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.

United States of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 113th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

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

Senate

The Senate met at 9:30 a.m. and was called to order by the Honorable CARL LEVIN, a Senator from the State of Michigan.

PRAYER

The Chaplain, Dr. Barry C. Black, offered the following prayer:

Let us pray.

Eternal God our king, You rule from Your throne, sustaining us with the unfolding of Your providence. Today, abide with our Senators and all those to whom You have committed the government of this Nation. Lord, give them Your special gifts of wisdom and understanding, of counsel and strength, providing them with the insights to choose what is best. Bless them with constancy of purpose and an unfailing devotion to their duties. Answer their prayers and give them Your peace.

We pray in Your merciful Name. Amen.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The Presiding Officer led the Pledge of Allegiance, as follows:

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

APPOINTMENT OF ACTING PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will please read a communication to the Senate from the President pro tempore (Mr. LEAHY).

The assistant legislative clerk read the following letter:

U.S. SENATE,
PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE,
Washington, DC, July 17, 2013.

To the Senate:

Under the provisions of rule I, paragraph 3, of the Standing Rules of the Senate, I hereby appoint the Honorable CARL LEVIN, a Senator from the State of Michigan, to perform the duties of the Chair.

PATRICK J. LEAHY,
President pro tempore.

Mr. LEVIN thereupon assumed the chair as Acting President pro tempore.

RECOGNITION OF THE MAJORITY LEADER

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The majority leader is recognized.

KEEP STUDENT LOANS AFFORDABLE ACT OF 2013—MOTION TO PROCEED

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I move to proceed to Calendar No. 124.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will report the bill by title.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

Motion to proceed to Calendar No. 124, S. 1238, a bill to amend the Higher Education Act of 1965 to extend the current reduced interest rate for undergraduate Federal Direct Stafford Loans for 1 year, and to modify required distribution rules for pension plans, and for other purposes.

SCHEDULE

Mr. REID. Following my remarks and those of the Republican leader, we will proceed to executive session to consider the nomination of Fred Hochberg to be president of the very important Export-Import Bank. At 10 a.m. there will be a cloture vote on the Hochberg nomination.

Following that, if cloture is invoked, we will have, as a result of some rules changes made earlier this year, 8 hours of debate. I doubt seriously if the Democrats will take any of their time, so we should be able to finish that sometime soon and have a vote on his confirmation, if we invoke cloture.

We then have left on the calendar for this week the Secretary of Labor and the head of the EPA. So we should be able to finish that tomorrow.

SENATE FRIENDSHIPS

Mr. President, I am so glad to see the Presiding Officer in the Chair. For those who perhaps are not aware, Senator LEVIN is a long-time Member of the Senate, and he has decided not to run again, which is very sad for the State of Michigan, the Senate, and the country, but that is the decision he made.

I had the good fortune—and he has heard me say this before, but I will say it again because I will never forget this—of coming to the Congress in 1982, with Senator LEVIN's brother—his older brother—and so the first time I met Senator CARL LEVIN I was contemplating whether I should run for the Senate, after having served in the House. At the very beginning of our visit—a visit in Senator LEVIN's office—I said to him: I know your brother. He and I came to Congress together a few years ago. CARL looked at me so intently and so seriously and said: Yes, he is my brother, but he is also my best friend. Well, having three brothers of my own, that was something that always stuck with me.

Senator LEVIN is our Presiding Officer today, and it doesn't happen very often, so we appreciate that. Our more senior Members don't preside as often as the more junior Members.

I also want to say, with this man in the chair, that we just had one of those rare occasions where the senior Senator from Michigan and I disagreed. The disagreement we had had nothing to do with us and everything to do with positions we had taken. We need not get into what the difference was—it was something dealing with the Senate and had nothing to do with our personalities—but I will say, as a result of the efforts of Senator LEVIN, I am sure he is as pleased as I am with what happened here in the Senate in the last couple of days.

For a number of reasons, not the least of which is the input of the Senator from Michigan, we have now started a new era—I hope a new normal era—here in the Senate where Senators, instead of talking past each

● This "bullet" symbol identifies statements or insertions which are not spoken by a Member of the Senate on the floor.

Printed on recycled paper.

other, start talking to each other. So I want to publicly state I appreciate the Senator from Michigan for many different reasons.

Senator LEVIN has been a long-time protector of our military, as the chairman of the Armed Services Committee. I am not an expert on what is happening in that committee, but I do know that during the more than three decades I have been in Congress no one has been more vigilant and caring about the men and women who serve in our military. So I admire, appreciate, and have great affection for the Presiding Officer.

The burdens we as leaders here in the Senate have—and I was reflecting on this as I was walking in here this morning—whether it is the Armed Services Committee or the things I am called upon to do, are so minimal compared to the burdens of the President of the United States—whoever the President of the United States happens to be. But let's focus on Barack Obama. Every day he gets up for a briefing about what is going on around the world, and there are so many things going on around the world that are so difficult—for him, for us as a country, and for the world. The problems we have here at home, as the leader of the superpower that we are, he has to deal with every day.

I had a visit with the President yesterday on the telephone. After we worked out an arrangement here in the Senate that was pleasing to virtually everybody, he called me and said: Thanks. I know it was a lot of hard work—and all that stuff. But I commented to him: We all realize the burdens that you bear. And I think we do. If we pause and think for a minute, it is easy to understand the heavy burdens this man bears.

We all know what a fine human being he is, and we have watched him, as we have seen all Presidents change before our eyes, this vibrant young man who served here in the Senate with us, with his coal-black hair, and now, after a few years, that hair is similar to that of myself and Senator LEVIN. He is still vibrant and strong, but he has a lot of burdens on his shoulders. Having worked with him as closely as I have, I have such understanding of what I think he goes through—at least somewhat of an understanding and some empathy for what he goes through.

