Latham
Latta
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Long
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
Maffei
Maloney, Sean
Marchant
Marino
Massie
Matheson
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul
McClintock
McHenry
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
Meadows
Meehan
Messer
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Mullin
Mulvaney
Murphy (FL)
Murphy (PA)
Neugebauer
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Nunnelee
Olson
Owens
Palazzo
Paulsen
Pearce
Perry

Peters (CA)
Peters (MI)
Peterson
Petri
Pittenger
Pitts
Poe (TX)
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Radel
Rahall
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rice (SC)
Rigell
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Royce
Ruiz
Runyan
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Sanford
Scalise
Schneider
Schock
Schrader
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Sinema
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Southerland
Stewart
Stivers
Stockman
Stutzman
Terry
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walorski
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (FL)
Young (IN)

NAYS—161

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

NOT VOTING—8

Campbell
Grimm
Herrera Beutler
Holt
Horsford
Lewis
McCarthy (NY)
Negrete McLeod

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

□ 1834

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

FAIRNESS FOR AMERICAN FAMILIES ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 1(c) of rule XIX, further consideration of H.R. 2668 will now resume.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

MOTION TO RECOMMIT

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Speaker, I have a motion to recommit at the desk.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. ANDREWS. Yes, I am.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. ANDREWS moves to recommit the bill H.R. 2668 to the Committee on Ways and Means with instructions to report the same back to the House forthwith with the following amendment:

Add at the end the following new section:

SEC. 3. PROTECTING CONSUMERS FROM PREMIUM INCREASES AND DISCRIMINATION ON THE BASIS OF PRE-EXISTING CONDITIONS.

Nothing in this Act shall be construed to alter, impact, delay, or weaken—

(1) section 1402 of the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act that reduces out-of-pocket costs and cost-sharing for individuals and families,

(2) sections 1001 and 1401 of such Act that provide tax credits and rebates for health insurance, or

(3) section 1201 of such Act that prohibits discrimination on the basis of pre-existing conditions and gender.

Mr. CAMP (during the reading). Mr. Speaker, I reserve a point of order against the motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. A point of order is reserved.

The gentleman from New Jersey is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. ANDREWS. The purpose of this amendment, which if passed would let us still proceed to final passage, is to provide protection for important consumer protections that I believe this bill puts in jeopardy.

There's probably not a Member of this Chamber who doesn't agree with the proposition that if a woman with breast cancer or a child with asthma goes to buy an insurance policy, I don't think many people here think they should be denied that policy because of their preexisting condition, or charged two or three times as much money because they've had breast cancer or asthma or they're a woman or they've been pregnant.

Almost everyone I hear talk about health care says Well, sure, I'm for getting rid of discrimination based on preexisting conditions. But I think we all know this: you can't accomplish that if you don't have a mechanism to keep costs from exploding for everybody else in the insurance marketplace. And, ladies and gentlemen, there's only two ways to do that.

The first way is to have a public fund that buys down those premium costs for people. With all due respect, the majority tried to do that and couldn't pass their bill on the floor. The second way to do it is to give everyone who can afford it the responsibility to buy health insurance for themselves.

The way that we create a situation in which we can say to that woman with breast cancer, Yes, you can have a health insurance policy, and it doesn't have to be three times as much in price, or the way that we can say to that young boy with asthma, Yes, you can have a health insurance policy, and it doesn't have to be three times as much in price, is to get everyone covered. If you don't get everyone covered, then the whole thing unravels. And when it unravels, so do the other protections in the Affordable Care Act. The preexisting condition discrimination we all say we want to prevent happens anyway.

The family whose child has a $1 million or $2 million chemotherapy bill runs up against a lifetime policy limit and they're on their own again. That expires, too. The protection for young men and young women who seek coverage on their parents' policy, that unravels, too. We go back to a day when the health care of the American people is in the clutches of the insurance industry and not decided between patients and their families and their physicians.

We have had this argument 38 times before on this floor. But this argument has taken place outside this floor as well. Last June, the litigants went to the United States Supreme Court and said this law was no good because it was unconstitutional. But the United States Supreme Court said, Yes, it is, and we're not going backwards.

Last year, two Presidential candidates traveled all over this country. One called for this law's repeal. The other stood by this law's enforcement. Last November, the American people spoke and they said, We're not going backward. Well, here we are again, and the choice is backward or forward.

Make no mistake about it, if the underlying bill passes, the law unravels and all the protections people say they want unravel with it. And we go back to the day when American health care was run by insurance companies and not by consumers and providers.

The choice, ladies and gentlemen, is backward or forward. I say we do not go backward to a day when insurance companies ran everything. We go forward. And when that woman with breast cancer goes to apply for that health insurance policy, the answer is no longer, Ma'am, I'm sorry, you're not eligible. You had cancer one day. The answer is, Ma'am, here is your policy. Here is your health security. Here is your independence from losing everything you had because you got sick.

The American people are better than this repeal. Vote ''yes'' on the motion to recommit and vote ''no'' on the underlying bill.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. CAMP. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my point of order and seek time in opposition to the motion.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The point of order is withdrawn.

The gentleman from Michigan is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. CAMP. Mr. Speaker, we know that ObamaCare increases premiums, and we know ObamaCare will force Americans to pay more for their health care.

□ 1845

It's not me that says this—although, I do—it's CBO. The Congressional Budget Office confirms that ObamaCare drives costs up of health care for working Americans. The only way to control health care costs and reduce health care costs is to delay ObamaCare until we can repeal it.

The only bill, the only legislation that the Congressional Budget Office scored as lowering premiums was the bill Republicans offered during the health care debate.

The President of the United States, through a blog post, delayed the employer mandate. This House just voted to delay the employer mandate. We owe it to the American people to give them the same treatment the President has given corporate America.

Defeat this motion. Pass the Fairness for Families Act.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the previous question is ordered on the motion to recommit.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to recommit.

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 and clause 9 of rule XX, the 5-minute vote on the motion to recommit will be followed by 5-minute votes on the passage of H.R. 2668, if ordered, and the approval of the Journal, if ordered.

This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 193, nays 230, not voting 10, as follows:

[Roll No. 362]

YEAS—193

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

NAYS—230

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

NOT VOTING—10

Campbell
Grimm
Herrera Beutler
Holt
Horsford
Lewis
McCarthy (NY)
Negrete McLeod
Ros-Lehtinen
Ryan (OH)

□ 1851

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

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

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 251, nays 174, not voting 8, as follows:

[Roll No. 363]

YEAS—251

Aderholt
Alexander
Amash
Amodei
Bachmann
Bachus
Barber
Barletta
Barr
Barrow (GA)
Barton
Benishek
Bentivolio
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Bonner
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Broun (GA)
Brownley (CA)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Burgess
Bustos
Calvert
Camp
Cantor
Capito
Carter
Cassidy
Chabot
Chaffetz
Coble
Coffman
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Conaway
Cook
Cotton
Cramer
Crawford
Crenshaw
Culberson
Daines
Davis, Rodney
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellmers
Enyart
Esty
Farenthold
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gallego
Garcia
Gardner
Garrett
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gibson
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Griffin (AR)
Guthrie
Hall
Hanna
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings (WA)
Heck (NV)
Hensarling
Holding

Hudson
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt
Issa
Jenkins
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Jordan
Joyce
Kelly (PA)
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kinzinger (IL)
Kirkpatrick
Kline
Labrador
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Lankford
Latham
Latta
LoBiondo
Long
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
Maffei
Maloney, Sean
Marchant
Marino
Massie
Matheson
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul
McClintock
McHenry
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
Meadows
Meehan
Messer
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Mullin
Mulvaney
Murphy (FL)
Murphy (PA)
Neugebauer
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Nunnelee
Olson
Owens
Palazzo
Paulsen
Pearce
Perry
Peters (CA)
Peters (MI)
Peterson
Petri
Pittenger
Pitts
Poe (TX)
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Radel
Rahall
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rice (SC)
Rigell
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Royce
Ruiz
Runyan
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Sanford
Scalise
Schneider
Schock
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Sinema
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Southerland
Stewart
Stivers
Stockman
Stutzman
Terry
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walorski
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (FL)
Young (IN)

NAYS—174

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

NOT VOTING—8

Campbell
Grimm
Herrera Beutler
Holt
Horsford
Lewis
McCarthy (NY)
Negrete McLeod

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

□ 1858

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana). Pursuant to section 3(b) of House Resolution 300, H.R. 2667 is laid on the table.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the question on agreeing to the Speaker's approval of the Journal, which the Chair will put de novo.

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

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

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 16, 2013.

Hon. JOHN BOEHNER,
Speaker of the House, U.S. Capitol, Washington, DC.

DEAR SPEAKER BOEHNER: Pursuant to Section 4(b) of the World War I Centennial Commission Act (Pub. L. 112–272), I hereby appoint Mr. Robert Dalessandro of Alexandria, Virginia, to the World War I Centennial Commission.

Thank you for your attention to this appointment.

Sincerely,

NANCY PELOSI,
Democratic Leader.

CONTINUATION OF THE NATIONAL EMERGENCY WITH RESPECT TO THE FORMER LIBERIAN REGIME OF CHARLES TAYLOR—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 113–47)

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

To the Congress of the United States:

Section 202(d) of the National Emergencies Act (50 U.S.C. 1622(d)) provides for the automatic termination of a national emergency unless, within 90 days prior to the anniversary date of its declaration, the President publishes in the *Federal Register* and transmits to the Congress a notice stating that the emergency is to continue in effect beyond the anniversary date. In accordance with this provision, I have sent the enclosed notice to the *Federal Register* for publication stating that the national emergency and related measures dealing with the former Liberian regime of Charles Taylor are to continue in effect beyond July 22, 2013.

Although Liberia has made advances to promote democracy, and the Special Court for Sierra Leone recently convicted Charles Taylor for war crimes and crimes against humanity, the actions and policies of former Liberian President Charles Taylor and other persons, in particular their unlawful depletion of Liberian resources and their removal from Liberia and secreting of Liberian funds and property, could still challenge Liberia's efforts to strengthen its democracy and the orderly development of its political, administrative, and economic institutions and resources. These actions and policies continue to pose an unusual and extraordinary threat to the foreign policy of the United States. For this reason, I have determined that it is necessary to continue the national emergency with respect to the former Liberian regime of Charles Taylor.

BARACK OBAMA.
THE WHITE HOUSE, *July 17, 2013.*

FEDERAL AGRICULTURE REFORM AND RISK MANAGEMENT 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. Madam Speaker, last week, the House passed the Federal Agriculture Reform and Risk Management Act, or FARRM Act. Overall, the agriculture programs will save $20 billion.

This package of farm bill programs will create a more cost-effective and market-oriented framework of agriculture policies and ensure that Americans continue to have a safe and affordable food supply.

This bill did not include title IV of the committee-passed legislation, which contained significant reforms to the Supplemental Nutritional Assistance Program, or food stamps, totaling an additional $20 billion in savings. Contrary to popular belief, the current SNAP program was not affected by passage of last week's FARRM Act.

The American people deserve a transparent and open debate over agriculture and nutrition programs, both of which are in dire need of reform, which is why the House will be considering reforms to SNAP in the coming weeks.

We have an opportunity to achieve a better and more efficient farm bill here, Madam Speaker. I look forward to working with colleagues in the House and Senate on a final package so that we can enact those commonsense reforms into law.

THE 21ST CENTURY'S GLOBAL CLEAN ENERGY RACE

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

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Madam Speaker, in April, the International Energy Agency concluded that despite some progress in deploying clean energy, that the average unit of energy produced in the world today is essentially polluting as it was 20 years ago.

As President Obama stated at Georgetown University last month, we cannot afford to slow-walk our transition to a lower carbon future. Climate change and its consequences are not waiting and neither can we.

The good news is the transition to a cleaner global economy presents a great economic opportunity for the United States. Bloomberg New Energy Finance estimates that private clean energy investment will more than triple by 2030. We should be fighting to attract that investment here in the United States, but we are at risk of missing out on that opportunity.

China and other countries have made firm national commitments to generate more electricity from clean energy sources, and that reality is reflected in their current levels of investment—a $65 billion investment in China compared to $35 billion in the United States.

Madam Speaker, we should not lose this competition, we should not jeopardize our future, and we should not jeopardize the climate. This is an opportunity for a win-win.

SUMMER OF SCANDALS

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

Mr. POE of Texas. Madam Speaker, in this sizzling ''Summer of Scandals,'' the evidence of no accountability continues to mount.

Someone in the Federal Government commits wrongdoing. The White House denies involvement or knowledge. Blames low-level operatives or somebody else. No accountability.

Exhibit 1: Fast and Furious. The government smuggled guns into Mexico. Two Americans and hundreds of Mexicans were killed by those guns. White House blamed Bush. An employee resigned. No accountability.

Exhibit 2: Benghazi. Requests for increased security were denied both before and during the attack. Four Americans were killed. Investigation bungled. A YouTube video was blamed. An employee was placed on leave but still collects a paycheck. No accountability.

Exhibit 3: IRS admitted targeting conservative organizations. Employees in Ohio were blamed. White House denied knowledge. No accountability.

Exhibit 4: The DOJ was caught wiretapping reporters to silence a leak. White House denied involvement. No accountability.

As the ''Summer of Scandals'' continues, the most transparent administration in history keeps hiding information from citizens about the abuse of its government power.

And that's just the way it is.

THIRD ANNIVERSARY OF INTERNATIONAL INDICTMENTS AGAINST SUDANESE PRESIDENT BASHIR FOR GENOCIDE IN DARFUR

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

Mr. MCGOVERN. Madam Speaker, last week marked the third anniversary of when the International Criminal Court issued an arrest warrant for Omar al-Bashir, the sitting President of Sudan, on three counts of genocide related to Darfur. Four years ago, Bashir was indicted on two counts of war crimes and five counts of crimes against humanity.

On Sunday, Bashir traveled to Nigeria to a red-carpet welcome and full guard of honor despite demands from human rights activists that Nigeria arrest him to face trial on genocide charges.

This is an outrage, Madam Speaker.

Congressmen WOLF, CAPUANO, and I have introduced H.R. 6092, the Sudan Peace, Security and Accountability Act. This bill strengthens sanctions against Sudan and requires a comprehensive strategy to address the many conflicts and human rights crimes occurring in Sudan, including the international strategy to enforce the ICC arrest warrants against Bashir and other Sudanese officials.

I ask my House colleagues to join us in this effort, to cosponsor H.R. 1692, and to move it to the House floor for approval in the 113th Congress.

TRIBUTE TO WILLIAM FRANCIS HARTNETT, JR.

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

Mr. ROKITA. Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize and salute a remarkable individual, William Francis Hartnett, Jr., who passed away on July 15. I wish to express my heartfelt gratitude and appreciation for his leadership and service to our country.

Mr. Hartnett had a servant's heart. He served our Nation as an officer in the U.S. Navy and as a special agent for the FBI. Mr. Hartnett sat on numerous boards, including St. Francis Hospital, Northwestern Memorial Hospital, the Chicago Public Library, Chicago Catholic Charities, and my alma mater, La Lumiere School in La Porte, Indiana.

Mr. Hartnett also developed real estate projects across the country, including Lake Point Tower in Chicago, United Nations Plaza in New York, Williams Center in Tulsa, Oklahoma, and the Century City in Los Angeles.

Mr. Hartnett was a family man, who is survived by his loving wife of 63 years, Lorrayne, in addition to 4 children, 17 grandchildren, and 6 great-grandchildren.

William Francis Hartnett, Jr., was a man truly committed to his family, his community, his Catholic faith, and his country. America is a better Nation because of Bill Hartnett, and I am lucky to know his family—his best achievement. He will be truly missed, Madam Speaker. Thank you and rest in peace, Mr. Hartnett.

KIDNAPPING OF FORMER MARINE ARMANDO TORRES IN MEXICO

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

Mr. HINOJOSA. Madam Speaker, I rise to express my deep concern for former Marine Corporal Armando Torres, who is in this photograph here. He was kidnapped by members of the Mexican cartel during a visit to Tamaulipas, Mexico, while visiting his father and uncle.

On May 14, 2013, 2 months ago, Mr. Torres crossed the Rio Grande River into Mexico and was to return the next day. Family members in Mexico report that Mr. Torres, along with his father and uncle, were forcibly taken by members of the Mexican cartel.

Corporal Torres is a combat veteran who served his country honorably in Iraq. I have asked the FBI in McAllen, Texas, and the U.S. Consulate General in Matamoros, Mexico, to help bring this marine and his relatives back safely to their loved ones.

Each agency has been working on this case every day for the past 2 months. They report the Mexican Government is cooperating with them on their efforts to find the victims of this outrageous crime.

I commend the quick action taken by both the FBI and the U.S. State Department, and I urge them to continue to do all they can to find and return our former marine, Armando Torres, back safely to the United States and to bring his relatives back home. The United States does not, and must not, give up and leave one of its own behind.

□ 1915

MARINES WILL NOT LEAVE THEIR BROTHERS BEHIND

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

Mr. BROUN of Georgia. Madam Speaker, I rise in support of Corporal Armando Torres, a 25-year-old marine and Iraq war vet, who finds himself in a desperate situation. More than 2 months ago, Corporal Torres was kidnapped, along with his father and uncle, from a Mexican ranch.

While the media's lack of attention has their kidnappers thinking we've just given up, my colleagues and my fellow marines in the House of Representatives have a different message: marines will not leave their brothers behind, and the U.S. should not either. We will not rest until we bring Corporal Torres home.

Now is the time to send a message to Torres' kidnappers that their actions against a U.S. citizen and a marine veteran will not be tolerated. I urge my fellow marines to join me on the House floor and to demand action for Corporal Torres and his family.

IMMIGRATION

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

Ms. DUCKWORTH. Madam Speaker, last month, in Addison, Illinois, I held an immigration roundtable with 38 organizations that spanned the political spectrum. Attending were the chambers of commerce, the ACLU, local colleges, and municipalities. They all told me that now is the time to act on comprehensive immigration reform.

My neighbors know that, done right, immigration reform can make our communities stronger and that it can provide opportunities for our businesses by expanding our workforce. Reform will make us safer by securing our borders. We can help balance our budget by letting millions of immigrants who are willing to make the necessary sacrifices become tax-paying American citizens. We must work together to provide a pathway to citizenship as part of any comprehensive immigration reform legislation.

The Senate has passed such a bipartisan proposal, and Members of the House should reach across the aisle and do the same. We cannot allow partisanship and extremism to stop us from making commonsense reforms that are vital to the future of this great Nation. Now is the time for Congress to pass comprehensive immigration reform legislation that is practical, fair, and humane.

LET'S PUT OFF THE SUFFERING

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

Mr. GOHMERT. Madam Speaker, this evening, we had a difficult vote—not difficult for some, but for some of us, it was.