Maybe somebody at the White House will pass him a copy of this exchange between the Presiding Officer and myself and they will tell him how much we in the Senate, Democrats and Republicans—the Republicans may disagree with him politically, but I don't think you can find a Republican who doesn't admire him as a good human being.

RESERVATION OF LEADER TIME

Mr. President, would you announce the business of the day?

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, the leadership time is reserved.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

NOMINATION OF FRED P. HOCHBERG TO BE PRESIDENT OF THE EXPORT-IMPORT BANK OF THE UNITED STATES

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, the Senate will proceed to executive session to consider the following nomination which the clerk will report.

The assistant legislative clerk read the nomination of Fred P. Hochberg, of New York, to be President of the Export-Import Bank of the United States.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, the time until 10 a.m. will be equally divided and controlled between the two leaders or their designees.

Mr. REID. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Ms. MIKULSKI. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MURPHY). Without objection, it is so ordered.

CLOTURE MOTION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, pursuant to rule XXII, the Chair lays before the Senate the pending cloture motion, which the clerk will report.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, hereby move to bring to a close debate on the nomination of Fred P. Hochberg, of New York, to be President of the Export-Import Bank of the United States.

Harry Reid, Tim Johnson, Benjamin L. Cardin, Christopher A. Coons, Patrick J. Leahy, Charles E. Schumer, Ron Wyden, Patty Murray, Heidi Heitkamp, Tom Udall, Martin Heinrich, Jack Reed, Sheldon Whitehouse, Elizabeth Warren, Richard J. Durbin, Kirsten E. Gillibrand, Robert Menendez

The PRESIDING OFFICER. By unanimous consent, the mandatory quorum call has been waived.

The question is, Is it the sense of the Senate that debate on the nomination of Fred P. Hochberg, of New York, to be President of the Export-Import Bank of the United States for a term expiring January 20, 2017, shall be brought to a close?

The yeas and nays are mandatory under the rule.

The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 82, nays 18, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 175 Ex.]

YEAS—82

Alexander	Baucus	Blumenthal
Ayotte	Begich	Blunt
Baldwin	Bennet	Boozman
Boxer	Heinrich	Nelson
Brown	Heitkamp	Portman
Burr	Heller	Pryor
Cantwell	Hirono	Reed
Cardin	Hoeven	Reid
Carper	Isakson	Rockefeller
Casey	Johanns	Sanders
Chiesa	Johnson (SD)	Schatz
Coats	Kaine	Schumer
Cochran	King	Scott
Collins	Kirk	Sessions
Coons	Klobuchar	Shaheen
Corker	Landrieu	Stabenow
Crapo	Leahy	Tester
Donnelly	Levin	Thune
Durbin	Manchin	Udall (CO)
Feinstein	Markey	Udall (NM)
Fischer	McCain	Vitter
Flake	McCaskill	Warner
Franken	Menendez	Warren
Gillibrand	Merkley	Whitehouse
Graham	Mikulski	Wicker
Hagan	Murkowski	Wyden
Harkin	Murphy	
Hatch	Murray	

NAYS—18

Barrasso	Grassley	Paul
Chambliss	Inhofe	Risch
Coburn	Johnson (WI)	Roberts
Cornyn	Lee	Rubio
Cruz	McConnell	Shelby
Enzi	Moran	Toomey

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Ms. HEITKAMP). On this vote, the yeas are 82, the nays are 18. Three-fifths of the Senators duly chosen and sworn having voted in the affirmative, the motion is agreed to.

Pursuant to S. Res. 15 of the 113th Congress, there is now 8 hours of postcloture debate equally divided in the usual form.

Who yields time?

If no one yields, the time will be equally divided.

The Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. TOOMEY. Madam President, I rise to speak for a few moments about the cloture vote we just had and the confirmation vote that is upcoming.

First of all, let me start by saying I think Mr. Hochberg is a good, capable, and competent person. The point I am making is that the candidate for President of the Ex-Im Bank, for whom we just granted cloture and are likely to confirm, is a capable individual.

I voted against cloture, and I am going to vote against this confirmation. It is not about him. I wish to explain what this is about for me and why I think this is a lost opportunity. Precisely, it is this: By invoking cloture, as we have just done, and confirming Mr. Hochberg, as we are no doubt about to do, I think we are going to miss a big opportunity to insist on some modest reforms that are necessary at the Ex-Im Bank and we are going to miss an opportunity to pressure the administration and the Ex-Im Bank to follow existing law in ways that are not currently being followed. I wish to touch on a couple of these.

First of all, just by way of background, a reminder about the Ex-Im Bank: This is a taxpayer risk. This is a bank that makes taxpayer-backed loans and guarantees to countries and companies that buy American products. In 2012 we reauthorized the ongoing existence of the Ex-Im Bank and increased its lending authority to $140

billion. Now, not only are taxpayers taking a risk every time a loan is made by the Ex-Im Bank, but the taxpayers are systematically being undercompensated for that loan. The pricing on these loans is necessarily not reflective of the full risk to the taxpayer. How do we know that? Because if they were fully pricing in the risk, then the Ex-Im Bank wouldn't have a competitive advantage over other private banks. They would be more than happy to finance exports. In fact, the export bank exists for the purpose of subsidizing these exports, and they do it in the form of consciously and intentionally underpricing the loans so that the taxpayers do not get an adequate compensation and certainly not a market compensation for the risk they take. That is just the reality. That is the nature of the Ex-Im Bank.

I would also point out that Ex-Im Bank's inspector general issued a report in September about some of the issues they discovered in the management of the Ex-Im Bank. They recommended that the Ex-Im Bank undergo stress testing. We require this of all of the big private financial institutions. They require that they go through all kinds of analyses about what would happen to their institutions under different economic and market circumstances that could occur, and then we evaluate how well they hold up to the stress of changes in interest rates, changes in economic conditions, and so on. The Ex-Im Bank has promised they will do this, but we haven't seen any results.

The inspector general also suggested some at least soft limits on concentration because the Ex-Im Bank is massively concentrated in a single industry. Almost all of the financing it provides is in a single industry, and that creates a risk to the taxpayers, of course, if there is a problem in that industry. The Ex-Im Bank has rejected considering any concentration limits.

The third thing I would point out is that the inspector general's report suggested that the board have more oversight authority. The Ex-Im Bank has not agreed to increase the board's oversight authority.

There is another problem with the Ex-Im Bank, it seems to me; that is, by its very nature it picks winners and losers in ways that are inappropriate. I will give a few examples. Because it is a government entity, it is ultimately controlled by the political class and its activities ultimately get politicized. It has already happened. For instance, in an entity that is supposed to be all about subsidizing exports for job creation purposes, there are mandates that a certain amount of their business has to be green activity. It has to be what some people think is acceptable or preferable in the energy space. That is a judgment which has nothing to do with maximizing overall exports. It is a political decision that is imposed on the Ex-Im Bank because politicians can. There is also a mandate on small business, which is to favor one sector over another.

There was an amendment when we were considering this bill. One of our colleagues offered an amendment that would force the Ex-Im Bank to make sure a certain amount of their business was subsidized loans to African companies and countries. I am sure this Senator has a very sincere interest in supporting Africa in various ways. That is fine if he has that interest, but is the Ex-Im Bank the vehicle we are supposed to use to do that? Let's keep in mind that when we establish a minimum statutory lending hurdle for some geographical area and Ex-Im is not there, they have to lower their standards to reach that goal, so it increases taxpayer risk for this political goal.

My point is that it is inevitable, it is guaranteed, it is already happening that this process becomes politicized, and that is not a good idea.

There is another problem with the activity of the Ex-Im Bank, which is that taxpayer-backed loans and guarantees also inevitably help some American companies at the expense of others. That is the nature of this, and that is a problem. One clear example is commercial air carriers. We have American companies that are airlines, they are commercial carriers, and then there are foreign companies that do this as well, and they compete directly against American carriers. Well, if you are a foreign airline, you get the Ex-Im Bank subsidy loan to buy your aircraft, and if you are an American airline, you don't. This happens. It happened recently. Air India got a $3.4 billion loan subsidy from Ex-Im Bank so they can buy their aircraft, and Air India competes directly with American companies that are not eligible for the loans because it is not considered an export.

These are the sorts of unintended consequences that occur when the government creates these mechanisms for meddling in the markets.

By the way, under current law the Ex-Im Bank is required to provide an analysis and make the analysis public about any adverse impact on American companies when they engage in this sort of activity, and we haven't seen that analysis. In fact, we have a court decision that criticizes the Ex-Im Bank. The court of appeals found that they had, in fact, failed to comply with this law about assessing the negative financial impact on U.S. companies; nevertheless, they are continuing to make these loan guarantees in this context.

All of these problems have been discussed in the past. We have had this debate before. One of the very constructive things we did in the 2012 reauthorization of the Export-Import Bank was that we said: What is the reason—why do we do all of this? The proponents always give the same argument—it is always the same—and it is that other countries around the world do this to subsidize their exports, and if we don't subsidize ours we will be at a competitive disadvantage and we can't have that.

That is the justification we always get. One can question the wisdom of that justification. We could have a big debate about that. But let's put that aside for a second because there is a potential solution to that problem. It is that in global trade talks and bilateral and multilateral trade talks, we, the United States—the world's biggest trading country, the world's biggest economy—could insist on a process by which we have a mutual wind-down of this economically unhealthy activity. The countries of the world that have these export-subsidizing banks could mutually agree to phase them out. Then we wouldn't have to do it because they do it, taxpayers wouldn't have this risk, and we wouldn't be unfairly benefiting some companies at the expense of others. We could phase this out.

In fact, that is exactly what the 2012 authorization bill requires. It requires the administration to begin negotiating with our trading partners for a mutual phaseout of all export subsidies. I believe that is the right solution to this admittedly difficult problem. Let's all agree we are going to phase out this activity.

Well, despite the fact that this mandate is in the reauthorization bill we passed a year ago—it is the law of the land—it is not happening. It is just not happening. There are no such discussions under way. There are no such negotiations. This is certainly not a priority of the administration's trading activity. I am not sure it exists at all as a priority. This is the main reason I came to the floor this morning and voted against cloture.

Cloture—the requirement to get the 60 votes to cut off debate to then consider the vote on the underlying nominee—is a very important tool. If we had held 41 votes, 41 Senators who refused to agree to cut off debate, the administration would have been in a little bit of a pickle because by the end of this month, in the absence of a newly confirmed President, the Ex-Im Bank couldn't do any business. So what would have happened? Would the Ex-Im Bank have just shut down? No. That wasn't ever going to happen. But what might have happened is we might have had a discussion: Can we get the administration to actually begin the negotiating they are supposed to do under existing law? Could they please begin to observe the law? Could the Ex-Im Bank actually begin to respond to the inspector general's reports? And in the pressure, frankly, of this moment, I think we would have had progress. Instead, we have voted for cloture. I think later today we are going to vote to confirm the nominee, who, as I said, is a very capable, very competent individual. So none of this is going to happen. What we are going to do is confirm the status quo, continue business as usual, business as it has been.