On the one hand, we had the President, who had announced he was going to do the unconstitutional even though he had pushed through ObamaCare without a single Republican vote for it, and people are beginning to realize just how devastating this is. They've lost their doctors; they've lost their insurance, and they're going to lose their insurance; people have been forced from full time to part time, and now they're seeking more part-time work to make up the difference; they're being told they're losing their benefits.

This extra whammy for American workers was going to be even more devastating if the individual mandate went through. Somebody making $14,000 was either going to buy insurance he couldn't afford or pay extra income tax.

Some of us knew if we would just let the whole thing go through, then people would be hurt, and they would demand repeal; but I had to vote not to make people suffer. Let's put off the suffering as long as possible and then, hopefully, repeal it.

COMPREHENSIVE IMMIGRATION REFORM

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

Mr. CÁRDENAS. Madam Speaker, I rise today to talk about comprehensive immigration reform, but from a slightly different standpoint from many of my colleagues who frequently occupy this Chamber with their perspectives.

Madam Speaker, we all know why we need comprehensive immigration reform, why we need to fix this system rather than depending on small, one-off solutions. Our system is broken, and we have to fix the entire immigration system now.

Our farms do not have stable workforces; our borders are not adequately protected; far too many high-tech companies are short the workers they need to continue to innovate; our schools attract the best and the brightest from around the world, but we can't keep sending them back after we educate them.

We know what needs to be fixed and why. What will happen once we fix the problems? Very simply, our economy will skyrocket.

Report after report, study after study says the same thing—the successful implementation of comprehensive immigration reform will cut the deficit, create manufacturing jobs and job opportunities nationwide, and create more than 100,000 American jobs every year for the next 10 years. We will see $832 billion being pumped into our economy over the next 10 years. As producers and consumers in this great Nation, undocumented immigrants grow the economic pie by at least $30 billion as we speak. Legalization would triple that number with various studies pointing to a $1 trillion impact on our gross domestic product right here in the United States over the next 10 years.

Madam Speaker, I am joined by many of my freshman class. This past election, voters sent us to Washington to solve problems like our broken immigration system, and that's what we want to do. It's time to make immigration reform a reality, and it's absolutely time to let people know what that reality really means for their own pocketbooks—those of both American citizens and immigrants. That's what we're going to talk about tonight.

Madam Speaker, for those watching at home, they can get in on one of the conversations by tweeting us at #CIRmeansjobs. If our constituents have questions, we will answer them.

With that, I look forward to an interesting and enlightening discussion tonight.

I would like to start off by talking with my colleague from California, Congressman SWALWELL. One thing I would like to ask this gentleman is whether he thinks comprehensive immigration reform will help not only create more job opportunities but also expand our Nation's workforce.

Mr. SWALWELL of California. Madam Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman from California, Congressman CÁRDENAS, for leading on this issue and for bringing together the freshman class on an issue that is important not just in California but across the country—the question about comprehensive immigration reform and whether it means jobs.

We know that it's the right thing to do to welcome the 11 million undocumented immigrants into our country and to put them on a pathway to citizenship. We also know that it's good for our economy, and I am happy to be here today to talk about this. Everyone agrees right now that our immigration system is broken. It must be reformed, not in a piecemeal manner, but comprehensively to meet the needs of the 21st century.

I represent a very diverse area, which includes the cities of Hayward, Union City, Fremont, Castro Valley, and San Lorenzo, California, among other cities. In those cities are some of the 11 million undocumented individuals. These are hardworking folks who come here for the same reason that our ancestors came—to make life better for themselves, their families, and their children. We should welcome that. We should embrace that they are choosing to come here to America rather than to go to other countries. It's a very good thing.

Tragically, right now, these undocumented workers are in the shadows, putting them at risk for exploitation

and allowing for the unscrupulous employer to drive down wages for everyone. It's time to bring them into the open, to provide them legalized status, and to allow them to earn citizenship.

We also need to reform our legal immigration process. For example, we need to stop forcing people who come here and study in America—in our classrooms and in our colleges—and become skilled workers in the U.S. to leave the country just when they want to stay and contribute. Not only is making these changes the morally right thing to do; but as my colleagues have been saying and will say tonight, it adds up for our economy.

The nonpartisan Congressional Budget Office analyzed the bipartisan Senate bill and found it would increase our GDP by 5.4 percent in 2033, or $1.4 trillion. It's not just the CBO. A paper published in 2012 by the Cato Institute found that comprehensive immigration reform would raise wages, increase consumption, create jobs, and generate additional revenue. It calculated a smaller benefit than did the CBO, but it's at least $1.5 trillion in extra GDP over 10 years.

Comprehensive immigration reform is not only the morally right thing to do; it's the economically correct thing to do to get America's economy moving again, and I am honored to stand with my colleagues today to push for this needed reform.

Mr. CÁRDENAS. Thank you very much, Congressman SWALWELL.

Next, we will hear from Congressman RUIZ from California.

Mr. RUIZ. Thank you, Congressman CÁRDENAS, for your remarks and for hosting this Special Order today to discuss the economic benefits of immigration reform. This is an issue that is very important to my district and to our great Nation.

Madam Speaker, Democrats and Republicans recognize that our current immigration system is broken and that the passage of the bipartisan Senate immigration bill a few weeks ago sends a strong message that the time for comprehensive reform is now.

Passing a commonsense, comprehensive immigration reform bill will lead to an economic boon in our country. Nonpartisan, independent studies have shown that comprehensive immigration reform will reduce the deficit by nearly $850 billion over the next 20 years and will reduce our Federal debt. Passing comprehensive immigration reform is being fiscally responsible. It will also increase economic growth and will strengthen our economy by expanding our labor force, increasing investment, and increasing overall productivity. It will also provide a significant boost to our tourism and agriculture sectors—two of the top industries in my district in southern California, which is the 36th Congressional District in the Coachella Valley and the Palm Springs area.

Comprehensive immigration reform means more jobs and more opportunity for people in my district and across the country—but only if we act. There is too much at stake if we do not take action to fix our broken immigration system. It is time for Congress to put partisanship aside and work together to pass a meaningful comprehensive immigration bill now.

Mr. CÁRDENAS. Thank you very much, Congressman RUIZ from California.

One of the things I'd like to make sure that we understand is that some people believe that the low-skilled jobs that some immigrants take in this country are jobs that are taken away from Americans. Ask any farmer around the country, especially the members of the biggest farms in the country. Some crops have gone unpicked, which means that that affects the pocketbooks of every American when those crops don't make it to our kitchen tables. It's really important for us to understand that many of the jobs that are taken by some immigrants to this country are jobs that U.S. workers just will not take. I think it's very important for us to understand that, and there is a diversity of jobs that we will cover over the next hour.

With that, I yield to Congressman GALLEGO from Texas.

Mr. GALLEGO. Thank you. I, too, want to thank my colleague, Congressman CÁRDENAS of California, as well as the other members of our freshman class, for this important time to talk about an issue that is critical to the border.

Madam Speaker, the 23rd Congressional District in Texas, which I have the privilege of representing, runs some 800 miles along the Texas-Mexico border. It encompasses 29 counties, which are bigger than 29 States, and 10 of the counties that I represent are along the Texas-Mexico border.

□ 1930

It includes five ports of entry: Eagle Pass, Del Rio, Presidio, Fabens, and Zaragoza-Ysleta in El Paso. No other congressional district in the country shares a larger border with Mexico.

The impact of the immigration debate, it's a tremendous impact not only on the 23rd District, but truly in all of Texas.

There are many reasons to pass comprehensive immigration reform, but one of the best reasons is simple, straightforward economics. Let's take a look at the numbers.

According to a 2006 report by the comptroller of public accounts in Texas, ''the absence of the estimated 1.4 million undocumented immigrants in Texas in fiscal year 2005 would have been a loss to the gross State product of $17.7 billion.''

Recently, I asked our current comptroller to update that study so that all of the Members of Congress from Texas would have updated information during a very important policy debate. Sadly, she denied my request. But a more recent study from the Immigration Policy Center noted that, if all unauthorized immigrants were removed from Texas, the State would lose $69.3 billion in economic activity, $30.8 billion in gross State product, and approximately 403,000 jobs, even accounting for adequate market adjustment time.

Economically, here's what comprehensive immigration reform means for Texas:

It means that deficits decrease, while GDP, productivity, investment, and employment all increase;

If the unauthorized immigrants in Texas were allowed to earn a path towards legalization, total wages in Texas would go up by about $9.7 billion, tax revenue in Texas would increase by $4.1 billion, and nearly 200,000 jobs would be created;

For every unauthorized person required to be legalized in Texas, more than $1,000 would be added to the gross State product in 2014, and that number would increase to more than $4,400 by the year 2020.

Let's talk about the CBO score, because according to the nonpartisan CBO report to which the comptroller of Texas referred my office, that study notes that our country will save almost a trillion dollars over the next two decades with comprehensive immigration reform, more than 10 million people will now pay billions of dollars in income and payroll taxes during the first decade alone, and we reduce the Federal deficit by $197 billion at the same time that we add $200 billion to the Social Security trust fund.

In Texas, all of the key players are standing behind immigration reform. The chambers of commerce, the Texas Farm Bureau, the labor communities, the faith communities, and, frankly, public opinion. They're all singing from the very same hymnbook.

Usually you hear the phrase that we should ''run government more like a business.'' A business doesn't make decisions on the basis of emotion. A business makes decisions on the basis of economics.

Economically, comprehensive immigration reform makes perfect sense. Our Nation becomes stronger as more people pledge allegiance to our flag and commit fully to this Nation and our economy.

The time is now. The right thing to do, if you care about the Texas economy and you want it to grow and grow and grow, you want to support comprehensive immigration reform.

With that, I thank my colleagues.

Mr. CÁRDENAS. Thank you very much, Congressman GALLEGO.

It's very important for us to understand that this is an issue of diversity. And it's not just diversity of people from all over the country, but diversity of economics for the United States of America.

It's no secret that we are the innovative capital of the world, but more and more every single day, every single year, we are depending more and more

and more on technical people coming to our country to fill those technical jobs that are fueling hundreds, if not millions, of jobs in this country and creating tremendous economic benefit for our country. It's really important for us to understand that.

I now yield to Congresswoman TITUS from Nevada to speak to those issues and others.

Ms. TITUS. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman from California for yielding me time, and I also thank him for organizing this Special Order.

We've heard a lot on this floor and in the press and from our constituents about the moral, the social, the political reasons for us to enact comprehensive immigration reform, but we haven't done enough talking about the economic aspects, so this is a good opportunity do that.

I'm very pleased to say that, in the Senate version of the comprehensive immigration reform bill, there is a provision that has to do with increasing H–1B visas. Those visas will bring with them increased jobs, which, of course, support the economy.

A second part of that provision is also something that I've been urging my colleagues on the House side who are working on the comprehensive immigration reform bill to include, and that provision would use the revenue from these high-skilled H–1B visas to promote STEM education at minority-serving colleges and universities. You can just look at this chart and see how many new jobs will be created both in 2013 and 2014 by the increase in the number of these visas that would be allowed.

If we increase the number of visas, we're also going to increase the amount of funds that come from companies that are willing to pay to bring people from outside the country here for these STEM jobs. I say let's use those funds both to create scholarships for low-income minority students who are pursuing STEM degrees and also to provide funding for American colleges and universities that serve those minority students. We want our new citizens to also be well-prepared citizens.

There are colleges and universities all across the country, including several in the First District of Nevada, that are working hard to attract students to the STEM fields. Earlier this year, the College of Southern Nevada hosted approximately 3,000 K through 12 Nevada students at their annual science and technology expo to get local students from all backgrounds, including our minority communities, excited about careers in STEM fields before they enter college. Then in January, the University of Nevada, Las Vegas hosted a STEM summit to feature STEM research and to get students involved in presenting that research and their work in the STEM fields.

These are significant and important efforts to promote STEM, but our colleges and universities need our help to expand and improve their STEM outreach and training. By increasing access to STEM education, we can help American and immigrant students gain the knowledge and skills they need in the sciences, technology, math, and engineering so they can compete for the jobs of tomorrow.

This is particularly critical for minority students, who are significantly underrepresented in these fields. According to the U.S. Census Bureau, in the 2009 American Community Survey, only 12 percent of STEM workers in this country are African American or Hispanic. We can and should be doing better, because a strong STEM workforce is important to American innovation and competitiveness.

So science and technology companies that are paying our government through the H–1B visa program to bring foreign workers to the United States to fill these STEM jobs should be making a contribution. Why not use these funds that they're paying to train Americans to have the skills to fill these jobs in the future? Providing scholarships to STEM students and granting funding to colleges and universities that serve minority communities to improve STEM programs would strengthen our educational system. It would help our economy and also our position as a global leader in science and technology.

So I would urge the Republican leadership to immediately take up the mantle of reform, make it law, and include these provisions for these high-tech visas, using the funding for the visas then to train our own students, many in minority communities, including the children of those immigrants that we are working to help, for the jobs of the future.

Fixing our broken immigration system is not just a moral imperative, but, as we are all discussing tonight, it's an economic necessity.

Mr. CÁRDENAS. Thank you very much, Congresswoman TITUS.

It's really important for us to understand and recognize the diversity of people who are speaking on this issue today, but the one common theme is the fact that economically this is the right thing to do. There are many other reasons why we need to fix our broken immigration system, but the number one benefit to every American citizen in this country is going to be economic growth for every corner of our country.

With that, I invite to the podium Congresswoman SINEMA from Arizona.

Ms. SINEMA. Thank you, Congressman CÁRDENAS, for being a leader on this issue and for inviting me to speak today.

Madam Speaker, Arizona is Ground Zero for the Federal Government's failure to address our immigration crisis with a comprehensive solution. Arizona has been waiting too long already. We deserve a solution now.

Comprehensive immigration reform is the number one issue about which I receive constituent feedback. Over 70 percent of the feedback encourages us to get comprehensive reform done. In short, my district wants us to get to ''yes.''

In our State, there is broad agreement among businesses and towns that conduct international trade, among schools that recruit international talent, among local chambers of commerce; there's agreement that comprehensive reform is an economic imperative. For this reason, Senator MCCAIN and Senator FLAKE led a bipartisan effort in the Senate to pass a comprehensive bill. Our Senators worked across the aisle to get this done.

Senator MCCAIN and Senator FLAKE understand that securing the border is a critical component of comprehensive reform. Controlling our borders prevents dangerous criminal cartels who traffic guns, drugs, and people from entering our country. It also creates an opportunity for those who want to do good to join us and contribute to our economy.

Business leaders at home agree that comprehensive immigration reform will help us meet our labor demands. It will create opportunities for us to recruit and invest in the world's top talent. This much-needed reform will fortify our international trade relationship with Mexico. That's Arizona's and one of America's largest trading partners.

Mayors in my community are unified. They believe a hyperpoliticized border is bad for business and it's bad for our economy.

We can no longer continue to educate young dreamers, cultivate their talent, and then send them to a different country where they're competing with us. Their pathway to citizenship is vital for our economy.

When hardworking families are able to come out of the shadows and take part in the American Dream, our community grows stronger.

Arizona's families and our economy depend on the U.S. House's commitment to a bipartisan solution. I call on my colleagues in both parties to put aside ideology and work to find a workable, practical, and pragmatic solution.

Arizona has been waiting too long already. We owe it to our State to pass immigration reform this year.

Thank you, Congressman, for yielding time to me to speak on this important issue.

Mr. CÁRDENAS. Thank you, Congresswoman SINEMA.

It's really important for us to also recognize that there are many industries that you might not think of that have to do with benefiting the economy as a whole for your community. If you have any activity of tourism in your community, you need to understand that comprehensive immigration reform is going to benefit you, as well.

With that, I invite Congresswoman GABBARD to take the floor.

Ms. GABBARD. Thank you very much, and I appreciate my colleague

from California for leading and encouraging this conversation to talk about the comprehensive immigration reform bill in a context that's much broader than has been talked about in many of the headlines.

Madam Speaker, for all of us to understand and recognize the great economic benefits and impacts of this bill on our country, we have to recognize that our borders do not just consist of those on the southwest border, our borders do not just consist of those along the northern part of our country with Canada, but these borders exist in every single one of our international airports all across the country.

□ 1945

Anyone who talks to me, it doesn't take very long for them to figure out how much I love my State of Hawaii, and also that I enjoy hearing from other people how much they love Hawaii as well. Travelers to Hawaii spent $16.9 billion in 2011 alone, and generated $2.5 billion which went to Federal, State and local governments, dollars that helped fund and create local jobs and public programs, such as funding our police, our firefighters, our teachers, our infrastructure projects, and our convention centers, where we host many, many gatherings of a diverse group of industries from all over the world.

In 2011, 160,800 jobs were created by the travel industry in my State of Hawaii alone. For every million dollars spent in Hawaii by travelers, 10 jobs are created. Everyone knows Hawaii is a tourist destination, but we have to realize the great potential that exists for our country to be marketed as a tourist destination as well, and what that impact will be.

Unbeknownst to many people, there are tourism provisions in the Senate bill, this comprehensive immigration reform bill, that will allow us to create an additional 1.3 million U.S. jobs by 2020 and produce about $160 billion in economic output by the year of 2020.

It's time for us to regain our share of the global travel market. From 2000 to 2010, the United States went from hosting 17 percent of all global travelers to just 12 percent. This is moving us in the wrong direction. By taking these steps that have been included in the comprehensive immigration reform bill, we can increase American exports cumulatively by $390 billion over the next 10 years.

I would like to talk about a couple of the travel provisions that have been included in the Senate bill that will encourage tourism not only in my home State of Hawaii but in States all across the country where we have such great diversity of cultures and geography and communities that must be celebrated.

The Senate bill includes reforms to the highly successful visa waiver program that allows additional countries like Brazil and Poland to apply for admission, enhancing U.S. security while also welcoming more visitors to the United States.

This bill also expands the tested and proven global entry program that allows preapproved, low-risk international travelers the ability to utilize an expedited clearance process upon entry into the United States. This expedited entry for trusted travelers enables our Customs and Border Patrol personnel to focus their time and limited resources on inspecting unknown or higher-risk travelers.

This bill also allows for expedited visa reviews for travelers who wish to visit the U.S. on short notice. And also, an important provision which will help service the limited resources of our embassies by including a pilot program that tests the use of secure video conferencing to conduct visa interviews, which would provide increased access to the United States visas for potential travelers. In this day and age of technology, this is a commonsense approach to this updating of the immigration reform bill.

There are many more provisions that are included in this bill. It is time for us to market the United States as a destination for our global traveler community and create the jobs for our hotel owners, for our airlines, for the restaurants, and all the small businesses that will benefit from this, and create more jobs for our economy as a result.

Thank you for the opportunity to talk about this growing industry.

Mr. CÁRDENAS. Thank you very much, Congresswoman GABBARD.