This, of course, occurs in a context, right? It occurs in the context of this argument we have been having about whether Republicans have been obstructing nominees, and I think, frankly, it infects the judgment about how Senators might consider voting on something such as a cloture measure. I would just remind everybody that going into this discussion earlier this week, the Senate had confirmed 1,560 of the President's nominees and was blocking 4—1,560 to 4. Some are suggesting that is an outrageous activity on our part because it denies the President the opportunity to assemble his team. Really? He has 1,560 confirmed, and there are 4 we are holding. That works out to 99.7 percent of the President's nominees confirmed, and we are portrayed as preventing the President from assembling his team. I completely reject that characterization. I think the President has enjoyed a tremendous opportunity and reality of getting his team in place, getting them confirmed.

We ought not relinquish the power the Constitution gives to the Senate to advise and consent. Remember, the Constitution doesn't just say that the Senate shall advise, it says advise and consent. ''Consent'' has a very specific meaning. If we do this automatically and routinely and we think that—I guess those who object to our approving 1,560 and objecting to 4—it seems to me the implication is that we are supposed to simply routinely rubberstamp everyone, there can't be any objections ever, whatsoever. That is not what the Constitution calls for. As a matter of constitutional principle, that is a very flawed analysis.

I wanted to speak this morning because this is a very real, specific case of where, had we exercised more fully, in my judgment, our opportunity to deny cloture, we would have made a little bit of progress in better observation of existing law, further reducing risk the taxpayers take, and getting the Ex-Im Bank to comply with some of the recommendations in the inspector general's report. I wanted to share that.

I know how this vote is going to go. I know Mr. Hochberg is going to be confirmed. I hope we will be able to make progress anyway, but I am sure we would have had a better chance of making meaningful progress if we had used this moment.

As we consider future nominees, I hope we will remember that this is a fundamental and important role for the Senate to play—to use confirmation as a moment to focus the attention of the administration on what is important to our constituents, to our taxpayers, and I hope we won't relinquish that opportunity.

I yield the floor.

OBAMACARE

Mr. LEE. Madam President, 2 weeks ago, while most Americans were busy getting ready for the Fourth of July holiday, the Obama administration made a stunning announcement about the President's signature legislative accomplishment, the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act.

The President admitted to the American people that because ObamaCare was so poorly crafted, he was delaying the enforcement of the employer mandate and would not assess fines and penalties to big companies that refused to provide insurance to their employees. The President explained that businesses could not handle ''the complexity of the requirements,'' and government bureaucrats would spend the next year simplifying the reporting rules so companies could comply.

I expected that in the next paragraph he would acknowledge that American families also deserve relief because, as polls consistently reflect, they have very big problems with the requirements as well. They have concerns about the government-run health care scheme known as the exchanges.

Henry Chao, the chief technical officer in charge of implementing the ObamaCare exchanges, has said:

> I'm pretty nervous. . . . Let's just make sure it's not a third-world experience.

American families also have very grave concerns about how much ObamaCare is going to add to our national debt. The Congressional Budget Office now estimates that the cost to taxpayers over the next 10 years will be $1.8 trillion. Young Americans are particularly concerned about ObamaCare because it is becoming clear that they will see the highest increases in health care premiums.

One study published in the magazine of the American Academy of Actuaries shows that middle- and low-income single adults between 21 and 29 years of age will see their premiums rise by 46 percent even after they take the ObamaCare subsidy.

A joint report by Republicans on the House Energy and Commerce, Senate Finance, and Senate HELP Committees that looked at over 30 different studies concluded that:

> Recent college graduates with entry-level jobs who are struggling to pay off student loan debt could see their premiums increase on average between 145 and 189 percent. Some studies estimate young adults could experience premium increases as high as 203 percent.

In my State, the State of Utah, premiums for young people will jump anywhere from 56 to 90 percent. As I read this statement from the Treasury Department, I was shocked to find no mention of these people. Parents, families, students, employees, taxpayers, hard-working Americans in general were totally left out, along with their concerns about the complexity of the requirements imposed by ObamaCare.

A senior adviser to the President took to the White House blog to spin the administration's announcement before long. She said:

> In our ongoing discussions with businesses, we have heard that you need time to get this right.

But why aren't American families part of these same ongoing discussions? Isn't the White House obligated to get this right for them too, before assessing fines and penalties and forcing them into a government-run third-world experience?

We knew ObamaCare would be unaffordable, but now we know it is also going to be unfair. It is fundamentally unfair for the President to exempt businesses from the onerous burdens of his law while forcing American families and individuals into ObamaCare's unsound and unstable system. It is unfair to protect the bottom lines of big business while making hard-working Americans pay the price through higher premiums, stiff penalties, cutbacks in worker hours, and job losses.

It is unfair to give businesses more time to figure out complex regulations but force everyone else to figure out equally complex mandates and requirements applicable to individuals. This administration has chosen to put its own political preferences and the interests of various government cronies ahead of those of the American people.

Republicans in Congress must now stand up for the individuals and families who do not have the money, who do not have the lobbyists, who do not have the connections to get this administration's attention on this important issue. We should do so using one of the few constitutional powers that Congress still carefully guards: its power of the purse.

As long as President Obama selectively enforces ObamaCare, no annual appropriations bill and no continuing resolution should fund further implementation of this law. In other words, if the President will not follow it, the American people should not fund it.

Last week's admission by the administration means that after more than 3 years of preparation and trial and error, the best case scenario for ObamaCare will be rampant dysfunction, waste, and injustice to taxpayers and working families. Even the President himself is now admitting that ObamaCare will not work. It is unaffordable and unfair.