Some people say that comprehensive immigration reform needs to happen because it is the socially responsible thing to do. But one thing that our numbers show, and whether it is a conservative group or the Congressional Budget Office staff, they basically are saying when we pass comprehensive immigration reform, we are going to see places like Social Security go up in value and actually extend the life of Social Security with those additional payers. It is important for us to understand that yes, it is a social responsibility for us to improve our immigration system, yet at the same time, once again, every American will benefit.

I yield to Congressman CARTWRIGHT from Pennsylvania.

Mr. CARTWRIGHT. Thank you, Congressman CÁRDENAS. I want to say tonight that I'm so proud of my fellow men and women, new Members who have spoken in this Special Order hour so far on comprehensive immigration reform.

Madam Speaker, it is obvious from the comments we've heard so far that the economic benefits of immigration reform are irrefutable. Sometimes you do have to follow the money, and the money speaks very loudly and clearly in this case—comprehensive immigration reform cannot be ignored as the correct solution. But I also want to mention that each and every one of the speakers who has been up so far has also said generically it is the right thing to do. I want to touch on that, if I may, this evening.

In my own faith tradition when we think about what the right thing to do is, we look to the Bible. We look to the Good Book. In my mind, one of the most important passages in the Bible describes what happens on the Last Judgment Day. It goes something like this:

When the Son of Man returns in all his glory, escorted by the angels, then he will take his seat on the throne of glory. All the nations will be assembled before him, and he will separate the people one from another as the shepherd separates the sheep from goats. At his right hand, he will place the sheep, at his left the goats. And to those on his right, he will say, Come, accept as your inheritance the kingdom that has been prepared for you from the foundation of the world. For when I was hungry, you fed me. When I was thirsty, you gave me drink. When I was a stranger, you welcomed me.

This passage could not be more clear on the moral imperative of the day when we talk about comprehensive immigration reform. It isn't just that comprehensive immigration reform will reduce our deficit. It isn't just that comprehensive immigration reform will strengthen our Social Security and our Medicare systems. It isn't just that comprehensive immigration reform will increase our gross domestic product and strengthen our American economy. No, more than that, at the heart of our moral fiber, we know comprehensive immigration reform is the right thing to do.

Mr. CÁRDENAS. Thank you very much, Congressman CARTWRIGHT.

I think it is very important for us to understand once again that tonight we are covering many aspects of why comprehensive immigration reform is good for this country. It's really important for us to understand, and what I urge every viewer to do is to ask your local Chamber of Commerce how they feel about whether comprehensive immigration reform is overdue and whether or not we should pass such a bill. Also ask your local law enforcement agencies. For example, 37 out of the 50 State attorneys general in this country have all signed a letter saying Congress, please pass a comprehensive immigration reform bill. And please ask anybody from whatever religion you may be a part of, ask that pastor, ask that individual that you look to for that spiritual guidance to answer the question as to whether or not comprehensive immigration reform is something they believe should happen in this country.

I think the answers will overwhelmingly be yes, yes, yes.

Now I yield to Congresswoman MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM from New Mexico to speak.

Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico. I thank the gentleman from California.

Madam Speaker, I could stand here all night talking about the many reasons why our country needs comprehensive immigration reform that keeps families together, provides a tough but fair pathway to citizenship, enhances border security, and that's in line with our core American values. But tonight, I'm going to focus on why immigration reform is good for the American economy and good for the economy of New Mexico.

Nationally, it's estimated that immigration reform will create 121,000 jobs a year and boost American GDP by $832 billion over the next decade. Nearly every day, we hear Members from both parties talking about the need to reduce our debt and deficit. Well, the nonpartisan Congressional Budget Office has determined that comprehensive immigration reform will reduce our national deficit by nearly $850 billion over the next two decades.

In New Mexico, comprehensive immigration reform will create 6,000 jobs over the next decade and increase our GSP—gross State product—by $3.8 billion. These economic benefits and new jobs will have a ripple effect, leading to even more economic activity, higher productivity, more critical investments, better wages, and even more jobs for New Mexicans and Americans. Simply put, we cannot afford not to pass comprehensive immigration reform.

Our economic future demands it, and that's why I'm glad that so many of my colleagues are taking to the floor this evening to make the case for comprehensive immigration reform because the American people need to know that it's good for the economy, good for business, and good for job creation.

The Senate has done its job and acted in a bipartisan manner. Now it's time for the House to do its job so we can send a comprehensive immigration reform to the President's desk and finally fix our broken immigration system.

Mr. CÁRDENAS. I thank the congresswoman.

Next, I'd like to yield to Congressman MURPHY from Florida. We've heard from a congresswoman from Hawaii, and next Congressman MURPHY from Florida will speak. Tourism is an important economic issue tip to tip in this country, and Florida is no exception.

Mr. MURPHY of Florida. First, I want to thank Mr. CÁRDENAS for putting this Special Order together. I'm here tonight to call on the House of Representatives to pass bipartisan comprehensive immigration reform that would reduce our deficit and grow our economy.

Madam Speaker, now that the Senate has passed comprehensive immigration reform with broad bipartisan support, it is time for the House to step up and do the same. Passing immigration reform will cut our Federal deficit and grow the economy. The Congressional Budget Office reported that the Senate immigration bill would reduce the Federal budget deficit by $850 billion over the next 20 years. Comprehensive immigration reform will also grow our economy. By expanding the U.S. labor force and America's productivity, increasing the number of available high-tech visas and increasing foreign investment, comprehensive immigration reform will increase our gross domestic product. It is projected that this will increase GDP by $1.4 trillion by 2033.

While not perfect, the Senate immigration bill is an important bipartisan compromise to address what is currently a broken system. I came to Washington to work across the aisle and find commonsense solutions just like this. Furthermore, the fact that this bill would reduce the Federal deficit and grow the economy should be something we can all agree on.

I urge my colleagues to support passing the Senate's bipartisan comprehensive immigration reform bill.

Mr. CÁRDENAS. I thank Congressman MURPHY. I think it is important for us to understand that every State has its unique differences, yet again, we are one Nation and we will all benefit from comprehensive immigration reform.

I would now like to yield to Congressman VEASEY from Texas.

Mr. VEASEY. I thank the distinguished gentleman from Los Angeles, California, for hosting this Special Order hour on a very important topic, and that is immigration reform.

Madam Speaker, recently I previewed a screening of ''The Dream is Now'' in Fort Worth, and Representative CASTRO also came to Fort Worth to join me on that. And I can assure you that the hundreds of constituents who attended the event represent a microcosm of undocumented immigrants in the U.S. who need us to act now on comprehensive immigration reform. The dream for 11 million people to come out of the shadows and contribute economically to the only country they've ever known rests in the hands in the United States House of Representatives.

Immigrants contribute to our economy as workers, as future entrepreneurs, as consumers, and as taxpayers. Latinos account for increasing shares of the economy and electorate in Texas. According to the U.S. Census Bureau, Texas's almost 450,000 Latino-owned businesses had sales receipts of nearly $62 billion and employed over 395,000 people in 2007, the last year for which data is available.

Additionally, over 61,000 foreign students in Texas contributed $1.4 billion to the economy in tuition fees and living expenses in the 2011–2012 academic year. These monumental numbers cannot be ignored.

In Dallas alone, immigrants accounted for 16 percent of economic output as of 2007, according to the Fiscal Policy Institute.

If all undocumented immigrants were removed from the State of Texas, our State, the Lone Star State, would lose $69.3 billion in economic activity, $30.8 billion in gross State product, and approximately 403,174 jobs, according to a report by the Perryman Group.

□ 2000

The Perryman Group is run by Ray Perryman, out of Waco, Texas, who has worked very closely with Rick Perry, who is really the face of the Republican Party in Texas.

It's time to highlight the economic benefits of immigration reform and to further encourage those on the right to support comprehensive immigration reform moving through the House.

In a time of economic hardship, it's hard to imagine that my colleagues on both sides of the aisle would be against expanding our economy, investing in American manufacturers, and strengthening American workers.

I want to thank the gentleman for allowing me to speak on this very important issue. Let's not make these families and our economy wait any longer. The time for comprehensive immigration reform is now.

Mr. CÁRDENAS. Thank you very much, Congressman VEASEY.

It's really important for us to understand, I keep saying, every corner of this country's going to benefit from comprehensive immigration reform. And you just heard from one of our Representatives from Texas explaining that there's actually Republicans in his State who actually realize the economic benefit and are urging comprehensive immigration reform now as well.

Before I go to the next speaker, I must ask, Madam Speaker, how much time do we still have?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from California has 18 minutes remaining.

Mr. CÁRDENAS. I yield time to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. GARCIA).

Mr. GARCIA. I'd like to thank the gentleman from California.

Madam Speaker, it's been 20 days since the Senate passed overwhelmingly a bipartisan immigration reform bill.

In the House Judiciary Committee, we've considered four controversial bills, none of which address the 11 million people that are already here.

In south Florida, for example, there are thousands of Venezuelan families stuck in an immigration system with some combination of legal or undocumented status. They came to this country fleeing Chavismo and have since purchased homes, started businesses, and invested millions in our community.

Earlier this year, I introduced a bill, the Venezuelan Liberty Act, which would allow any Venezuelan who had been in the United States since Chavez was elected to adjust to permanent-resident status. This is similar to what Congress passed in 1997 with the Nicaraguan Adjustment Act and the Central American Relief Act.

However, because we have yet to consider any sort of legalization path, the House Judiciary Committee has not yet had the opportunity to consider this bill as an amendment or to debate on how best to bring people out of the shadows.

And Venezuelans aren't alone. The Haitians, the Africans, the Central Americans on TPS, the young people who are covered under DACA continue to live their lives in immigration limbo while the House has yet to act.

Immigration reform isn't about politics. It's about our Nation's values. It's about our economy. It's about our future.

The recent White House report and last month's CBO report confirmed what my constituents in south Florida already know: our Nation's livelihood depends on fixing our broken immigration system.

The Center for American Progress projected that immigration reform would generate over 8,000 additional jobs per year in Florida and that current Florida citizens would see an increase in wages of $6.3 billion over the next 10 years.

We may not agree on everything, but we cannot afford to wait any longer. Passing immigration reform will spur innovation, lower our deficit, and raise wages for all workers.

As if the voices of many DREAMers who have recently descended on Washington aren't enough, business leaders, law enforcement officials, farmers, clergy throughout the U.S. have urged Congress to take action.

It's time to move this Nation forward. I urge the House leadership to bring immigration reform to the floor.

The time has come. Ha llegado la hora.

Mr. CÁRDENAS. Thank you very much, Congressman GARCIA.

Next I'll yield time to the gentleman from California (Mr. VARGAS).

Mr. VARGAS. I want to thank the gentleman from California for yielding to allow me to speak on this very important issue to California.

But I especially want to thank the gentleman from Pennsylvania for putting it in the context of our faith and our faith communities and our faith tradition. He, of course, quoted famously from Matthew 25. He could have quoted from Leviticus. In fact, I would like to do that now, from Leviticus 19:33–34:

> When an alien resides among you in your land, do not mistreat them. The foreigner residing among you must be treated as your native born. Love them as yourself for you were foreigners in Egypt. I am the Lord your God.

And I have to ask, are we keeping that commandment?

Are we keeping that rule?

Are we keeping that pronouncement?

Of course we're not. I wish that we were.

Immigration reform is vital to the economy of our country and, in particular, to California and my district. California is unique in that it is home to the technology industry, which relies heavily and highly on skilled talent and has an incredibly successful agriculture industry, which needs a temporary worker program that provides a predictable workforce.

The more California business leaders I speak with, the more apparent it is that immigration reform is the key to stimulating our economy and encouraging job growth.

Ruben Barrales, the immediate past president and CEO of the San Diego Regional Chamber of Commerce and current head of the Republican Political Action Committee, GROW Elect said:

> It is the responsibility of national leaders to modernize our immigration laws to help the United States remain competitive in the global economy.
>
> Comprehensive immigration reform should help to attract and retain highly skilled immigrants, and should provide some pathway to legalization for qualified undocumented immigrants.
>
> We must welcome immigrants, who continue to strengthen our economy and reinvigorate our society.

The California Chamber of Commerce is also acutely aware of the immense value that surrounds successful immigration reform. The California Chamber of Commerce, along with 29 other chambers, including the El Centro Chamber in my district, signed a letter stating that they stand united in adopting comprehensive reform.

The letter states:

> Immigration reform is especially important to California as there are approximately 2.6 million undocumented immigrants in California, 23 percent of the Nation's total.
>
> The uncertainty over their legal status is a drag on our economy and, if resolved, would stimulate consumer spending and investment.

Many of those who are in California have called our State home for more than 10 years, becoming Americans in all but legal status. Californians would benefit from more than 18,000 jobs created each year as a result of comprehensive immigration reform, according to a 2013 study by the Center for American Progress.

Moreover, California would see a 10-year cumulative increase in gross state product of $125.5 billion, an increase of earnings of all California residents of $68.2 billion, and, finally, an increase in taxes paid by undocumented immigrants by $5.22 billion.

There is no denying that immigration reform is an economically sound decision, and I urge my Republican colleagues to work with us to achieve real, valuable, economically beneficial immigration reform.

And I respectfully ask that, again, they look at their own faith because that's really the basis of this. We know it's the right thing to do.

Look to Genesis. Look to Leviticus. Look especially to Matthew 25, and you'll see in your hearts, this is the right thing to do.

Mr. CÁRDENAS. Thank you very much, Congressman VARGAS.

I'll yield time to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. CASTRO). And I'd like to ask Congressman CASTRO if he can help me answer the question a young lady tweeted on this, as we're commenting tonight from the floor.

Brenda asked, What are you doing for children who came here through no fault of their own?

Congressman CASTRO.

Mr. CASTRO of Texas. Well, Congressman, thank you for that question, and thank you for your work on this issue.

Madam Speaker, in the Senate bill that was passed recently, there is relief for students known as DREAMers, those who were brought here as young kids through no fault of their own and through no choice, and now find themselves undocumented, with no way, oftentimes, to go to college or to pursue their career dreams. These are folks who are literally in a kind of limbo.

And so what we should do is offer them a path to citizenship to allow them to become American citizens. This country is, after all, for the overwhelming majority of them, the only country they've ever called home. It's the only place they know as home; and this is an issue, I think, that tugs at the conscience of Americans.

And most polls show that an overwhelming majority of Americans support a path to citizenship for DREAM Act students.

So I hope, Congressman CÁRDENAS, that what we can do in the House of Representatives is follow the example of the Senate, work in a bipartisan manner, and offer relief for these DREAM Act students who are caught in limbo, who, through no fault of their own, are here in the United States of America, who call our country home, who are proud to be Americans, and who deserve a chance to become full-fledged citizens.

I would also point out, you know, as I said before, that there are very compelling moral and economic reasons to support comprehensive reform.

I represent San Antonio, Texas, here in Congress. And of all the States in the Nation, I believe that Texas has the most to gain or lose by what happens on this issue. The reason I say that is that we have the longest border with Mexico, for example, 1,200 miles.

We do the most trade with Latin America, and there are four or five major American industries and Texas industries, everything from the high-tech industry in Austin, just as you have one in California in Silicon Valley, to the agricultural industry, the construction industry, the hospitality industry. These major American industries literally would not exist the way they do but for immigrant labor.

And I want to give you the best example of that. The agricultural industry self-reports that 50 percent of its workers are undocumented. And so when States like Alabama and Georgia pass laws that essentially led immigrants to flee those States, their agricultural industries paid a very steep

price. So those are the stakes that we're dealing with on this issue.

I am hoping that House Republicans will join Democrats who have been pushing for comprehensive reform for quite some time now, join us in coming to a solution that does more than just incite fear or scare people, and actually tries to resolve this issue in a pragmatic way for the Nation.

Mr. CÁRDENAS. Thank you very much, Congressman CASTRO.

I'd like to thank all of my colleagues who spoke here tonight.

And thank you, Madam Speaker, for affording us the opportunity to speak to the American public and to actually explain this very, very critical, important economic benefit to our great country.

I'd like to thank my colleagues, my fellow Americans, for speaking out tonight and explaining to every American of our great country that comprehensive immigration reform benefits you. Every single person born in this country will benefit tremendously from passage of comprehensive immigration reform.

I think it's important for us to understand that, to many of us American-born citizens, this is a very important issue. It's about economics, but it's also an emotional issue as well.

I'm very, very proud to say that I was born in this country, and I thank my parents for coming to California and for raising me in California as an American citizen, even though they were raised in Mexico.

I think it's important for us to understand that I'm proud of growing up in a family where my father owned a business, and he taught me and explained to me, with his first-grade education in Mexico, he told me time and time again, as well as telling my 10 brothers and sisters, you have an opportunity for an education. You need to take advantage of that opportunity, and we did.

I'm very proud to say that my mother had a second-grade education, my father had a first-grade education, but their children now have doctorate degrees, master's degrees, bachelor's degrees, engineers, teachers, psychologists, all raised in one humble home in Pacoima.

□ 2015

That is the American experience, ladies and gentlemen. And one thing that I'm very proud to say as well about our 10 families, now that we're raising our own American families, every single one of our households pays more annually in taxes than my mother and father's home ever made in one given year. I'll say that again. From a humble home where a man and a woman together raised their children, their entire annual income did not equal the amount of taxes that each one of their sons and daughters now pay today.

To me, that's the exclamation point on everything we've talked about tonight. We've talked about how important it is to the Social Security system. It will boost that. We talked about how it is to the deficit that we hear about on this floor so many times. It will actually erase $850 billion from our U.S. deficit.

There are so many benefits that will benefit not only our coffers here in Washington, which benefits America, but will actually benefit hundreds upon hundreds of thousands of American-born citizens that will work in those industries that are created and spearheaded by immigrants to this country.

And I must say this. I would like to read a few of the names of immigrants born outside of this country who created businesses in this country that many of us use everyday and recognize:

Sergey Brin from Russia, cofounder of Google;

Pierre Omidyar, an Iranian immigrant from France, one of the cofounders of eBay, Inc.;

Jerry Yang from Taiwan, cofounder of Yahoo;

James L. Kraft, a Canadian, cofounder of Kraft Foods, Inc.;

Levi Strauss, a man from Germany, founder of Levi-Strauss in California;

Liz Claiborne from Belgium, founder of Liz Claiborne, Inc. If you think clothes don't mean much, that's a United States company worth $5 billion;

Andrew Grove from Hungary, cofounder of Intel, a company worth $112 billion;

Kevork S. Hovnanian from Iraq, founder of Hovnanian Enterprises, a homebuilder that in 2011 had revenues of $1.1 billion.

And the list goes on and on and on. Every single one of those individuals made their second life here in our great country. And it's because there was a time that in this country we embraced everyone from around the world. And all we asked of them is that they just obey the laws once they are here and that they do well with the opportunities that our great country affords every human being when they are here.