If he will not follow it, we should not fund it. The only reasonable choice now is to protect the country from ObamaCare's looming disaster, start over, and finally begin work on real health care reform that works for everyone.

I would like to shift topics and speak briefly in opposition to the confirmation of Fred Hochberg to continue as Chairman and President of the Export-Import Bank. By confirming Mr. Hochberg, we would perpetuate the existence of an organization whose sole purpose is to dispense corporate welfare and political privileges to well-connected special interests.

The Export-Import Bank, or Ex-Im as it is commonly known, is an example of everything that is wrong with Washington today. It is big government

serving the interests of big corporations at the expense of individuals, families, and small businesses throughout America.

I am, of course, not alone in this view. I have good company. In 2008, while campaigning for the office of President of the United States, then-Senator Barack Obama referred to Ex-Im as ''little more than a fund for corporate welfare.'' So it is. After all, in fiscal year 2012, $12.2 billion of Ex-Im's $14.7 billion in loan guarantees went to a single company—one company. Our free enterprise system may not be perfect, but it is fair. Crony capitalism which is promoted by the Export-Import Bank is neither.

Abraham Lincoln once said that the leading object of government was to ''lift artificial weights from all shoulders, to clear the paths of laudable pursuit for all, to afford all an unfettered start and a fair chance in the race of life.''

Crony capitalism is the opposite of this noble vision. It lays on artificial waste, obstructs paths of laudable pursuit, and makes the race of life fettered and unfair. We may have honest disagreements about when and whether and to what extent and under what circumstances it is a good idea for the government to redistribute wealth from the rich and give it to the poor, but can't we all agree it is always a bad idea to redistribute wealth from the poor and the middle class and give it to large corporations?

The saddest part is it is not even clear the bank actually helps U.S. firms to outperform their foreign competitors. Ex-Im's convoluted financing has been accused of pricing at least one U.S. airline out of being able to compete with foreign firms, and at least one court has agreed.

Cronyism is a cancer. It undermines public trust in our economy and in our political system. Ordinary Americans who have the gnawing sense that the game seems rigged against them unfortunately have good reason to feel that way. It is not the free market that serves the middle men at the expense of the middle class. It is the crony cartels of big government, big business, and big special interests conspiring against the American dream, helping each other to American taxpayers' money. The Ex-Im Bank is part of this graft.

I urge all of my colleagues to join me in opposing this nominee and the crony capitalist organization that he leads.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Washington.

Ms. CANTWELL. Madam President, I rise to speak in support of Fred Hochberg and his nomination to the second term as Chairman of the Export-Import Bank. I have heard now two speeches on the other side of the aisle from my colleagues who not only seem to take exception with Mr. Hochberg's nomination but the Export-Import Bank in and of itself.

I think they are wrong. I think they are wrong because they do not understand Washington's need to focus on the fact that we have an export economy. We want U.S. products to be bought and sold in countries and markets all over the world. We are here today to talk about a critical vote to support 225,000 jobs that are part of our export economy. If we fail to confirm Fred Hochberg for a second term as Chairman of the Export-Import Bank, businesses across the United States will lose a key tool in job creation.

This is because his term expires, runs out, on July 20.

What would that mean? It would mean the Export-Import Bank, which needs at least three of its five board members to have a quorum, would not have a quorum and would not be able to issue any new loans. This means the transactions that U.S. companies depend on, the guarantees and the transactions to finance the sale of U.S. products and services overseas, would not be able to move forward.

If we don't confirm Mr. Hochberg this week, the bank cannot approve loans and it would take away a job-creating tool that American innovators and businesses count on. This is why I am calling on my colleagues, in a bipartisan fashion, to confirm Mr. Hochberg as the Export-Import Bank Chairman for a second term.

His nomination is supported by the Chamber of Commerce and by the National Association of Manufacturers. He has proven to be a solid leader in his organization by listening, implementing, innovating, and administering a very critical job-creation tool.

When I visited businesses across my State in 2012 to talk about the Export-Import Bank, I heard the American people wanted us to focus on job creation and supporting business. The Export-Import Bank helps American-made products to be shipped all around the world.

I saw a company in my State, Yakima, WA, the Manhasset music stand company, use the Export-Import Bank to make sure sales go all around the globe, including China.

I saw a grain silo manufacturer called SCAFCO in Spokane, which also would testify to the fact that they have been able to sell their grain to many countries around the globe because of the financing the Export-Import Bank guarantees.

Airline cockpit hardware made by the Esterline Corporation factory in Everett, WA, also testified to the same effect; that when you are looking around the globe to secure financing of U.S. products into more developing countries, it is hard to get the financing to work.

The United States can be left at the starting line or the United States can use this vital tool that I call a tactic for small business to get access to make sure their products get a final sale.

The Export-Import Bank supports 83,000 jobs in my State alone, which benefits from the finance mechanism. Over the last 5 years, it has supported many jobs throughout the United States. Overall, it supported, as I said, 225,000 jobs and more than 3,000 businesses in 2012.

In the small business area, 2,500 of those are small businesses. The notion that this is somehow crony capitalism—and maybe he is talking about the shenanigans that happened on Wall Street, but he is certainly not talking about the Export-Import Bank.

I am advocating that we keep the very positive results of this bank, keep Mr. Hochberg, and make sure we continue to sell our products from Everett, WA, or Auburn, KY, all over the globe.

Ninety-five percent of the world's consumers live outside our borders. The question is: are we going to make sure that U.S. products get into the hands of the growing middle class around the globe? In 2030, China's middle class will be 1 billion people, 1 billion middle-class people in China, up from 150 million today. India's middle class will grow 80 percent, from 50 million to 475 million.