We have one of the highest standards of living in the world. And there's a reason for that. Because there was a time for many, many years that we welcomed people to our shores. At this time where we just reopened the Statute of Liberty, it's time for us to embrace people from around the world and for us to recognize it's not just about doing the right thing for them. It is the right thing for every American citizen born in this country. The benefits economically are tremendous.

There are no losers, ladies and gentlemen, when it comes to the United States Congress doing the right thing. Let's put a comprehensive immigration bill through our process and on the desk of this President and let's watch this country thrive. Our great country deserves it.

Once again, I would like to thank everybody who participated, and I yield back the balance of my time.

TOTO, WE'RE NOT IN KANSAS ANYMORE

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

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Madam Speaker, my friends on the other side of the aisle speak to a great issue coming aboard, and we're going to, I know, have many great discussions about that as we go forward.

I'm grateful for the floor time tonight, which I'm pleased to share tonight with my good friend and one of the newest Members here in our House, the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. SMITH).

It's an incredible honor and privilege to serve in this House. And for me, the privilege of serving as the voice of northeast Georgia in the U.S. House of Representatives now for what's going on 6 months. I'm deeply humbled and honored by the trust each of my constituents has placed in me. I wanted to take some time to share some of the lessons that I've learned and the progress we're making in achieving goals that I spent over a year talking about on the campaign trail to friends and family and the supporters and the constituents of our northeast Georgia community.

Twenty counties make up northeast Georgia and the Ninth Congressional District. It's a very diverse area. It's an area in which we have what we call from the highlands to the islands. We have lakes, we have lowlands, we have the start of the Appalachian Trail. We have a place where movies are created. We have a place where I really believe dreams are fostered.

For me, it started back a long time ago. My father was a Georgia State trooper. We moved to Gainesville. That's where I was raised and spent my life. I went to high school there while I was with my mom and dad, along with my brother. That's what grounded me in family.

As I stand here on this floor and as I look around, as I listen, as I had just the great honor just a little bit ago to sit in that chair and preside over an earnest debate on what I really feel is a very important topic right now, one in which we had disagreement, one in which we look forward in one side presenting one issue and one presenting another. From my perspective, we voted to delay a bill that, in my personal opinion, is damaging to America. But we had that debate here.

And by standing in that chair and working there, it reminded me when I used to watch this floor from my home when I was in high school, and as I came up through college and as I was starting a young family with my wonderful bride, Lisa. We have three children. I would watch this floor on C–SPAN and I would see many of the same folks who actually even spoke today. And now to be a part of this

body, there's a sense of history. And if I could encourage any of my fellow colleagues, whether they be Democrat or Republican, new, old, been here a little over a month or been here 50-something years, it is to remember when we walk on the floor of this House, it means something special. It means something to be a part of an institution that makes a difference in people's lives. And I believe from my perspective as a Republican and as a conservative that we can make a difference on the floor of this House and in Washington, D.C., when we remember why we are here. And for me, that's very easy. It's the people of the Ninth District. It's my family.

Everywhere I would speak, people would ask me, Doug, why do you want to be a Member of the House of Representatives? I said I had three reasons. They were Jordon, Copeland, and Cameron. They're my three children. Because I believe that what goes on on this House floor and across the way in the Senate, what happens on this Capitol ground, is something that can make a difference because all across the world, ladies and gentlemen, people still look to us. They still look to America because we're the freest country in the world. We're a country that provides opportunity. But we have to be guarded and we have to watch and we have to stay vigilant. And in doing so, I believe that that is what makes this place special.

I've learned a lot in the first half of 2013. The need to vigilantly protect the noble heritage of our Founding Fathers that they gave us here as a heritage of liberty, responsibility, and limited government. And this has been impressed upon me in the last little bit as never before.

Over the last 6 months, our Nation and this distinguished body have faced issues and challenges that no one could have anticipated even 6 months ago, let alone a year ago. In my short time here, we have experienced the tragedy and horror of domestic terrorism in the Boston bombing. I can remember that day and hearing about that and just thinking what was going on and seeing the faces of those affected by that. And it highlighted our need for security and our well-being here and how some within our country want to tear down the very freedoms we have. And they'll do so by any means.

But I also look in a lighthearted way at the last couple of months. When I was younger, I used to like those little Pez dispensers. I used to like, Madam Speaker, those Pez dispensers that had the little head and the characters. But when you pushed the top, something would pop out. It would be candy.

Unfortunately, for the last month or two, all we've had is a Pez dispenser of scandal. All we've had is a Pez dispenser of problems with the IRS and the Department of Justice and with NSA and things that really come to a point that really elaborate, I believe, on belief on the issue of trust in this town. It goes back to the towns in northeast Georgia, for me personally, like Homer, Gainesville, Clermont, Ellijay, Cumming, and Elberton, and these kind of places where they look to us and say, What are you doing up there? Why is it so hard to not do it right?

And I've been a part of committees like Judiciary and the Oversight and Government Reform and Foreign Affairs Committees in which we've investigated and we've held hearings. Because I believe we've got to hold ourselves accountable, and we've got to hold the administration accountable because we are sent up here with a word that is very often overlooked—and it's called ''stewardship.'' We're stewards of what we've been given. And the ''given'' for us is an elected office to come and represent 700,000 or more people—and to do so with the resources that we've been given. And when they look around and they see that Pez dispenser and it pops out another issue or another scandal, then their trust is diminished. And when their trust is diminished, ladies and gentlemen, we have a lot harder job to do.

So these are trying times for our Nation and the commonsense conservative values that I believe I bring from northeast Georgia's Ninth Congressional District. These values are rooted in the principles of our Founders, and they give me guidance for why I want to be here and for what I want to accomplish and be a part of.

But I have to say one of the best things that I've had is looking around and making new friends on both sides of the aisle, and looking at that as we go forward. But for me, being one of the newest members of the Georgia delegation, it's looking around and when I have someone come in and I make a new friend who is our youngest and newest Member from the House on the Republican side, the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. SMITH), who took the responsibility from his work in the legislature in Missouri, who's taken his fight of regulatory reform and taken his fight and conviction with his family and now stepped into the pit, so to speak, stepped into the fire.

I'm glad to have you here and to serve with you on Judiciary and getting to know you over the last few weeks. I see why the people of Missouri sent you here. And that's a great thing. So I would just be honored to yield time to you tonight just to sort of share what's in your heart, what brought you here, and some things that you've seen even in your short time here.

I would be happy to yield to the gentleman tonight.

Mr. SMITH of Missouri. I appreciate it. I want to thank my good friend from Georgia. It's a great honor being in this Chamber for 42 days. I definitely have some issues that are quite important to me.

Madam Speaker, one issue that I would like to highlight tonight is an issue that threatens my district. It's the National Blueways System. It was conceived on May 24, 2012, by Interior Department Secretary Salazar. The National Blueways System is described as ''a headwaters to mouth approach to rivers management'' and ''a mechanism to encourage stakeholders to integrate their land and water stewardship efforts by adopting a watershed approach.'' Importantly, a river is supposed to be nominated for a Blueways designation by local stakeholders.

Though no local stakeholders from my district were included in the nomination process, the White River Watershed, of which 14 counties are in my district, was named as the Nation's second National Blueways in January of this year. Who nominated the White River to become a Blueways? The National Wildlife Refuge Association, an organization based in Washington, D.C. A quick trip to their Web site reveals that in addition to being based in Washington, D.C., around a thousand miles away from the White River Watershed, not a single member of their board of directors is from Arkansas or Missouri. Where's the local knowledge? How is this organization a stakeholder?

Local stakeholders eventually found out about the designation and they were furious, as you can imagine. And when I use the term local stakeholders, I mean groups and individuals living in the watershed, including public officials elected to represent those individuals. Why were they furious? Typically, Federal designations bring along with them rules and regulations that affect the landowners. These rules and regulations might restrict access to the rivers in my district that are used for recreational purposes and fuel our tourist economy. These rules and regulations might also restrict farmers and ranchers from being able to access the water they need for their crops and livestock.

I'm pleased to note that the White River National Blueways nomination was recently withdrawn, due in large part to significant outcry from Missourians let out of the process. We were also informed today that the entire National Blueways System has been paused and put under review.

□ 2030

But I want to make something very clear here tonight: simply pausing the program until the folks back home forget about it and then trying to restart these designations is deplorable. I urge the Interior Department to quickly complete its review and define that the entire Blueways System needs to be scrapped.

Madam Speaker, we also discussed the National Blueways System further today in two hearings. In the first, Secretary Jewell, Secretary Salazar's newly appointed successor, noted that ''she did not know very much about the Blueways System.'' When I asked her today who the relevant authority on the Blueways System was, she said

that it was ''Rebecca Wodder.'' Unfortunately, for those of us who would have liked to ask the Interior Department questions about the Blueways today, Rebecca Wodder refused to come to our subcommittee hearing.

As we noted in our hearings today, the process for designating these ''National Blueways'' has not always been voluntary, open, or public. It is disturbing that Ms. Wodder continues to refuse to testify about this program before our committee. Though the program is often trumpeted as voluntary, open, and public, Ms. Wodder has never been interested in making her comments voluntary, open, or public about the designations.

Madam Speaker, let me provide you with a little more background about the district that I proudly represent, Missouri's Eighth Congressional District. It contains 30 counties in southeastern and southern Missouri. We range from 40 miles south of the city of St. Louis, down the mighty Mississippi River, the entire Bootheel region, all the way west to about 40 miles east of Springfield, and in the northwest corner, the Phelps County, Rolla area.

My district is agriculturally diverse. We grow everything from citrus to sugar. Fourteen of the 30 counties in my district contain land that would have been within the ''White River National Blueways'' designation. In addition, my district includes the Ozark National Scenic Riverway, a National Park Service entity that spans through five counties on the western side, including my home county near my home of Salem.

The parts of our local economy that are not driven by agriculture rely heavily on tourism and natural resources. Folks come from all over the State and all around the country to be guided on float trips on the rivers and streams contained in my district. We have a thriving timber industry that produces lumber, charcoal, and finished wood products, and some of the district's largest employers mine lead and smelt aluminum.

What is the common thread that ties together the components of agriculture, tourism, and natural resources in my district? It is property rights, and our ability to use the land and its bounty to make a living.

All too often, the Federal Government tugs at this thread, threatening to unwind the fabric of our economy. Whether it is new regulations restricting farm labor, new EPA carbon emission rules that would shutter our largest employers, or shutting down access and restricting the use of our rivers and streams in my district, my district is under attack.

My constituents and I are tired of unelected Washington, D.C., bureaucrats creating new programs out of thin air and having the ability to end our way of life and the way that we make a living. While the White River National Blueways has been withdrawn, it is only the latest symptom of a disease that has embedded itself into the very core of this administration. They think that they know better than locals, and they think that they can act on their own without congressional approval or oversight.

Where does it stop?

Madam Speaker, today, I challenge the Members of this body to make it our goal not only to stop the National Blueways System all over this country but also to fight the disease that spawned it. Local groups and individuals are best situated to manage their lands and resources. We don't need bureaucratic mandates sent from on high in Washington, D.C., that may have drastic repercussions for our local economies.

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. I appreciate the gentleman from Missouri.

One of the things that I just want to ask you, as we just take a moment here, one of the things you brought up is something that I have discovered, and I just actually discovered it when I was on the State legislature as well, but up here it is even more prevalent: Have you already gotten the sense of ''Washington Knows Best?'' There used to be a TV show called ''Father Knows Best.'' I think up here we live ''Washington Knows Best.'' Is that what you are seeing?

Mr. SMITH of Missouri. Clearly, the few square miles that hover around the District of Columbia, it seems like they know how to better manage our forest or our rivers or our lives or our kids working on the farms, you name it. They believe that that's the process that you should manage from up above and push down.

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. I think one of the things, in my district and the district you serve—you have 30 counties, I have 20 counties—very agriculturally diverse, we are more with livestock but also poultry, also what we call the ''agrarian tourism'' with the wineries and other things that are growing, and what we are finding is just simply let us do what we need to do. I think that is one of the reasons that from our conservative perspective, working with the farm bill and the issues that we have had with that, is let's deal with agriculture, let's deal with the SNAP programs and others separately, and that was something that I believe was a good thing.

But I want to go back to one thing. Coming and testifying in committees—and you and I sit next to each other on a couple of committees—and now you've seen this today, that if you work, in my personal opinion, you work for the government, Congress is your oversight agency. That is the constitutional role of what we have. It is disturbing to me, not only in what you and I have heard today about someone not wanting to come and testify, but I have seen it in other committees as well where they just simply don't show up. We've got a disconnect.

Do you think this person actually gets your district and the impact that that would have by not coming to testify? Does that just show maybe that they don't get it?

Mr. SMITH of Missouri. It is extremely disappointing that any Federal employee that is asked by Congress to come and testify and to give information in a broader sense and they refuse to testify or refuse to be present, that's unacceptable. They shouldn't be a Federal employee if they are not willing to stand up and justify what they do in their position. Constantly you see the buck just continue to be passed on, and never does it stop with a lot of folks in the bureaucracy in the Federal Government.

I think that's our responsibility, that's our responsibility as Members of Congress, is to go after these bureaucrats who try to never allow the truth to always be seen immediately.

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. I agree.

I think one of the things that we look at is we have literally thousands upon thousands of workers in our Federal Governments and our State Governments who are good people doing an honest day's work who want to make a difference, and they believe that it is their calling to do that.

I think, unfortunately, it is those individuals sometimes that won't believe what I and you believe in stewardship and interacting with the Congress and interacting with the agency and interacting with locals that really has cast aspersion on a large net of workers who are trying to do it right, who do get in there and go to work every day and do good work for the government that they work for.

I just believe that it goes back to stewardship. I am just raised on that stewardship issue. I'm going to talk a little bit more about it later. But I think if you have a job, that is something you need to look at.

I appreciate so much what you meant to this body in 42 days and look forward to us working together as we share some more tonight. I thank you for that.

The principles that I want to talk about here for just a little while tonight are what I call ''commonsense conservative values.'' They are things like individual freedom, fiscal responsibility, and a constitutionally limited government.

When I came to Washington and I began to look, I took these as my core values, if you will. I took them seriously when I crafted not only the legislative agenda that I wanted to work on, but also when it came down to working on other pieces of legislation and signing on to other people's legislation and also working with our conservative Members, our Republican Party, and those across the aisle who would join us.

Here is where I believe we miss it, and my colleague from Missouri brought this out. It is easy for many times that we can always say what we do. We can always say this is what we do, and there's many times that we will be able to say this is how we do it.

However, I believe that we, and especially from my party, and as a conservative who stands in this well and speaks tonight, is we've got to get better at not only saying this is what we are doing, this is how we are doing it, but we've got to reconnect, I believe, with the American people in this body and in this city with why we do what we do. That is going to matter when we look at people looking up here and they look on the TV or they read their newspapers and they see the problems that we've talked about earlier, they see the disconnect with a top-down style that is really just growing in our country, whether it be the river systems or it be in our farms or it be in our factories or it be in our workplaces.

What we've really got to understand is we've got to now say, these are these beliefs that I just laid out: individual freedom, fiscal responsibility, and constitutionally limited government. What I want to do is begin a conversation that may carry over many weeks and say, this is why I believe this is what is good for America, this is why I believe, as I did this afternoon, that if it was good enough for businesses, that it is good enough for individuals.

We've got to be fair with the American people. They understand when we are not being fair. They look at us and they believe things that are said and they say, we don't trust our government anymore, we don't trust them not to listen into our phone conversations or tap into our Internet email, they don't trust us anymore to believe us when we say that we have their best interest at heart, because frankly over the past number of years in this city we have failed them.

We, I believe, from a conservative perspective, have to get back to saying why it matters once again to have a balanced budget. Now, I know that sounds like just comic relief up here in this city. But for me and in my family—and I always take it back to my home and my wife—when we sit down and we look at our budget and we say this is how much we have coming in, believe me, I am blessed. I have said before that I believe if I could just get my wife, if she were to control the budget, we would be balanced in a very short time and have a surplus. Because we've had to do it many times when we have cut back and we have said, this is what matters to us. It is called ''priorities'' and it is called ''stewardship.'' It goes back to individual freedom, it goes back to fiscal responsibility, and it goes back to constitutionally limited government.

I believe that conservative values and conservative principles and conservative ideas that we are trying to promote right now from my perspective in my district, in my service here in Washington, is what will matter to this country and restore the shining light that I believe America is. When we understand that, then Joe and Sally, whether they are in south Florida or in Washington State or in Alaska or in northeast Georgia or in the beautiful scenery of Missouri, they all understand that at the end of the day they have paychecks, they have school bills, they have reports, they have families, they have responsibilities, and they want to be a part, but they have to look at it from a perspective of what do I have and how can I do it.

It goes back to that common theme of stewardship—stewardship—and understanding we've been given a set amount of resources and a set amount of time. The question is what do we do with it? I believe that is what will change and put us back on a course of being able to work together and moving forward with ideas that matter.

For people that now say we cannot continue the path we are on, when they have such a low opinion of this body, when they look at their country and they say it is on a wrong direction, well, I believe it is on a wrong direction because we've left the fundamental flooring of our Founding Fathers who said that we should be promoting individual freedom, fiscally responsibility, and constitutionally limited government.

In January, I joined my colleagues in the reading of the United States Constitution right here on this House floor. In fact, I came right here to this podium, as my recollection comes about after six months, a lot of things going on. But it was right here where we began with reading the Constitution again at the start of this Congress. I believe that each public servant should constantly refer to this vital document when performing his or her duties, and also the things that have come through our courts and others that have formed the foundation of our constitutional framework.

I'm pleased that this body began its session by reminding ourselves of the responsibilities we have to the American people, as well as the liberties we are sworn to protect. I am a chaplain in the United States Air Force Reserve, and recently I have been monitoring very carefully the development that has surrounded our servicemembers' rights of free speech and freedom of religious exercise and making sure that they are protected. Our men and women in uniform bled and bleed daily and die for these precious liberties.

I had the opportunity to serve in Iraq in 2008. I had the ability, and I was a nighttime flight line chaplain, and I would go around at night and it was great, because I was the only chaplain on duty so I would spend time with our flying squadrons and spend time with our maintenance operators and our food service folks and our security forces and would get to know them on a very real and personal basis.

□ 2045

I did so in a role which did not matter if they had faith or no faith. It was my job to protect their right to have a faith and to practice it or to not have a faith and choose not to practice any kind of faith, but it was protected under what chaplains do.

Lately, efforts through the DOD and outside organizations and this administration seem to want to take that privilege and that right that we have in our Constitution and denigrate that right and take it away. I am very troubled by efforts that would curb chaplains' abilities to perform their duties and prevent servicemembers from honestly sharing their faiths or a Scripture with other servicemembers.