We need our businesses, large and small, to have the tools to reach this new, growing tool of consumers. Not only does this help businesses, the Ex-Im Bank also helps taxpayers.

I don't know where the idea that this is crony capitalism comes from, but this program is a very good deal for the U.S. Department of the Treasury. In fact, it returned nearly $1.6 billion to the U.S. Treasury since 2005. It actually is helping us return money to the Treasury and it helps our businesses continue to grow in export markets.

As we speak, there are almost $4 billion in transactions awaiting approval for the bank; that is, if we don't approve the chairman, these deals might not go through. There are many American businesses counting on their transaction so they can compete in an international market.

The international competitor is not going to wait until we approve Mr. Hochberg if we delay this. They are going to go ahead, cash in on the business deals, and our competitors will win.

I think the U.S. Chamber of Commerce said it best in a 2011 letter to congressional leaders: The Export-Import Bank enables U.S. companies, large and small, to turn export opportunities into real sales that help create real jobs in the United States of America.

I was proud that Mr. Hochberg came to Seattle last year for the opening of a regional Ex-Im office, focusing on small businesses to make sure they can get the financing for end products to get to these markets. We should be moving more toward policies to help businesses, the small businesses, grow with confidence into these international markets.

I ask my colleagues to do the right thing, follow through, and confirm this chairman.

Since its creation in 1934, the Export-Import Bank was approved by unanimous consent or voice vote 24 times. For 24 times no one called this crony capitalism. No, they were supporting it. The last time we authorized it, it had 78 votes. It ended up in the House of Representatives with 330 votes.

I am pointing this out because all of the delay in Mr. Hochberg's confirmation hurts business in the end, when the majority of my colleagues do agree this is a vital tool to help boost products made in America.

In the last reauthorization we did make improvements to strengthen the Ex-Im Bank. Quarterly reports are delivered on the default rates, which now can't go above 2 percent.

The Government Accountability Office also is required to work with risk management structures to make sure loans and businesses are not too risky. Transactions above a certain dollar amount receive public comment, and they deliver a yearly report on those transactions.

I know my colleagues have mentioned this issue about aviation, and I can guarantee, as the chair of the Aviation Subcommittee, I want U.S. airline industries to be competitive in international markets. Certainly, the world community on financing of airplane sales is working together to make sure those are closer to market-based rates and working on the same page so these financing schemes work together.

The 2011 Aircraft Sector Understanding sets out the terms and conditions on how airlines can finance aircraft purchases using Government-backed financing. The Understanding requires a closer alignment with commercial market borrowing rates. This agreement covers all major trading partners except China.

All of these improvements we continue to make in the Ex-Im Bank are important. As I said, Mr. Hochberg has been open to many discussions as to how we move ahead. Let us not deny the fact that in developing markets, a financial tool such as the Export-Import Bank, that actually delivers on helping job creation in the United States by getting the sales of many different products into these developing countries and growing middle class, is very good for the United States. The fact that it returns to the taxpayer is very positive.

Let's not let this slip another moment. Let's get Mr. Hochberg back to the task at hand, which is approving these transactions so U.S. companies can continue to grow jobs here by accessing new markets overseas.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. CORNYN. I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. CORNYN. Madam President, this last Monday night we had a remarkable occurrence in the Senate. Democrats and Republicans actually met together, as the Presiding Officer knows, in the Old Senate Chamber, a historic location where the Senate used to meet before we became so large and expanded to 100 Members. What was so good about that, from my perspective, was that we actually had some communication going on and we learned there were a lot of Senators who were actually frustrated by the way the Senate has been operating. It gave us all an opportunity, there in a confidential setting, to speak our mind and to share our frustrations.

But I think one of the things we have forgotten—maybe not forgotten, but need to be reminded of from time to time—is what makes the Senate unique, not just here in America and our form of government but throughout the world. Sometimes the Senate is referred to as the world's greatest deliberative body. As we all know, it has become less so in recent years. But we all remember the story of the constitutional convention in Philadelphia when they were at loggerheads in trying to figure out how to create the legislative branch. There were some who wanted a single unicameral legislative body, and there were discussions then about whether there actually needed to be a Senate in addition to the House of Representatives, which, of course, would literally be representative of the people based on their numbers as opposed to representing the respective States, which is the function of the Senate.

Late in the convention there was a compromise proposed by the Senator from Connecticut, Roger Sherman, on behalf of the small States. Of course, the small States were worried the big States would gang up on them. Ironically, under this compromise, it is now the small States that gang up on the big States, but that is another story for another day.

Under this Connecticut Compromise, the Senate came to be comprised of two Senators representing each State, no matter how big or how small the State. My State of 26 million people only gets two Senators. The Presiding Officer's State, a smaller State, also gets two Senators. That was part of the Connecticut Compromise back when the country was founded.

The Constitution could not have been ratified without this compromise. It initially failed, but Benjamin Franklin later found a better time to reintroduce it and it passed. But here is the real function of the Senate, and it comes from a story told of a conversation between Thomas Jefferson and George Washington. Of course, Washington had presided over the constitutional convention. Jefferson was in Paris. When he returned, he asked Washington why he allowed the Senate to be formed, because Jefferson had considered it unnecessary. One body based on proportional representation, Jefferson thought, should be enough. Washington then asked Jefferson if he cooled his tea by first pouring it in the saucer, which was the custom of the day. Sure, responded Jefferson. And Washington said: So it is that the Senate must cool tempers and prevent hasty legislation by making sure it is well thought out and fully debated.

I mention that story and recite a little bit of history to remind us the Senate was created not just to be another House of Representatives but for another purpose altogether. That is the other reason why Senators are elected for 6-year terms from a whole State as opposed to just a congressional district where our colleagues across the Capitol run every 2 years from smaller areas. Of course, they are supposed to be much more closely tied to their constituents. We are supposedly given a little more flexibility to take the long view and not the short-term view in how we decide matters.

That is the reason why so many of us were concerned at the threat of the majority leader to invoke the so-called nuclear option. I know for most Americans this is not something that is at the top of their list to be concerned with, but from an institutional and constitutional perspective it is absolutely critical the Senate remain true to the design of the Founders of our country as framed in our Constitution.

As a rationale to invoking the so-called nuclear option and turning the Senate into a purely majority-vote institution, there were claims this side of the aisle had been obstructing too many of President Obama's nominations. But the facts tell a far different story. Thus far, the President has nominated more than 1,560 people for various positions, and only 4—only 4—of them have been rejected by the Senate.

Since 2009, this Chamber has confirmed 199 of President Obama's article III judicial nominees and rejected 2 of them, and 80 of those nominees were confirmed by voice vote, which is essentially a unanimous vote. Another 64 were confirmed by unanimous rollcall votes. Does that sound like a crisis? Does that sound like obstructionism? I think not.

I would like to suggest it is another problem that has caused the Senate to become, in a way, a nondeliberative body and quite dysfunctional. For example, during Senator REID's tenure as majority leader, an unprecedented number of bills have come to the floor directly from the majority leader's office. Any of us who remember our high school civics lessons know that, ordinarily, committees of the Congress are supposed to write legislation. Then once the committees vote that legislation out, it comes to the Senate floor. Obviously, the purpose for that is to give everyone in the committees an opportunity to vent their concerns, to offer amendments, to debate them, and then to mark up a bill before it comes to the Senate floor so we do a better job and deal with all of the unintended

consequences and the like. But during the tenure of the current majority leader an unprecedented number of bills have simply sprung to life out of the majority leader's office.

Many of my colleagues, including Members of Senator REID's own party, have been left wondering why it is the committees actually even exist in a world where bills simply come to the Senate floor under rule XIV without the sort of deliberation and consideration they should get in committees before arriving here. When legislation arrives on the floor, Senators are routinely denied an opportunity to offer the amendments they see fit and to have debate and votes on those amendments.

To give some perspective—and I know some people will say the American people are not interested in the process, they are interested more in the policy, but this demonstrates why the process is so important to getting the right policies embraced—during the 109th Congress, when this side of the aisle, Republicans, controlled this Chamber, Senate Democrats offered more than 1,000 separate amendments—1,043 separate amendments—to legislation. During the 112th Congress, when our Democratic colleagues were in charge, Republicans were only allowed to offer 400 amendments—1,043 to 400, a big difference.

During the 109th Congress, when Republicans controlled this Chamber, there were 428 recorded votes on Senate amendments—428. In the 112th Congress, there were 224—a little more than half of the number.

Since becoming majority leader, Senator REID has blocked amendments on bills on the floor no fewer than 70 times. In the language of Senate procedure, we call that filling the amendment tree, but what it means is the minority is effectively shut out of the ability to shape legislation by offering amendments on the Senate floor. And that is no small thing. Again, I represent 26 million people in the State of Texas. Being a Member of the minority, when Senator REID blocks any amendment I wish to offer to a bill, he has effectively shut out of the process 26 million Texans. And it is not just my State, it is every State represented by the minority.

As a comparison, the previous Senate majority leader, Senator Bill Frist of Tennessee, a Republican, filled the amendment tree only 12 times in 4 years. So 70 times under Senator REID, 12 times for Senator Frist. And before him, Majority Leader Tom Daschle, a Democrat, filled the tree only once in 1½ years—once in 1½ years. When Trent Lott was the majority leader, a Republican, he did it 10 times in 5 years. George Mitchell, a Democratic majority leader, did it three times in 6 years. Majority Leader Robert C. Byrd, who was an institution unto himself here in the Senate, did it three times in 2 years. And finally, Senator Bob Dole of Kansas, the majority leader, a Republican, did it seven times in 3½ years.

My point is not to bore people with statistics but to point out the Senate has changed dramatically under the tenure of the current majority leader in a way where Members of the Senate are blocked from offering amendments to legislation in the interest of their constituents. As majority leader, Senator REID has denied those rights to the minority and the rights of the people we represent. When he refuses to let us offer amendments and debate those amendments, he refuses to let us have real debate and he is effectively gagging millions of our constituents.

One more time I would like to remind Senator REID of what he promised 6 years ago. He said: As majority leader, I intend to run the Senate with respect for the rules and for the minority the rules protect. The Senate was established to make sure that minorities are protected. Majorities can always protect themselves but minorities cannot. That is what the Senate is all about.

I would also like to remind our colleagues what President Obama said in April of 2005, when he was in the Senate. He said: If the majority chooses to end the filibuster, if they choose to change the rules and put an end to democratic debate, then the fighting, the bitterness, and the gridlock will only get worse.

My point is to say the Senate has been transformed in recent years into an image of an institution the Founders of our country would hardly recognize, nor would previously serving Senators who operated in an environment where every Senator had an opportunity to offer amendments to legislation and to get a vote on those amendments; where the minority's rights were protected by denying the majority the right to simply shut out the minority, denying them an opportunity to offer or debate important pieces of legislation.