Now, before anyone jumps up and says, Proselytizing, we don't need that in the military or workplaces, there are already rules for that, there are already things that would keep out of bounds the inappropriate workings of someone's sharing or putting someone in a position of uncomfortableness with their faith. But when it comes to chaplains, our very experience is to share from what we believe and what we have in our hearts, and for me, being a Southern Baptist chaplain, it comes from a faith that I believe is deeply welled within me. To say that that cannot be a part of who I am is something that is simply wrong.

Now, we have ideas of bringing into the Chaplain Corps, among different services, an atheist chaplain. Now, when I first heard this, I said, This must be a joke. You're kidding me. An atheist chaplain? Now, if you choose to not believe in God, that is your right. You're in America, and that is your belief, and that is something that you can have. You can be agnostic—believe there's a God but not personal—or you can have a personal faith of another variety or you can be Muslim or Hindu or Buddhist or whatever you want to do and whatever you want to believe.

There are standards that we have as chaplains: we have to have a master's degree; we have to be endorsed by our religious affiliation endorser to be a part of the Chaplain Corps. We serve sort of two halves: we serve the military by maintaining our military bearing and our physical fitness and our military qualifications; and at the same time, I also have to maintain my qualifications as a Southern Baptist ordained minister. In doing so, I can't have one without the other. It goes back to a theme that I've talked about tonight of responsibility. No matter the household, no matter the political persuasion, people get responsibility, and they get stewardship; but as chaplains, we have to measure both sides.

So, when it becomes a game, in my mind, to take away or to denigrate what the chaplain's role is—to protect the religious freedom and expression of all servicemembers whether they have faith or not—then we're missing it, and, frankly, those on Main Street don't get it. They don't understand it in their churches and in their synagogues and in their mosques. They don't get it.

Then there's Washington, D.C. When we have job issues in our country and

when we have financial issues in our country, we are finding out from our agencies—from the Department of Defense—and an administration that is pushing an agenda that goes to the very heart of our constitutional freedom, they don't get it. Frankly, I don't either. I'm going to be watching this over the next few weeks and few months, and I will continue to speak out.

There are many ways for us to be there, but I believe, as a chaplain, I have stood beside the bed of those who've believed as I and of those who have never had a faith or who have wanted a faith, but they wanted to talk to someone who was not in the chain of command who they could share in and confide in. Back home, their wives were struggling and their kids were suffering, and they just wanted to be a part, and they knew they were separated. They wanted to talk about their work environments. They wanted to talk about their jobs. They wanted to talk about their dreams and aspirations—and yes, for some, they needed protection. They wanted their meals because they needed Kosher requirements. Even in one case, we had a situation in which a Wiccan wanted to have a place in which he could perform his services, and we provided that for him. That's not the faith that I subscribe to, but it is my job as a chaplain—it is my role—to provide that for them so that they can.

We've got to quit playing games, and we definitely have to quit playing games with our fundamental freedoms. You see, we can talk about what we want to do and how we want to do it, but I believe many people are just wanting to know why this matters. Why is DOUG COLLINS talking about this on the floor tonight? Why is he talking about these issues of individual freedom, of fiscal responsibility and constitutionally limited government?

Why? Because it matters and because they are the things that make us free.

I've also taken seriously our Second Amendment rights in seeing what has happened up here in not taking into account or in discounting the needs that we have in our society for responsible firearm ownership, but we cannot take away the rights of those gun owners in our country and of those who want to own guns simply on a whim or a political agenda. We don't need to do that.

Why? Because it matters.

When we look at this, one of the issues that I've had over my last few months is: I was driving home one night, and in the midst of all this debate in Washington about Should we curb gun rights? Should we do background checks? Should we do a lot of different things, I thought to myself, I had a father-in-law who grew up shooting, and he talks about the way he would target shoot as he was growing up, shooting squirrels and other things. What I found was—whether it was my father-in-law, TJ, or my daddy, Leonard Collins—they had a commonality. What the commonality was is that they understood that gun ownership also meant gun responsibility.

So, as I was driving home one night, I said, What can we do in the Ninth Congressional District of Georgia to promote responsible gun ownership? Here is that word ''responsible'' again. We've got to be responsible with what we have.

What we did is we said we're going to have gun safety events. We put on several gun safety events, and well over 300 people attended these events. They were put on by the local sheriff's department for those because what I was also hearing was that many people were going out and buying guns for the first time because they didn't think that guns were going to be around. So, in my district, gun shops were overflowing, and people were buying guns.

I said, What can we do to make sure that gun rights and ownership and our Second Amendment principles are balanced with the responsibility that is given? These people showed up, and they learned. They learned how to store their weapons. They learned how to take care of their weapons. They learned what they should do and shouldn't do.

That is responsible government. That is taking what we do here and making it matter to the folks on Main Street—in the high schools and the stores and the shops that we go into every day. That's what's going to put conservative ideas back on the map—by attaching them to what matters and by attaching them to who and what we are because when we attach it to the dinner table, when we get to the point when we say, This is why it matters, instead of the vast rhetoric of this world, then we will be able to say and people can look at us and say, That's why they think that a balanced budget is necessary, and that's why they believe that the ObamaCare legislation is so bad, not because we're fighting against a President we don't like, but because it doesn't make sense—and it costs us jobs; it costs us money; it costs our people trust in the government that I hold so dear.

You see, when you understand this, you move to fiscal responsibility or, like I say here, fiscal irresponsibility. Only up here can you talk about it. I was in the State government, and I dealt in similar terms; but I remember in the first 2 weeks I was in this Chamber—and you can debate the good or the bad—we spent $60 billion. That's three Georgia budgets in 2 weeks. It wasn't that I was not in Georgia anymore. I wasn't in Kansas anymore either, Toto. I wasn't there. Something wasn't making sense. We've got to get back to a fiscal responsibility approach; $17 trillion in debt is a national disgrace, and it's a national disgrace because you can't go into anyone's household and knock off the zeros—knock off whatever you want to do—and then apply it to your family budget.

If you happen to be watching tonight or if you happen to see this later, I want you to do something. Just apply the same concept to your home budget; and whether you're Democrat or Republican, we can come to the understanding that numbers don't lie and that, when you've got $17 trillion in debt and when you're taking in this amount of money and when you're spending this amount of money and when you can't reconcile the two, it's not because we're making a better country. It's because we're not making the hard choices that you have to make every day in your homes and in your businesses.

That's what we've got to get back to. That's what this country needs to get back to. It's not about the vast rhetoric. We can debate the big things all we want; but what we've got to understand is when we debate the big things and when we miss the small things, people lose trust in us, and we've got to stop that.

That's why I believe that the Republican budget presents a smart, fiscally sound policy. It balances our Federal budget, and it allows hardworking Georgians and Missourians and North Carolinians and others to actually keep more of their own money. That's a novel concept.

As much as I like this city—and I love to go at night and see Lincoln, and I love to go see the Jefferson Memorial, and I love to look around at the museums and see the history that just oozes from this place—I'll tell you what: I want to come here and spend my money, and I want folks from Georgia to come up here to spend their hard-earned money, their tourist dollars, but I don't want Georgians or anybody else in this country to have to look to the government to be sending money. I want us to be able to earn that money and to have a free enterprise system that works again and is not crippled by a government that is too big and too large.

In addition to the Federal budget that we passed and balancing it in 10 years, which, again, is a novel concept because, undoubtedly, on the other side of the building here and in other places, they don't ever seem to think a balanced budget is necessary. Explain that to your banker the next time you go in. The House budget cuts $4.6 trillion over the next decade; it simplifies the Tax Code; it repeals ObamaCare, protects Medicare and increases energy exploration.

Again, we can tell you the ''how,'' and we can tell you the ''what,'' but what about ''why''? Why does this matter? Why do these things that I just talked about matter? Because they end up putting more responsibility in individual households; they end up putting more money in individual billfolds; and they end up getting the government back in the proportion it has been.

It has been said many times that fire is a great thing. I love fire. I love a fire outside, and I love a pit outside, but do

you know something? That fire is wonderful as long as it's inside and constrained. When it's inside the fire pit, then you cook with it, and you warm yourself with it, and you can make sure that it doesn't burn down the whole forest. But once it gets outside that fire ring, then it can burn down the whole forest. I live up in an area which is inhabited with a lot of forest. We've seen a lot of forest fires, and we've seen a lot of mistakes when using fire.

So I'm just going to say the same thing is true with our budget. What matters in our budget and why it matters, I believe, to most Americans is that we can't allow the debt—the crushing debt—to begin to get outside of that ring, as it has already, and start taking everything else with it.

I wish that the administration felt the same as I did, but they don't. In fact, what happens in their budget, as opposed to balancing, actually, is that it has more taxes, more spending, more borrowing—the same thing that we've gotten into.

I heard a friend across the aisle today talk about the issue of if you do the same thing over and over and expect a different result, it's the definition of ''insanity.'' Well, we're doing the same things over and over again, and we're expecting different results. We actually have to cut spending to get a balanced budget. You actually have to do things in a budget that is so overgrown. The first thing we need to do is to begin cutting. For those of you who say ''no''—you're looking at the screen right now and you're saying, No, we've got to raise taxes—remember, we did that at the end of the year. It's now time for some cutting.

When we looked ahead, I also looked at fiscal responsibility, and that's why I was pleased that this House adopted unanimously an amendment that I had for Camp Merrill, which is where our rangers are trained. What it will do is transfer the land from Forestry to the DOD, which will ensure we save millions of dollars in taxpayer money at Camp Merrill while at the same time providing them with an increased amount of security. In doing so, I believe this just makes common sense.

For some who will say, What does that matter to me? well, it matters when I looked at this situation—and this is inside my district—and they told me that two government agencies—the DOD and Forestry—had been negotiating for 20 years. An agency of the government and an agency of the government, both paid by my and your tax dollars and both serving us as Americans individually and collectively—two agencies—took 20 years and could not come to a resolution. In fact, they almost came to a resolution, and then one government agency wanted $10 million more at the end.

That is wrong. That is why people look at government and why they look at our government processes and say that it doesn't work, because you can't get away with that in the business world. I've been in the business world as a pastor of a church. If it takes you 20 years to negotiate a simple business proposition, you're going to be bankrupt before you can ever get there. That's why this matters.

We also have to look at a constitutionally limited government. Our Founders envisioned a Federal Government that was strong enough to hold the States together and to protect our Nation but that was limited in its authority in citizens' lives. Unfortunately, many in the current administration—and in the culture in Washington—refuse to accept the limitations placed on them by the Constitution. As Congress, we also have to take back our role.

□ 2100

When we take back our role, then we'll be able to have oversight and control of the purse string, and then we'll be able to do what we do.

Limiting the firepower of Federal bureaucrats and those who work to make de facto law, as my friend from Missouri talked about, through regulation is one of my highest priorities. In fact, when we looked at this, I started with Congressman TED YOHO out of Florida. We started a Freshman Regulatory Reform Working Group. I've introduced H.R. 1493, the Sunshine for Regulatory Decrees and Settlements Act, which has been marked up recently in subcommittee and hopefully will come to the full committee and to the floor of this House very soon, because I believe regulations are the beginning of the end.

I want to just show you here what I mean by this. The amount of red tape that continues to grow in this administration and, in all fairness, previous administrations is way too much. When we start back at 2000 and we look at the increasing number of regulations, then we see what is happening. We went from the 170,000 to 180,000 up to a quarter of a million. And this is just in this timeframe. Look at the number in the last 5 to 6 years how regulation has just expanded. We cannot continue this path.

Why does this matter to you? Some of you are sitting here saying, Oh, here is just another Republican. Here is just another Republican talking about—he just wants to make dirty water, dirty air, and do all those things. I've heard those arguments, but I, frankly, tired of those arguments because I live here, too. Remember, I said the three reasons I wanted to be here were Jordan, Copelan, and Cameron. I don't want my children and my grandchildren that I have not seen to have dirty water and dirty air and unsafe workplaces, but there is a limit to what government can do. And we have done a lot.

So I want to say this is why—and then you say, If that's just you talking, why does it matter to me? I'm going to tell you why it matters. And it should matter to every tax-paying family in this country, every American, everybody. I don't single out any groups. I take us all as a whole. We're Americans.

How do we know that this affects you? Look right here. What do regulations cost us? The average American family pays $14,678 in hidden annual regulatory taxes. That's a lot of money. I know in Washington this is just a drop in the bucket, and when we put it out to American families it's just one at a time and people don't care.

I'm going to tell you, from northeast Georgia, $15,000 will do a lot. For my family—I have a senior and a freshman in high school now, actually the high school I went to. It's amazing that it hasn't changed a whole lot in the only 3 or 4 years since I was last there. Unfortunately, it's almost 30 years now. But what has happened is that amount of money, that $15,000—if DOUG COLLINS' family, if Lisa and DOUG sat down and said, ''What can we do with that $15,000?'' or what could Jim and Sally do in south Florida, or over in California or in Arizona or North Carolina when you have families sitting down and talking about their budgets and talking about what they want, here's what they could do. They could buy a new car, a 2013 Ford Fiesta, $13,200; 2013 Chevrolet Sonic, $14,185. Or better yet—and I heard it from this well, passionately explained by one of my friends from across the aisle in talking about education and the importance of education. I believe that as well. What it could do in Georgia is this: it could send their kids to college. One year of tuition and fees at the University of Georgia is $10,262.

We can talk about these big things all we want. We can talk about $17 trillion debt. We can talk about budgets that don't balance. We can talk about scandals that are coming out like PEZ dispensers. We can talk about all these things. But in the end it starts back to what I talked about earlier, that it goes back to it doesn't matter what the big picture is and what it is to people if they don't understand why it matters to them.

I'm standing here tonight as a proud member of the Republican Conference, as a conservative. If you don't believe me, just look at my voting record, because I believe conservative principles matter.

Why do they matter? Because I believe they're the very things that we can explain why they matter by looking at things like this and showing where regulations are hurting our businesses and hurting our jobs, and I can explain to you why a $17 trillion debt hurts us. It takes us away from buying cars, building houses, adding additions, or sending our children to college. That's why it matters. That's why conservative principles matter. And if we haven't done a good job articulating that, then shame on us, because that's what matters. It is the individual families. It is the individual hopes that we share.

So I come to a close tonight in having a wonderful time explaining why I believe conservatism matters and why conservatism is relevant for today. I believe it's individual freedom. I believe it's fiscal responsibility. I believe it's constitutionally limited government. And I will continue to view my decisions through those glasses. And there will be times that we're not all going to agree. And our side, across the aisle, we're not going to agree, but that's what this place is for. It's a place for healthy debate. It's a place in which we can share big ideas.

But if we, as a body, lose the reason we are here, if we lose the fact that we're not here representing always the big ideas or the things that are abstract, when we disconnect ourselves from the dinner table and the coffee shops and the hardware stores, then we have disconnected ourselves from our purpose for being here. Frankly, Mr. Speaker, I don't want to do that.

I'm going to be in this well talking about what matters and highlighting things that may not be real sexy to the press. They may not want to put it in the paper, but it matters to the American people. And I want to encourage our body here in the House and our friends across the way in the upper Chamber and this administration to say let's come together.

I believe conservative principles matter. I believe conservative issues are what will get us back to the thriving economy and the jobs that we need to be focused on. But it's going to take work, it's going to take explaining, and it's not going to be something we can just brush off. It's going to have to be something that we take seriously so that we can go to the individuals that we see in our grocery stores and our service stations and our high school football games and basketball games and baseball games, and we can look our friends and neighbors in the eye and say, ''This is what I'm trying to do. I'm trying to get Congress back to the role of understanding. It's about what happens to you, not what happens to us.'' When we do that, then America is much better off than what we have.

I appreciate my friend from Missouri being here tonight and discussing these important topics with me. The principles we set forward tonight will help guide not only myself but others in the month ahead.

I also notice that I have been joined by a friend from North Carolina, and I would be happy to yield to my friend from North Carolina if she would like to say something.

Ms. FOXX. I appreciate the gentleman yielding, and I want to compliment you on the job that you've done tonight and say as a freshman that I think you have picked up very quickly on the issues involved here. I commend you for taking the time to explain things so well tonight to the American people.

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. I appreciate that. And your work here is something I can look up to, and I appreciate that so much, along with my friends from all over, Congresswoman BACHMANN and others, who share this. We've got to share this message. It matters. We can never lose sight. Amongst the 435, we represent 700,000 or more. They're looking to us for good, conservative, commonsense values.

The challenges that our Nation faces are great, but the resiliency of the American spirit is even greater. I'm encouraged by the accomplishments of this body and what we have put forward from the majority and the dedication and commitment of my colleagues on both sides of the aisle. When we look at this, we can never forget the responsibility of the bounty that we have. It can only be matched by our vigilance to the responsibility of the abundance we've been given. If we keep vigilant, then we'll keep our eyes on the right prize, we'll keep our eyes on what matters, and we'll keep our eyes on our families.

And for me, it always goes back to three reasons: Jordan, Copelan, and Cameron, and a beautiful lady I call my bride of 25 years, Lisa. That's why I'm here, because they represent all the other families and nieces and nephews across this country that we can help if we get our act together and explain to them why this place matters still in our country.

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

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 5, STUDENT SUCCESS ACT

Ms. FOXX, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 113–158) on the resolution (H. Res. 303) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 5) to support State and local accountability for public education, protect State and local authority, inform parents of the performance of their children's schools, and for other purposes, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

AMERICA'S DEBT BURDEN

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

Mrs. BACHMANN. Mr. Speaker, I thank you for the recognition, and I want to thank the Founders and the American people for the privilege of being able to serve in the United States Congress and also for the form of government that they gave to us.

We've just heard a wonderful speech given on why it matters, why it's so important that we stand up for this concept that was given to all of us by our Founders, because this Nation is different from all other nations for a reason and that's why we're so proud of it. And we need to say that once in a while, why it does matter.

There are issues before us now that our Nation is looking at, and it seems like life goes on and we aren't shocked. Yet here in Washington, D.C., we end up being shocked over and over again because most of us come here very normal people, a part of different various levels of the fabric of society. We bring our cumulated experiences here and we deliberate, trying to make the best decisions that we possibly can.

Why? So that our country can be better than it was before. Because the one thing that we know looking forward, we want to make sure what we have now is enhanced not just for ourselves, but for the next generation. There's a reason why we've put so much time into our children, into our nephews and nieces, into our grandchildren—because we know that they're going to carry the baton. We get our moment in the sun for a certain period of our life and then we hand the baton on to the next generation. That's also a part of why it matters.

Today, I was in the Financial Services Committee, Mr. Speaker. When I was in the Financial Services Committee, we were honored. We had before our committee the Chairman of the Federal Reserve, Mr. Ben Bernanke. He has served faithfully for nearly 10 years. And under his leadership at the Federal Reserve, we've seen extraordinary changes in our financial system. Never before had we seen something quite like the Federal Reserve opening the Fed's discount window to private investment banks. We saw the Federal Reserve giving subsidized access to companies that we had never seen before. We've seen what the results of that have been within our economy.

Many people call this a jobless recovery. Well, a jobless recovery is no recovery at all; because if you don't have a job, if you don't have a good-paying job, if you don't have increased benefits, you've got trouble. You've got trouble because I believe it's all about Americans first, about American wages first, about American jobs first, and about North America benefits first.

I made a note, Mr. Speaker, when I was in committee today. I noted that the debt clock was running. It was on a TV in the Financial Services room. The number 17 was up there, and 17 is $17 trillion, which is a lot of money. When I came into Congress, Mr. Speaker, we were $8.67 trillion in debt, and we were all looking around wondering how in the world will we ever pay back $8.67 trillion in debt. That was January of 2007.

We're now in 2013. So something over 6 years later, we have nearly doubled the national debt. That's the baton that we're handing to the next generation. It isn't a lightweight titanium baton. This is a baton that's made out of one of the heaviest substances on Earth.

What does that mean? That means if you're a runner in a marathon or a runner in a race, you'd much prefer to have a lightweight titanium baton that you're carrying as opposed to a very heavy, weighted-down burden that you're trying to run with. Well, that would be a pleasure compared to what we're handing off to the next generation in terms of debt burden.

This is what I found today, Mr. Speaker, during the Financial Services Committee hearing. We went for approximately 3 hours during the hearing, and I noted that the debt clock was at $17 trillion, so many billion. But it was at about $195 million. I watched that debt clock throughout the time that Mr. Bernanke sat at the desk. After about 3 hours, we had accumulated, in this country, an additional $400 million in debt.

□ 2115

I waited patiently because I had a question that I wanted to ask Chairman Bernanke. And I watched the numbers go up, and I watched the numbers go up, and I turned to one of my colleagues on my left, Mr. MCHENRY, who serves very honorably from the State of North Carolina. And I said, Take a look, Mr. MCHENRY. The debt has increased over $50 million just since we got started.

He said, Are you kidding?

I said, No, it really has. Take a look at the clock.

And I looked, pretty soon it was $75 million. Then it was over $100 million. And it grew and it grew until in 3 hours time, we added $400 million to the national debt.

Well, this is the question, Mr. Speaker, that I wanted to ask the Federal Reserve chairman. The number at the top that I've written down is $16,699,421,095,673.60. What is this? It's the debt limit. Now, why do I put this number up, $16 trillion. I put that up because something very weird happened in the United States Government.

On July 12 on the Treasury Department's daily debt sheet, they put this up on the Internet, on that daily debt sheet they recorded $16,699,396,000,000.00, exactly to the penny. That number stayed the same for 56 days straight. Now this is kind of odd because if in 3 hours time you can accumulate $400 million in additional debt because Washington, D.C., and this Congress and this President just can't seem to figure out how to stop spending more money than they take in, if we accumulate that much in 3 hours, how could it possibly be—and I asked the Federal Reserve chair this question today in Financial Services—how can it possibly be that for 56 days the spending seemingly stood still, and not one additional penny was added to the national debt? How could that possibly be? How could it possibly be that magically by some freak coincidence the national debt stayed at the same exact dollar amount, oh, just $25 billion or so below the national debt limit. How could that be?

Well, even though he's been the Federal Reserve chair for 10 years, he had no idea how that could happen. In fact, he didn't even know that it had happened. He didn't know for 56 days in a row there wasn't one single change in the debt limit even though in a 3-hour period of time we add over $400 million in new debt. How could that be?

Well, part of the reason that he speculated is perhaps the Treasury used what they call their extraordinary means to be able to deal with the debt ceiling. You see, Mr. Speaker, what happened is we shattered a ceiling all right. We shattered a glass ceiling. We broke through our debt limit, and we broke through last May 17. But you see, this government wanted to wink and they wanted to nod, and they wanted to play games with the American people. And so for 56 days, they acted like we weren't spending more money than what we took in.

I know if my children did that to me, that would be called a lie in our house. That is not acceptable to my husband and I. You don't lie to us. One thing that the Federal Government should never do to the people who pay the bills in this country is lie to them. And it seems to me that that's what this number is. For 56 days, they're pretending that we aren't adding any debt when of course we added debt because on today's debt clock, we're over $17 trillion.

Why does this matter? Why is this so important? Because this body is about to engage a policy that will structurally change this country forever. And, Mr. Speaker, it's dealing with the issue of granting perpetual amnesty to tens of millions of illegal aliens. Why does this matter? It matters on so many different levels because, as I've shown in this chart, we're broke. We're broke because this is top number, the debt limit, this means that we owe this money. We don't have it sitting in a vault somewhere. As a matter of fact, if you go to the U.S. Treasury and you open it up, you don't open it up and find stacks of $100 bills. Moths and feathers fly out. There's nothing in there if you go to the vault. There's nothing in there; that's the problem. And we're making the problem worse and worse and worse.

And at the worst possible time, Mr. Speaker, now the United States Congress is considering adding trillions of dollars more. And the current estimate by the Heritage Foundation is that we would be adding $6 trillion more because you see, Mr. Speaker, amnesty is terribly expensive. It costs a fortune because the estimate is that the average illegal alien that comes into the United States is approximately 34 years of age. They come in with less than a 10th-grade education. And by the time they are 34 years of age, they usually aren't going back to school to get a high school diploma, much less a college degree. And so what we have found statistically is that the average illegal alien who comes in does pay taxes. They pay somewhere in the neighborhood of $10,000 a year in taxes, gas taxes, sales taxes, various user fees they'll pay. But the other estimate is they pull out of the U.S. Treasury over $30,000 a year in public subsidies and benefits. This is extremely expensive.

That means for each person who comes in, we're looking on average at a cost of over $20,000 per person per year. So rather than adding to our society in the form of adding to our Treasury, we're drawing down from the Treasury. We're going backwards faster than even this debt clock is showing us.

Well, what's the answer? I'll tell you what I'm hearing from home, Mr. Speaker. People are saying, MICHELE, can you tell me why in the world we are not actually securing our border?

I say, You know, you're asking a very good question. Ronald Reagan promised us back in the mid-1980s when he said I have a one time deal for you: We will give amnesty to 1 million people that are in this country.

Sounds like a lot of people, 1 million people. That 1 million people turned into 3.6 million people. Why? Because when people heard that there was going to be a great gift that was going to be given, more people wanted in on that gift. And so more people came across the border, and 3.6 million people were granted amnesty.

And we were told the border would be secured. And 27 years later, we're still waiting to have that border secured. A promise was given, but a promise wasn't kept.

And, Mr. Speaker, we went even further than that. In this very Chamber in the House of Representatives, we passed another bill dealing with border security because people said, What's going on? It isn't 1 million people now in this country that are illegal, now it could be 5 million, it could be 10 million. So back in 2006, this body decided in its wisdom it would pass a bill to actually secure the border to the point where we would even build a fence. So this body passed a bill. It was passed in the Senate. It went to President Bush's desk. It was signed into law, and this body agreed, we will build a fence on our southern border. And what's more than that, something that Congress doesn't often do, it paid for the fence. It actually appropriated the money. We actually gave the money to build the fence, the design, the whole works. We were going to get her done.

Here we are, Mr. Speaker, 27 years after the promise made by Ronald Reagan, no fence. Seven years after the bill passed the House of Representatives and was paid for, no fence.

My question, Mr. Speaker, where's the fence? If we don't have a fence 7 years after we passed a law, where's the money? I think the American people have the right to ask, Give me my fence or give me my money back. What's going on? We need to get some answers. You see, that's why when we

have this phony bill that came out of the United States Senate that said legalization first for illegal aliens, border security probably never, the American people looked at that bill and they said, Are you kidding me?

You see, Mr. Speaker, the American people are pretty smart. They're not going to be taken for a ride a third time. It's the old saying: fool me once, shame on you. Fool me twice, shame on me.

The American people are saying no dice; we're not going to have anything to do with this this time because the times have changed. You see, the economy has soured since 1987. The economy has soured since 2006. We have massive unemployment like we have not seen for decades. And in the midst of this unemployment, Mr. Speaker, we have 22 million Americans today that are looking for a full-time job, 22 million Americans. And we're going to legalize by granting amnesty to tens of millions of new illegal aliens who would come into this country and compete for jobs that 22 million Americans citizens would love to have? This doesn't make any sense.

You see, the United States Chamber of Commerce came out with a brand new survey. They went to the number one job creators of this country, who are small businesses. And small businesses said, three out of four of them, as a matter of fact, said that ObamaCare is causing them to fire their full-time workers. ObamaCare is causing them to reduce the number of hours that their full-time workers have, and they're actually looking also at only hiring part-time workers.

In fact, this isn't just big business or just small business. A letter came out from three unions that was sent to Speaker PELOSI, and also Majority Leader HARRY REID in the Senate, and it said this. It was from James Hoffa, who signed one of the letters from the Teamsters union.

He said, Hey, Mr. President—and I'm paraphrasing—we were with you. As a matter of fact, we put boots on the ground for you, Mr. President. We got you reelected in this last election, Mr. President. We went out and said your bill was a good bill, Mr. President. You told us that if we liked our health care, we could keep it, Mr. President. And they're saying that's not what's happening. Because we fought for the backbone of the middle class, which is a 40-hour work week. And now—I paraphrase in this letter—Mr. Hoffa said that now we are looking at a new normal. And the new normal for the American workforce is a 30-hour work week. Thirty hours.

So now you have the American people who would have to support their families, pay their mortgage, buy their groceries, pay for their car, on a 30-hour work week.

And guess what, Mr. Speaker? That would be without health care. And so there's steam coming out of the ears of these unions. They're so angry because they're saying all that the unions fought for, to have a decent wage and to have decent benefit packages for the American people, they're seeing it go out the window. And at the same time, they're being expected to fall in line with the President's agenda and go along with amnesty for tens of millions of illegal aliens who are going to be fighting for those 30 hour a week jobs? Are we out of our mind?

I go back to the beginning of what I started saying, Mr. Speaker, and it's this: we are looking at handing the baton to the next generation. And what is it we're leaving them? What is it that we're giving them? Are we giving them more jobs? It doesn't look like it. Job rates are falling. Labor participation rates are falling.

Are we giving them higher wages? I don't think so because when President Obama took office in 2008, the average household income was $55,000 a year. And then a story came out this last year that the average household income has dropped from $55,000 to $50,000 a year. A study came out this April, a Harvard study. It said that a loss in the average household income can be attributed to illegal aliens in the United States in the amount of $1,300 a year. Now that might not seem like a lot of money to the big elites in this country who think it would be great to have amnesty for illegal aliens, but it sure as heck means a lot, $1,300 a year, to someone who's making it on $50,000 a year for their annual household income. I'm here to tell you, Mr. Speaker, there's a lot of people who would love to make $50,000 a year for their annual household income, and they can't get anywhere near that.

And so why in the world, I ask you, would we want to disadvantage a woman who is a Hispanic who works in this country. Maybe she is doing her best working as a waitress, maybe she's working in an office, maybe she's working cleaning hotel rooms to try and help her family out.

□ 2130

Why in the world would we disadvantage her by bringing in more people to compete for her job and to compete for her benefit package?

Why in the world would we disadvantage African American youth in the inner city who have an unbelievable unemployment rate, who, in the last few summers, they've gone as high as 46 percent unemployment. My heart breaks for African American kids in inner cities who haven't been able to get jobs.

And we're thinking that we need to trip over ourselves and help President Obama achieve his number one political goal in his second term?

We're barely 6 months into President Obama's second term, and, why, I can't begin to understand, are we tripping over ourselves to make sure that we have even more competition for the low-skilled workers who are having trouble even finding jobs and even finding wage and benefit packages.

We can do so much better than that, Mr. Speaker. I know we can. That's why we've got to focus on border security, because border security is what the American people are asking of us because it's America first, American jobs first, American wages first, and American benefits first. Benefits are expensive, and we need them.

I also would like to talk for just a moment about other people in this economy that are looking to us for a little help and a little relief right now, and that's senior citizens, because senior citizens tend to live on a fixed income, and they're nervous. They're nervous that their money isn't going to be worth what it was; and they should be, because, you see, when, as I said, this is the fiction that we were all told, that at $16 trillion, which is our debt, and of course it isn't. It's well over $17 trillion now.

When the Federal Government continues to spend money that it doesn't have, and so it quite literally just makes it up, let's face it. The Federal Reserve chair, Ben Bernanke, was asked in committee today, in Financial Services, Mr. Bernanke, does the Federal Reserve, when it borrows money, does it print money? Is that what it's doing?

And his answer was, well, not literally. But the point being, yes, they make it up. They make it up in the form of a computer with digits in it. And so somebody, every morning, gets out the magic fairy fingers and writes on the magic fairy keys, and the Treasury Department puts a request to the Federal Reserve, and the Treasury Department says to the Federal Reserve, in essence, say, Federal Reserve, we're about, oh, maybe $4 billion short today. Do you think you could loan us some money?

And the Federal Reserve says, sure, we'll be happy to. So they type on their keys. Here's $4 billion. And in exchange, the Treasury Department sends over an email that says IOU $4 billion. Everybody's happy. So one hand reaches into this pocket and hands money to this pocket.

The only problem is, Mr. Speaker, there's no money that ever gets exchanged. It's just a conversation, a made-up conversation.

How does that impact a senior citizen, Mr. Speaker, who's at home listening right now, who has, let's say, $30,000 sitting in a bank? And they're hoping that that $30,000 can still buy them a year from now $30,000 worth of goods.

Well, when you keep talking to each other, the Federal Reserve to the Treasury, and you're just making up money, all that does is lower the value of what a senior citizen has in the bank. So rather than $30,000 in the bank, at the end of the year, maybe that's worth $29,500. Maybe that's worth $29,000, because the value of that money keeps getting diluted and diluted and diluted because the Federal Government, in essence, is stealing the

value of what these senior citizens put in the bank. It is a form of legalized theft.

Now, what morality is it that allows a government to steal from senior citizens, steal future opportunities from the next generation?

I call that immorality. Theft is immorality. You don't steal from your grandparents. You don't steal from your parents. You certainly don't steal from your children. But yet that's what we're doing.

And then when we add in this consequential issue that will structurally change America forever, and we're telling ourselves that we have an obligation to grant amnesty to tens of millions of illegal aliens?

Let's talk for a second about that bill in the Senate. The bill that the Senate passed is perpetual amnesty. It would never again allow for the Federal Government to meaningfully be able to deport any illegal alien ever again.

It almost works like magic. An illegal alien gets into the United States, all they have to do is say the magic words to the ICE agents who may pick them up, and they say, I want to apply for political asylum. Once they say that—this may shock some of the people who are watching tonight—once an illegal alien says to an ICE agent, I want to apply for political asylum, they would be granted, at taxpayer expense, a lawyer, and that lawyer would help them to gain their U.S. citizenship. What a deal.

So you come into the United States, you eventually are on your ''path to citizenship,'' at taxpayer expense. And what form of benefits would be available to you?

Well, under the Senate bill, you can immediately get a Social Security card, and you can immediately get access to a driver's license.

If you have a Social Security card, Mr. Speaker, and if you have access to a driver's license, there's an awful lot of advantages that you could have very quick. You can apply for a lot of public subsidized benefits that can be yours, and you've got an identity, and you're on your way.

What I don't understand, Mr. Speaker, is that in this country we're generous. We're extremely generous. Every year we allow 1 million people who are not American citizens, who are foreigners, we welcome with open arms 1 million people a year as new U.S. citizens into this country. That's amazing.

We've got something over 300 million people, and we say come in, a million every year.

Mr. Speaker, if you look at all the countries in the world, there's over, what, 120 countries, more than that in the world. If you add up every country in the world, Mr. Speaker, and a lot of countries have a lot more population than we have, if you add up all those countries combined, they don't allow as many new immigrants into their countries, in all the countries of the world, as the United States of America does in 1 year.

We are amazing in our generosity. Plus there are 4 million people on a waiting list every year waiting to get into the United States. We have a system of immigration. We have a system that's worked for years.

The problem is, we have a lot of people that don't want to wait for that system to work. Four million people are waiting, are on the waiting list now. One million people got in this year, legally.

Why is it, again, that we are tripping over ourselves to help the people who have broken our laws, who are in this country?

Why is it that we aren't saying to those people, we have a waiting list; you need to go and apply and get on the waiting list and wait your turn, and then you can come into the country too.

Why are we trying to figure out a way to fast-track the illegal people?

Shouldn't we be apologizing to the people then, the 4 million people who are on that waiting list?

I also wonder—people ask me, Mr. Speaker—I also wonder why that's our top priority. Why wouldn't our top priority, Mr. Speaker, be the 22 million people who are American citizens who are looking for full-time employment right now?

Shouldn't that be our top priority, trying to figure out how we can find them a job?

You know, it's really interesting to me, in the survey that came out today from the Chamber of Commerce, they found that of all the small businesses in America, only 17 percent, fewer than one out of five small businesses hired anybody in the last 2 years.

I'm going to say that again. The Chamber of Commerce found in a survey that of all the small businesses in America, less than 17 percent, less than one out of five small businesses, and they're the engine of this economy, hired anybody on a full-time basis in the last 2 years.

That's a very sad commentary. There's not a lot of hiring. That's why I say America first, jobs first, wages for Americans first, benefits for Americans first. That's how sad this ''jobless recovery'' has been, which is no recovery at all.

Here's what's even worse. Less than 20 percent of small businesses say that in the next 2 years do they have any plans at all to hire.

If we know that only 17 percent of small businesses have hired in the last 2 years, and less than 20 percent will hire in the next 2 years, I don't think that we should be giving amnesty to tens of millions of illegal aliens.

Let's focus, Mr. Speaker, on America first. Let's focus on finding jobs for those 22 million who are looking for full-time jobs. Let's focus on increasing the wages for American workers first, and let's focus on increasing the benefit packages for Americans first. That's what we need to do, Mr. Speaker.

And I thank the American people for this opportunity to be a Representative and stand in the greatest well that there is in the world.

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 Iowa (Mr. KING) for the remainder of the time until 10 p.m.

Mr. KING of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I want to say, first it's a privilege to be recognized to address you here on the floor of the House of Representatives.

And it's also interesting and engaging to listen to the gentlelady from Minnesota as she delivered her presentation here tonight with typical vigor and precision.

I looked at that poster, and it was very interesting to me. And so I see that $400 million in 3 hours, and I divide that out, multiply it times 24, then multiply that times 56 days, and I come up with a number that's $179.2 billion increased national debt in the period of time that none is registered.

And so putting this in perspective, it's just another example of an administration that hasn't been straight with us.

So, I come here, Mr. Speaker, to address this situation of immigration, as the gentlelady from Minnesota has. It's something that's important for all of us to understand the big picture, the full picture. And it is about economics, it's about culture, it's about civilization, it's about balancing our budget, it's about the vitality of the United States of America, and we have to be weighing all of these factors.

The immigration issue is the most complex and the most far-reaching topic that we ever deal with here in the United States Congress. And we think that ObamaCare is complicated. It is. It's a lot of pages of legislation. But also the bad things that are flowing from it were predicted here from this spot by many of us on our side of the aisle. It was understandable for us.

But because it's somewhat objective to be able to look at the formulas and see what's going to happen and know what insurance policies do, the immigration issue goes deeper. And it's the multiplication of current demographics and how they blend with future demographics, and what we might do, and all of the things that flow from it.

So as the gentlelady from Minnesota said, the net cost on the Senate's Gang of Eight bill turns out to be $6.33 trillion, $6.3 trillion, Mr. Speaker. And that's what that group will generate. Let's see—the net cost, $6.3 trillion, they will pay, there's $9.4 trillion all together dealing with this. There will be $3.1 trillion in taxes paid. The benefits, $9.4 trillion in benefits drawn down by the group of people who would be given amnesty under the Senate version of the bill.

They would pay $3.1 trillion in taxes over their lifetime, and the net figure

would be $6.3 trillion that would come out of the pockets of the taxpayers to add on to that nearly $17 trillion in national debt that we have today.

And the study that was done by Robert Rector of the Heritage Foundation, I saw a little piece on the Internet here a couple of nights ago where someone described it as ''the much maligned study.'' Well, I'm occasionally the much maligned Member of Congress, but I don't notice that that makes me any less accurate or any less factual in the positions that I take. They are soundly based, and so were the analyses and the study done by Robert Rector in his study to show us the net cost of the amnesty act that's passed out of the Senate today, and not yet messaged to the House, but passed out of the Senate.

And that's just the economic cost. And he showed, by formula, there are always exceptions to this. When you're dealing with human beings, there are always exceptions.

But by formula, the newly arriving, those that are here illegally, those that would come in the next waves or two, as Mrs. BACHMANN said, there'd be an average of about a tenth-grade education. People who are high school dropouts or high school graduates, on average, cannot sustain themselves in this society without welfare benefits.

We are a cradle-to-grave welfare state. We have at least 80 different means-tested welfare programs in the United States.

□ 2145

They range from the food stamp program to temporary assistance to needy families to the WIC program. And it goes on and on. The heat subsidies, rent subsidies. No one has them all memorialized, Mr. Speaker, which means no one can figure out how they interrelate with each other, how they interact with each other, or how people react on that interaction of those 80 different means-tested Federal welfare programs.

But we know this. At a certain point, if you pile on more and more welfare, even those who are quite ambitious are eventually going to be living better than those that are working hard and smart. And so what it does is in a way it bribes people to leave the workforce and go on the welfare roles or transition from the workforce into the welfare roles. That's going on all over America. That's one of the reasons why, in this country of about 316 million people in this country, we have so many people that are on the welfare system and this workforce that Mrs. BACHMANN talked about of 22 million who are looking for a full-time job.

Here's some other data from the Department of Labor's Web site. You go and look at the numbers there of those who are simply not in the workforce. They might have retired early on their own money, they might be on SSI disability, they might be on anything, all but unemployment. Those folks might be homemakers. They might be in school. They might be doing nothing. But when you add all of them up that are simply not in the workforce, of working age, that number comes to over 88 million people. And when you add the official unemployed to that, some number approaching 13 million people, it's clear that for the last 5 to 6 years we have had over 100 million people in this country who are simply not in the workforce but are of working age.

Now, I don't conclude that every one of them can go to work or are suitable for work, but I would say this. If we need more workforce, Mr. Speaker, why in the world would we grant amnesty, a path to citizenship, and full access to those 80 different means-tested Federal welfare programs for 11 million or 22 million or 33 million people that are in the United States illegally? Why would we give them American jobs when we have Americans here who are not in the workforce?

One of the jobs we should do in this Congress is constantly be thinking and pushing and promoting legislation that increases the average annual individual productivity of the people in our country. And I watched as some of the libertarian CATO economists will tell us, well, we have to open our borders and bring in 11 million or 22 million or 33 million or 44 million or 55 million people because that's how we grow our economy, and we can't grow our economy unless we do that. Some even say that the fertility rate is higher with newly arriving immigrants, especially illegal immigrants. I think that that's drawing a conclusion that's not necessarily supportable by the data that's out there. It might just be by observation.

But to bring people in and give them jobs while Americans are looking for jobs is the wrong thing to do. And just because somebody increases the GDP doesn't mean they're a net contributor to our economy or our society. Say there's someone 50 years old and never worked a day in their life and never lifted a finger. It's completely possible in this society today. That person hasn't contributed to the GDP by anything they've produced, perhaps by what they've consumed, but at best they can be break even. They can't be a net increase.

But if that individual goes out and does an hour's worth of work and receives an hour's worth of pay and produces an hour's worth of product, good, or service that has marketable value here or abroad, they've contributed to the gross domestic product by the value of that hour's work that they've contributed.

So, by that theory, CATO economists say all the people that we would legalize in amnesty that are illegal today, presuming that they will work, they will help grow our economy. Sure, they would, but they also would contribute to the necessary loss to the taxpayers because they can't sustain themselves.

That doesn't mean that there aren't good, smart, productive legal immigrants that can contribute and can be a net increase to our economy. There are quite a number of them, if you count them. But statistically, by a wide margin, the lower and undereducated cannot contribute. They cannot be a net contributor to this society. That's proven clearly by the Heritage Foundation study done by Robert Rector. It's something the American people need to look at. It's not been effectively rebutted by the people that disagree. They have another agenda.

So I have put this argument out in this way, Mr. Speaker. I used to take the position that there was nothing in the Senate Gang of Eight amnesty bill that was good for the American people. Why would Americans do this? Why? Mark Steyn wrote an op-ed about 3 or 4 months ago. He laid out some of the data, and the last sentence was one word, a question, ''Why?'' Why would America do this? Why would we bring in the equivalent of the population of Canada and throw in New Zealand's population while we're at it, if I remember his statement correctly. Why?

Well, not because it contributes to the social, economic, or cultural well-being of the United States of America. That wouldn't be why. That is what kind of an immigration policy we need, yes. But it's because it isn't true that no Americans benefit from this. If you look at narrow self-interests, there are three categories of Americans that benefit from the illegal immigration that they would like to see legalized and they would like to see the perpetual flow of new illegal immigration coming in so there are people lining up for the next amnesty. There are three classes of people, three categories of people.

One is the elitists that believe that somehow they've got a birthright to live in gated communities and have cheap labor to clean their houses and mow their lawns and weed their flower gardens and maybe wash their car and make sure their lives are as smooth as they'd like to have them be. That's an elitist attitude if they think they want to have discounted labor to do that.

I had a meeting with a group of elitists in the great Northeast and one of them said to me, I went down to the day labor parking place and I needed somebody to come up and weed my garden and clean up around the place. I offered him $15 an hour, and nobody would take the money. You've got to pass an immigration bill. I don't have enough access to people that can take care of my lawn and my garden and my yard. He thought $15 an hour should have hired anybody, but I'm really certain that it's been a lot of years since he's worked for $15 an hour.

So I said to him, If you can't hire somebody to mow your lawn and if you don't have time to do that yourself, maybe you should get an apartment down in the big city and sell your house to somebody that can either pay

the wages necessary or do it themselves. That's how the economy has to work. It's supply and demand. And the value of a commodity in the marketplace is determined by supply and demand, Mr. Speaker. Whether it's corn or beans or gold or oil or labor, it's supply and demand.

And people say, well, there's work that Americans won't do. I completely reject that theory. It's offensive to me to hear from elitists that there's work that Americans won't do. I don't know if you can find work that my family hasn't done. I'm pretty confident you can't find work we've refused to do. But we try to be, I often say, hardworking Americans.

Well, we also have to be smart-working Americans. Smart and hardworking Americans. It's not good enough in this society to just work hard anymore. You've got to work smart at the same time.

So, when we do that, we market our wages to the point where we can sustain ourselves in this society. Or, if you can't get that done, you supplement it by some of the 80 different means-tested Federal welfare programs. But when you think that there's work that Americans won't do, when people say that, I would argue, no, I think that you can hire an American to do anything, anything that's decent and just and right and moral.

There's honor and dignity in all work. You just have to bid up the price until you get the people to do the work. I've had to do that in most of my business life.

I started a construction company in 1975. And, yes, I had to hire people, and I was proud of the work we did. We put some long, hard hours in in difficult conditions. But in order to have people show up for work the next day, you had to pay them an adequate wage for the day before. And when I found that I couldn't hire the right people for the wages I was paying, I raised the wages and I increased the benefit package, and we hired the people we needed and we kept the people that we needed. That seems to be beyond the realm of the way of thinking of a lot of elitists' attitudes here that say there's work that Americans won't do.

So I just say, okay, I'll prove it to you. Somebody is going to have to front the money to do this. But I'd say this. I can hire Bill Clinton to mow my lawn. I might have to pay him a million dollars, but I could hire him to mow my law. I might have to pay him $2 million or $10 million, depending how much I might want to tease this situation.

But you understand my point, Mr. Speaker. You have to bid it up. At some point, somebody's going to take the bid. Just like when you're waiting to get on an airplane and somebody has to get bumped from a seat and they start to auction that off and say, I'll give you a $400 ticket to fly someplace else. Somebody decides to take that. If not, they up the ante again and again. Up the ante, up the ante, and somebody will take the bid. You auction this off in a way until somebody steps up to do the work.

Americans will always do the work, Mr. Speaker. We have always done the work. And we need to keep the work here at home and we need to make sure that the people in this country that have the skills and have the desire are going to work. If they don't have the desire, it might just be that the safety net that is our 80 different means-tested welfare programs has turned into a hammock and they've gotten lazy on us. If that happens, you need to dial that down a little bit so the hammock is no longer so much a hammock as it is a safety net. When that happens, some of those folks will decide, I'm going to climb out of this safety net and I'm going to go to work, and I'm going to contribute to the GDP and I'm going earn enough that I can sustain myself and my family.

There was a time not that long ago—25 years ago, maybe now 30 years ago—when a young man could grow up and graduate from high school and look over to the beef plant and decide, I want to get a job there and go punch that time clock and make good wages and make my living in there processing meat. And you need that if you are going to eat it, anyway. So they would aspire to do so and go punch that time clock and work there every day, and they would work there for 40, 45 years. And they would be making, each year, about the same amount of money as a teacher does with a college degree. And that went on until they started bringing illegal labor in to drive the wages down in the packing plant.

Today, teachers are making about twice as much as that guy that's working in the packing plant. And that young man—especially young men, and young women also. But that young man now that decides that he doesn't have a future ahead in college, he can no longer go in and punch the time clock and make a living and pay for a modest house over a lifetime and maybe provide an opportunity for his kids that want to go to college. That opportunity isn't there anymore.

So they drift off onto the welfare programs, and some of them drift off into drugs and some of them leave the community because they're being underbid by people who will work cheaper, that are more mobile, that aren't lawfully present in the United States, that came here to live in the shadows. And my colleagues will say, well, we have to bring the 11 million out of the shadows because it's the right thing to do. Well, is it? What's our moral obligation for those folks?

I believe in the dignity of every human person. I think we owe them that respect and that dignity. But to solve a problem that they created by their own action by sacrificing the rule of law and rewarding people who broke the law with a path to citizenship, American jobs, the right to vote as a reward for breaking the law, do you think, Mr. Speaker, they're going to raise their children then to respect the rule of law if they're the beneficiaries of breaking it by the tens of millions—11 million, 22 million, 33 million, maybe 44 million people? It changes the culture in the United States of America when you inject millions of people in who are rewarded for breaking the law.

My friends down in the Senate side and some here in the House will say, But they have to go to the back of the line. It's not amnesty. They're going to have to pay a fine. They're going to have to pay back taxes. It's an onerous road to get to citizenship under the plan of the Gang of Eight.

Well, is it as onerous as maybe living in the shadows? They're not living in the shadows, Mr. Speaker. They come into my office. They plug their Obama phones in to charge them, which is about the height of an entitlement attitude. They're not living in the shadows. They're out in the open lobbying Congress as open and blatant as can be with disrespect for the rule of law. They erode the rule of law.

By the way, for the 11-plus million people, outside this country there are at least 5 million who respect the law, who are lined up in their home country the right way to come into America the legal way. And what do we say to them? We're going to take 11 million or 22 million or 33 million people and we're going to make them go to what we define as the back of the line? But if it's in the United States, it's not the back of the line. The line is outside the United States, 5 million long. So are they going to say, Go to the back of line; go back to your home country and get in the back of the line?

Have you ever, Mr. Speaker, stood in a line and thought, Well, I'm almost there. It's been a long wait. I want to get into the movie theater. Maybe I've got to visit the men's room, and the line gets longer on you instead of shorter. What's more frustrating than having respect for rules and the rule of law and having to back up because somebody else cut in front? And how long are you going to have patience with that?

I oppose amnesty. I oppose perpetual and retroactive amnesty, and I support the rule of law. I'm going to continue to defend this rule of law and defend this country so that we can send to our children the promise that came from our Founding Fathers: the future of an American destiny above and beyond the Shining City on the Hill.

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 medical mandated recovery.

Mr. LEWIS of Georgia (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for today.

BILL PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Karen L. Haas, Clerk of the House, reported that on July 17, 2013, she presented to the President of the United States, for his approval, the following bill:

H.R. 2289. To rename section 219(c) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 as the Kay Bailey Hutchison Spousal IRA.

ADJOURNMENT

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

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 10 p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, July 18, 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:

2261. A letter from the Under Secretary, Department of Defense, transmitting the fiscal year 2011 report entitled, ''Operation and Financial Support of Military Museums''; to the Committee on Armed Services.

2262. A letter from the Under Secretary, Department of Defense, transmitting the Department's quarterly report entitled, ''Acceptance of contributions for defense programs, projects, and activities; Defense Cooperation Account'', for the period ending March 31, 2013; to the Committee on Armed Services.

2263. A letter from the Acting Under Secretary, Department of Defense, transmitting a report on the Federal Voting Assistance Program's 2012 Post-Election Report to Congress; to the Committee on House Administration.

2264. A letter from the President, National Council on Radiation Protection and Measurements, transmitting the 2012 Annual Report of an independent auditor who has audited the records of the National Council on Radiation Protection and Measurements, pursuant to 36 U.S.C. 4514; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2265. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; Bay Swim VI, Presque Isle Bay, Erie, PA [Docket Number: USCG-2013-0311] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received July 2, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2266. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; Mississippi River Mile 95.5 — Mile 96.5; New Orleans, LA [Docket Number: USCG-2013-0188] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received July 2, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2267. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; Delaware River Waterfront Corp. Fireworks Display, Delaware River; Camden, NJ [Docket Number: USCG-2013-0496] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received July 2, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2268. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; Wicomico Community Fireworks Rain Date, Great Wicomico River, Heathsville, VA [Docket Number: USCG-2013-0386] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received July 2, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2269. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule — Significant Issue Revenue Procedure (Rev. Proc. 2013-32) received July 2, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

2270. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Energy, transmitting a report entitled, ''U.S. Department of Energy Naval Petroleum Reserve No. 3 Disposition Decision Analysis and Timeline Report to Congress''; jointly to the Committees on Armed Services and Energy and Commerce.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Ms. FOXX: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 303. Resolution providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 5) to support State and local accountability for public education, protect State and local authority, inform parents of the performance of their children's schools, and for other purposes (Rept. 113–158). Referred to the House Calendar.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

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

By Mr. MURPHY of Pennsylvania (for himself, Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, Mr. DENT, Mr. DIAZ-BALART, Ms. MATSUI, Mr. BURGESS, Mr. SHUSTER, Mr. SARBANES, Mr. FORTENBERRY, Mrs. CAPITO, Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio, Mr. VELA, Ms. HANABUSA, and Mr. SCHOCK):

H.R. 2703. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide liability protections for volunteer practitioners at health centers under section 330 of such Act; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. MICHAUD (for himself and Mr. MILLER of Florida):

H.R. 2704. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to direct the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to submit to Congress a Future-Years Veterans Program and a quadrennial veterans review, to establish in the Department of Veterans Affairs a Chief Strategy Officer, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. DENHAM:

H.R. 2705. A bill to develop a pilot program to remove non-native predator fishes from the Stanislaus River to protect the native anadromous fishery resources affected by the operation of the New Melones Unit of the East Side Division of the Central Valley Project, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. YARMUTH (for himself, Mr. POLIS, Ms. BONAMICI, Ms. NORTON, Mr. RAHALL, Mr. CONNOLLY, Mr. COHEN, and Mr. CARTWRIGHT):

H.R. 2706. A bill to establish a comprehensive literacy program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. CHABOT (for himself, Mr. SIMPSON, and Mr. GRAVES of Missouri):

H.R. 2707. A bill to direct the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency to carry out a pilot program to work with municipalities that are seeking to develop and implement integrated plans to meet their wastewater and stormwater obligations under the Federal Water Pollution Control Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. CAMP (for himself, Mr. LEVIN, Mr. NUNES, and Mr. RANGEL):

H.R. 2708. A bill to amend the Harmonized Tariff Schedule of the United States to modify temporarily certain rates of duty, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CAMP (for himself, Mr. LEVIN, Mr. NUNES, and Mr. RANGEL):

H.R. 2709. A bill to extend the Generalized System of Preferences; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CULBERSON (for himself and Mr. BISHOP of Utah):

H.R. 2710. A bill to amend the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 to restore State sovereignty over public education and parental rights over the education of their children; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Ms. JENKINS (for herself and Mr. BRADY of Texas):

H.R. 2711. A bill to amend title 5, United States Code, to establish certain procedures for conducting in-person or telephonic interactions by Executive branch employees with individuals, and for other purposes; 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 Mrs. LOWEY (for herself and Mr. ENGEL):

H.R. 2712. A bill to provide certain requirements for the licensing of commercial nuclear facilities; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. MEADOWS:

H.R. 2713. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to exclude from gross income gain from the sale or grant of conservation easements and to allow the sale or grant of conservation easements in the case of the special estate tax valuation provisions for certain farm and other trade or business real property; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MEADOWS:

H.R. 2714. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow taxpayers to assign to another taxpayer the amount of the unused charitable deduction for qualified conservation contributions; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MICHAUD (for himself and Mr. WELCH):

H.R. 2715. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to include biomass heating appliances for tax credits available for energy-efficient building property and energy property; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MORAN:

H.R. 2716. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for offsetting certain past-due local tax debts against income tax overpayments; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ROSKAM (for himself and Mr. DEUTCH):

H.R. 2717. 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. YOUNG of Alaska (for himself and Mr. COLE):

H.R. 2718. A bill to empower federally recognized Indian tribes to accept restricted fee tribal lands, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Ms. NORTON:

H. Res. 304. A resolution expressing support for dancing as a form of valuable exercise and artistic expression, and for the designation of July 27, 2013, as National Dance Day; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

CONSTITUTIONAL AUTHORITY STATEMENT

Pursuant to clause 7 of rule XII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the following statements are submitted regarding the specific powers granted to Congress in the Constitution to enact the accompanying bill or joint resolution.

By Mr. MURPHY of Pennsylvania:

H.R. 2703.

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

Article I, section 8, clauses 3 and 18 of the Constitution of the United States.

By Mr. MICHAUD:

H.R. 2704.

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

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18—''The Congress shall have Power To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by the Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.''

By Mr. DENHAM:

H.R. 2705.

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

Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution, specifically Clause 1 (relating to providing for the common defense and general welfare of the United States) and Clause 18 (relating to the power to make all laws necessary and proper for carrying out the powers vested in Congress).

By Mr. YARMUTH:

H.R. 2706.

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

Clause 3 of Section 8 of Article 1 of the Constitution.

By Mr. CHABOT:

H.R. 2707.

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

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 3

''To regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes.''

By Mr. CAMP:

H.R. 2708.

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

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1—The Congress shall have Power to lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts and Excises, to pay the debts and provide for the common Defence and general Welfare of the United States; but all Duties, Imposts and Excises shall be uniform throughout the United States.

By Mr. CAMP:

H.R. 2709.

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

Section 8 of Article I of the U.S. Constitution.

By Mr. CULBERSON:

H.R. 2710.

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

Tenth Amendment, Constitution of the United States.

By Ms. JENKINS:

H.R. 2711.

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

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 18,—''To make all laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into execution the foregoing powers, and all other powers vested by this Constitution in the government of the United States, or in any department or officer thereof.''

To better insure the due process rights guaranteed in Fifth and Fourteenth Amendments to the United States Constitution

By Mrs. LOWEY:

H.R. 2712.

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

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 18.

By Mr. MEADOWS:

H.R. 2713.

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

Clause 1, Section 8 of Article 1 of the United States Constitution which reads:

''The Congress shall have Power to lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts, and Excises, to pay the Debts, and provide for the common Defense and General Welfare of the United States; but all Duties and Imposts and Excises shall be uniform throughout the United States.'

By Mr. MEADOWS:

H.R. 2714.

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

Clause 1, Section 8 of Article 1 of the United States Constitution which reads: ''The Congress shall have Power to lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts, and Excises, to pay the Debts, and provide for the common Defense and General Welfare of the United States; but all Duties and Imposts and Excises shall be uniform throughout the United States.'

By Mr. MICHAUD:

H.R. 2715.

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

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. MORAN:

H.R. 2716.

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

This Bill is enacted pursuant to Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution which provides Congress with the power to lay and collect taxes and regulate commerce among the several states.

By Mr. ROSKAM:

H.R. 2717.

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

Article 1, Section 8 of the Constitution

By Mr. YOUNG of Alaska:

H.R. 2718.

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

Article I, Section 8

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 24: Mr. SMITH of Missouri.
H.R. 154: Mr. COOPER.
H.R. 176: Mr. HUDSON.
H.R. 184: Mrs. BUSTOS.
H.R. 285: Mr. TAKANO.
H.R. 310: Mr. WELCH, Ms. SINEMA, Mrs. BUSTOS, and Mr. PERRY.
H.R. 322: Mr. JOYCE and Mr. BARLETTA.
H.R. 333: Mr. BRALEY of Iowa, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, and Mr. KING of New York.
H.R. 366: Mr. DELANEY.
H.R. 449: Mr. BARLETTA.
H.R. 460: Ms. LOFGREN, Ms. ESHOO, and Mr. KENNEDY.
H.R. 508: Mr. PALLONE, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. LOBIONDO, Mr. RUNYAN, Mr. FOSTER, and Mrs. LOWEY.
H.R. 509: Mr. BARBER.
H.R. 510: Mr. BARBER.
H.R. 511: Mr. BARBER.
H.R. 517: Mr. RUSH.
H.R. 551: Mr. RANGEL, Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. VEASEY, Mr. LOEBSACK, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. HONDA, Mr. CÁRDENAS, Mr. POLIS, Mr. GRIJALVA, and Ms. CHU.
H.R. 556: Mrs. BLACK.
H.R. 578: Mr. KINZINGER of Illinois.
H.R. 621: Mr. WESTMORELAND.
H.R. 647: Mr. LANCE.
H.R. 664: Mrs. NAPOLITANO.
H.R. 685: Mr. PAYNE, Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, and Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York.
H.R. 721: Mr. GALLEGO.
H.R. 755: Mr. CARTWRIGHT, Mr. MCDERMOTT, and Mr. CULBERSON.
H.R. 795: Mr. WEBER of Texas, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Mr. HARRIS, and Mr. FLORES.
H.R. 797: Mr. HECK of Nevada.
H.R. 805: Mr. WOMACK.
H.R. 808: Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia.
H.R. 940: Mr. DESANTIS and Mr. JOYCE.
H.R. 1008: Mr. YARMUTH.
H.R. 1014: Mr. MURPHY of Pennsylvania, Mr. LOEBSACK, and Mr. SHUSTER.
H.R. 1020: Mr. RUNYAN.
H.R. 1024: Mr. COBLE, Mr. BERA of California, Mr. HUDSON, Mr. MULLIN, and Mr. KINZINGER of Illinois.
H.R. 1091: Mr. MARCHANT.
H.R. 1095: Mr. ROE of Tennessee, Mr. LOBIONDO, Mrs. BLACK, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mrs. HARTZLER, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Mr. RUSH, and Mr. MARCHANT.
H.R. 1176: Mr. MULVANEY.
H.R. 1187: Ms. TSONGAS, Ms. WATERS, and Mr. POCAN.
H.R. 1250: Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia.
H.R. 1254: Mr. TIBERI.
H.R. 1286: Mr. MICHAUD.
H.R. 1309: Mr. BUCSHON, Mr. GERLACH, Mr. JONES, and Mr. PAULSEN.
H.R. 1339: Ms. WATERS and Mr. WALZ.
H.R. 1346: Mr. MCGOVERN.
H.R. 1354: Mrs. NOEM.
H.R. 1416: Mrs. WAGNER.
H.R. 1437: Mr. BACHUS.
H.R. 1465: Mr. MCNERNEY.
H.R. 1466: Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia.
H.R. 1502: Mr. GERLACH and Mr. NUNES.
H.R. 1528: Mr. HARRIS.
H.R. 1531: Mr. CICILLINE.
H.R. 1572: Mr. WOMACK.
H.R. 1590: Mr. HANNA.
H.R. 1620: Mr. LUETKEMEYER and Mr. PETERS of Michigan.
H.R. 1690: Mr. POLIS.
H.R. 1692: Mr. SMITH of New Jersey.
H.R. 1696: Mr. CONNOLLY.
H.R. 1734: Mr. COHEN.
H.R. 1771: Mr. PITTENGER and Mr. LATTA.
H.R. 1775: Mr. MARCHANT, Mr. WESTMORELAND, and Mr. WITTMAN.
H.R. 1779: Mr. RENACCI.
H.R. 1787: Mr. OLSON and Mr. GALLEGO.
H.R. 1795: Mr. COSTA.
H.R. 1825: Mr. GRIFFIN of Arkansas, Mr. BACHUS, Mrs. NOEM, and Mr. HECK of Nevada.
H.R. 1843: Ms. WATERS and Mr. HIMES.
H.R. 1844: Mr. TAKANO, Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, and Mr. POCAN.
H.R. 1852: Mr. HONDA, Mr. JORDAN, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mrs. ROBY, Mr. ELLISON, Mr. LAMALFA, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. COHEN, Mr. NADLER, Ms. LEE of California, Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, and Mr. MCNERNEY.

H.R. 1869: Mr. FITZPATRICK, Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia, Ms. KUSTER, Mrs. BUSTOS, Mr. TERRY, Mr. KINZINGER of Illinois, Mr. FATTAH, and Mr. PERRY.

H.R. 1874: Mr. BARLETTA and Mr. KINZINGER of Illinois.

H.R. 1877: Mr. CONNOLLY.

H.R. 1908: Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. CHABOT, Mr. WEBER of Texas, Mr. BISHOP of Utah, Mr. PITTENGER, and Mr. WALBERG.

H.R. 1910: Mr. SWALWELL of California.

H.R. 1913: Mr. COHEN.

H.R. 1915: Ms. LOFGREN and Ms. WATERS.

H.R. 1920: Mr. LANGEVIN, Mr. WELCH, and Mr. KENNEDY.

H.R. 1921: Mr. SARBANES.

H.R. 1985: Mr. KINZINGER of Illinois.

H.R. 2009: Mr. KINZINGER of Illinois.

H.R. 2016: Mr. WALBERG, Mr. NEUGEBAUER, Mr. FLORES, and Mr. BENTIVOLIO.

H.R. 2019: Mr. HOLDING, Mr. ROSS, Mr. WOMACK, Mr. GIBBS, Ms. HERRERA BEUTLER, and Mrs. NOEM.

H.R. 2029: Mr. CARTWRIGHT.

H.R. 2030: Mr. COHEN and Mr. QUIGLEY.

H.R. 2044: Mr. NADLER and Mr. BLUMENAUER.

H.R. 2052: Mr. RADEL.

H.R. 2066: Mr. UPTON and Mr. ROSKAM.

H.R. 2085: Mr. SCHNEIDER.

H.R. 2093: Mr. NUNES and Mr. GOODLATTE.

H.R. 2139: Mr. ROSKAM.

H.R. 2146: Mr. OWENS.

H.R. 2149: Ms. NORTON.

H.R. 2162: Mr. MCCLINTOCK.

H.R. 2178: Mr. PAYNE.

H.R. 2182: Mr. YARMUTH.

H.R. 2208: Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD and Mr. THOMPSON of California.

H.R. 2221: Mr. GARRETT, Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. FORTENBERRY, Mr. STIVERS, Ms. SHEA-PORTER, and Mr. MATHESON.

H.R. 2224: Mr. SMITH of Washington, Mr. WELCH, Mr. CICILLINE, and Mr. SCHOCK.

H.R. 2273: Mr. REED.

H.R. 2300: Mr. HUDSON and Mrs. HARTZLER.

H.R. 2302: Mr. WELCH and Mr. RYAN of Ohio.

H.R. 2309: Mr. DENHAM, Mr. FITZPATRICK, Mr. AL GREEN of Texas, Mr. LATHAM, Mr. POSEY, Mr. YOUNG of Florida, and Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois.

H.R. 2315: Mr. KINZINGER of Illinois.

H.R. 2360: Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania.

H.R. 2387: Mr. REED.

H.R. 2394: Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina.

H.R. 2409: Mr. NUNNELEE, Mr. BROOKS of Alabama, Mrs. BACHMANN, Mrs. HARTZLER, Mr. NEUGEBAUER, Mr. FORBES, Mr. LAMALFA, and Mr. WESTMORELAND.

H.R. 2413: Mr. BENTIVOLIO.

H.R. 2429: Mr. GOODLATTE, Mr. BARLETTA, Mr. YOUNG of Indiana, Mr. SMITH of Nebraska, Mr. STIVERS, and Mr. MULLIN.

H.R. 2445: Mr. CULBERSON and Mr. HARRIS.

H.R. 2446: Mr. KLINE.

H.R. 2449: Mr. BERA of California and Mr. CONNOLLY.

H.R. 2456: Mr. BENTIVOLIO.

H.R. 2459: Mr. KING of New York.

H.R. 2500: Mr. WALBERG.

H.R. 2501: Mr. RANGEL, Mr. RADEL, and Mr. NUNNELEE.

H.R. 2503: Mr. BILIRAKIS.

H.R. 2506: Mr. BENTIVOLIO, Mr. OWENS, Mr. CÁRDENAS, Mr. WOLF, Mr. BARROW of Georgia, Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. WELCH, Mr. PETERS of California, Mr. FITZPATRICK, Ms. SINEMA, Ms. KUSTER, Ms. JENKINS, Mrs. BUSTOS, Mr. KINZINGER of Illinois, Mr. MEEHAN, Mr. GIBSON, and Mr. FATTAH.

H.R. 2511: Mr. WESTMORELAND.

H.R. 2518: Mr. KIND.

H.R. 2536: Ms. LEE of California and Ms. ESHOO.

H.R. 2557: Mr. FLORES, Mr. NEUGEBAUER, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Mr. STOCKMAN, Mr. GRIFFIN of Arkansas, Mr. WALBERG, Mr. ROKITA, Mr. FLEMING, Mr. POSEY, and Mr. LAMBORN.

H.R. 2565: Mr. PAULSEN, Mr. RADEL, Mr. NUNNELEE, Mr. NEUGEBAUER, Mr. TURNER, and Mrs. HARTZLER.

H.R. 2575: Mr. CASSIDY, Mr. BENTIVOLIO, and Mr. WESTMORELAND.

H.R. 2579: Mr. WESTMORELAND.

H.R. 2590: Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. FITZPATRICK, Mr. WELCH, Ms. SINEMA, Ms. KUSTER, Mr. RIGELL, Mr. JOYCE, Mr. PETERS of California, Mrs. BUSTOS, Mr. FATTAH, Mr. MEEHAN, and Mr. LIPINSKI.

H.R. 2591: Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas.

H.R. 2619: Mr. GRIJALVA.

H.R. 2633: Mr. KING of New York and Mr. HASTINGS of Florida.

H.R. 2643: Mr. RIBBLE, Ms. SINEMA, Ms. JENKINS, Mr. KINZINGER of Illinois, Mrs. BUSTOS, Mr. DENT, Mr. GIBSON, Mr. LOESBACK, Mr. FATTAH, Mr. RUIZ, and Mr. PERRY.

H.R. 2652: Mr. POCAN and Mr. PASTOR of Arizona.

H.R. 2668: Mr. BENISHEK.

H.R. 2670: Ms. SHEA-PORTER, Mr. FARR and Mr. SWALWELL of California.

H.R. 2675: Mr. LOWENTHAL, Mr. WELCH, Mr. GIBSON, Ms. GABBARD, Mr. FATTAH, and Ms. BROWNLEY of California.

H.R. 2677: Mr. HECK of Washington.

H.R. 2679: Mr. SALMON, Mr. NEUGEBAUER and Mr. WESTMORELAND.

H.R. 2682: Mr. ROKITA, Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Mr. BROOKS of Alabama, Mr. WILLIAMS, Mr. SALMON, Mr. NEUGEBAUER, Mr. FLORES, Mr. HULTGREN, Mr. CONAWAY, Mr. STUTZMAN, Mr. GRIFFIN of Arkansas, Mr. DAINES, Mr. BISHOP of Utah, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Mr. WEBER of Texas, Mr. BENTIVOLIO, Mr. HUIZENGA of Michigan and Mr. POE of Texas.

H.R. 2686: Mr. COOK, Ms. BROWNLEY of California, Mr. FITZPATRICK, Mrs. BUSTOS, Mr. RIGELL, Ms. SINEMA, Mr. FATTAH, and Mr. PERRY.

H.R. 2689: Mr. WOLF, Mr. BARROW of Georgia, Mr. MULVANEY, Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. REED, Ms. JENKINS, Mr. DENT, Ms. GABBARD, Mrs. BUSTOS, Ms. SINEMA, Mr. GIBSON, Mr. FATTAH, Mr. RUIZ, and Ms. BROWNLEY of California.

H.R. 2691: Ms. DELAURO.

H.R. 2692: Mr. CLAY.

H.R. 2694: Mr. REED, Mr. YOUNG of Indiana, Mr. MAFFEI, Mr. COFFMAN, Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Mr. BERA of California, Mr. NOLAN, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. MORAN, Mr. SCHRADER, Mr. COOPER, Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York, Mr. MATHESON, Mr. BARROW of Georgia, Mr. BENTIVOLIO, Mr. PETERS of California, Mrs. BUSTOS, Ms. SINEMA, Ms. JENKINS, Mr. SCHNEIDER, Mr. OWENS, Mr. CICILLINE, Mr. LOEBSACK, Ms. GABBARD, Mr. RUIZ, and Mr. PERRY.

H.R. 2695: Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas and Mr. HUFFMAN.

H.J. Res. 20: Mr. BEN RAY LUJÁN of New Mexico.

H.J. Res. 44: Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi.

H. Con. Res. 41: Mr. CARTWRIGHT, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, and Mr. RUSH.

H. Con. Res. 45: Mr. BISHOP of Utah, Mr. LAMBORN, Mr. STOCKMAN, Mr. BARTON, Mr. KING of Iowa, Mr. GOHMERT, Mr. MULVANEY, Mr. JORDAN, Mr. NEUGEBAUER, Mr. SALMON, Mr. BROOKS of Alabama, Mr. SOUTHERLAND, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Mr. ROE of Tennessee, Mr. LAMALFA, Mr. COLE, Mr. HARRIS, Mr. MCCLINTOCK, and Mr. LATTA.

H. Res. 47: Mr. PAYNE, Ms. CHU, Mr. NADLER, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. CONNOLLY, Ms. DUCKWORTH, Ms. SINEMA, Mr. RUIZ, Mr. MEEKS, Mr. MAFFEI, Mr. SHERMAN, Mr. AL GREEN of Texas, Ms. CASTOR of Florida, Mr. DINGELL, Mr. TONKO, Ms. SPEIER, Mr. HECK of Washington, Mr. CLEAVER, Mr. TAKANO, Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. NOLAN, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. WALZ, Mr. MURPHY of Florida, Mr. SCHIFF, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York, and Mrs. BEATTY.

H. Res. 109: Mr. SHERMAN, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, and Mr. BARLETTA.

H. Res. 135: Ms. LOFGREN.

H. Res. 249: Mr. BEN RAY LUJÁN of New Mexico.

H. Res. 282: Mr. HINOJOSA, Ms. JENKINS, Mr. CÁRDENAS, Mr. LANGEVIN, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Mr. CLAY, Ms. SCHWARTZ, Mr. DINGELL, and Mr. VAN HOLLEN.

H. Res. 284: Mr. KINZINGER of Illinois and Mr. GARAMENDI.

H. Res. 285: Mr. ROSKAM and Mr. PAYNE.

H. Res. 293: Mr. GIBSON, Mrs. WALORSKI, Mr. BENTIVOLIO, and Mr. HECK of Nevada.

CONGRESSIONAL EARMARKS, LIMITED TAX BENEFITS, OR LIMITED TARIFF BENEFITS

Under clause 9 of rule XXI, lists or statements on congressional earmarks, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits were submitted as follows:

The amendment to be offered by Representative KLINE, or a designee, to H.R. 5, Student Success Act, does not contain any congressional earmarks, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits as defined in clause 9 of rule XXI.