That is what has happened under the current majority leader, and that is why I believe those meetings, such as the one we had in the Old Senate Chamber this past Monday night, are so important. But we do have to rely on the facts. Facts can be stubborn, but I think our debate ought to be based on the facts and on a rational discussion of what the Framers intended when they created the Senate and its unique role—unique not just here in America but to all legislative bodies in the world.

HEALTH CARE

Madam President, I would like to turn to another topic. Now that we have gotten past the nuclear option, at least for a time, I think it is important we return to important issues that actually affect the lives of the American people in very direct ways, and health care is one of them.

During the Fourth of July recess, the administration unilaterally delayed several provisions of the so-called Affordable Care Act, otherwise sometimes known as ObamaCare. What they did specifically is they delayed enactment of the employer mandate.

It was an implicit acknowledgement by the administration that ObamaCare is actually stifling job creation and prompting many businesses to turn from full-time employment to part time. In fact, there are now 8.2 million Americans working part-time jobs for economic reasons when they would like to work full time. That number is up from 7.6 to 8.2 million since March. And a new survey has found that 74 percent of small businesses are going to reduce hiring, reduce worker hours, or replace full-time employees with part-time employees in part in response to ObamaCare.

The House of Representatives has drafted a bill that would codify the employer mandate delay that the administration announced earlier this month. In other words, they want to uphold the rule of law. Yet the President is now threatening to veto the very legislation that enacts the policy that he himself announced, which is truly surreal. The House bill on the employer mandate would do exactly what the President has already announced he would do unilaterally. There is no conceivable reason that I can think of for the administration to oppose this legislation—unless, of course, President Obama thinks he can pick and choose which laws to enforce for the sake of his own convenience. I am afraid he does believe that, and the evidence goes well beyond ObamaCare.

Yesterday afternoon I listed several examples of the administration's persistent contempt for the rule of law.

I mentioned the government-run Chrysler bankruptcy process in which the company-secured bondholders received far less for their loans than the United Auto Workers pension funds.

I mentioned the subsequent Solyndra bankruptcy in which the administration violated the law by making taxpayers subordinate to private lenders.

I mentioned the President's unconstitutional appointments to the National Labor Relations Board and the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau. You don't have to take my word for it; that is the decision of the court of appeals. The case has now been taken up by the U.S. Supreme Court to define what the President's powers are to make so-called recess appointments. But one thing that is absolutely clear is that the President—the executive branch—can't dictate to the Senate when we are in recess, thus empowering the President to make those appointments without the advice and consent function contained in the Constitution; otherwise, the executive branch will have no checks and no balances on its power, and there will be no power on the part of the Senate to do the appropriate oversight and to confirm the President's nominees.

In addition to his recess appointments, I mentioned yesterday his decision to unilaterally waive key requirements in both the 1996 welfare reform

law and the 2002 No Child Left Behind Act, and I also mentioned his refusal to enforce certain immigration laws.

What the House of Representatives is trying to do with its employer mandate bill is to make sure that the same rules apply to everyone and that the executive branch and the White House in particular don't just pick winners and losers when it comes to the Affordable Care Act, Obamacare.

If this President or any President is allowed to selectively enforce the law based on political expediency, our democracy and adherence to the rule of law will be severely weakened.

The principle at stake is far more important than the particular legislation we are talking about. It is about the constitutional separation of powers between the executive and the legislative branches of government. By assuming to be able to unilaterally suspend laws that prove inconvenient, the President is showing disdain for those checks and balances on executive authority as well as his oath, where he pledges to faithfully execute the laws of the United States.

Those of us who support repealing ObamaCare in its entirety and then replacing it with real health care reforms that reduce costs and expand patient choice and access to quality care, while protecting Americans with preexisting conditions and saving programs such as Medicaid and Medicare, believe ObamaCare ought to be repealed in its entirety and replaced with commonsense reforms that will actually bring down the costs, increase the quality, and preserve the patient-doctor relationship when it comes to making health care choices.

Our preference would be to repeal the entire law, but we would like to work with the President and our friends across the aisle now that it appears, according to the administration's own actions, that they actually believe ObamaCare is not turning out as it was originally intended in 2010. Indeed, one of the principal architects in the Senate, the chairman of the Senate Finance Committee, Senator MAX BAUCUS of Montana, has told Secretary Kathleen Sebelius of Health and Human Services that the implementation of ObamaCare is turning out to be a train wreck. And indeed it is.

Unfortunately, the President is still refusing to acknowledge the growing evidence that ObamaCare cannot perform as was originally promised. We know that the promise that if you like the health care coverage you have, you can keep it that the President so famously made—that is not true. Seven million Americans have lost their health care coverage as ObamaCare is being implemented and many more as employers are incentivized to drop their employer-provided coverage, leaving American families to find their health insurance elsewhere. The promise the President made that the average cost of health care insurance for a family of four would go down by $2,400—we know it has gone up by $2,400 since then.

Unfortunately, it appears the wheels are coming off of ObamaCare, and the people who will suffer the most are hard-working American families we are pledged to protect and help. What we ought to be doing rather than denying the obvious is working together to try to enact commonsense reforms.

It is not an answer for the President to discard the politically inconvenient portions of ObamaCare and kick off implementation until after the next election. To me, that is one of the most amazing things about the way ObamaCare has been implemented. It passed in 2010, but very little of it actually kicked in before the Presidential election of 2012. So there is no real political accountability, no real opportunity for the voters to voice their objection once it had been implemented, if it had been implemented on a timely basis. And now, because it has proven to be politically inconvenient, the President has proposed to kick off implementation of the employer mandate until after the 2014 midterm congressional elections. That is no way to have accountability for the decisions we make here. That is the opposite.

We are simply urging the President to support the rule of law and to make sure the same rules apply to everyone—apply to Members of Congress and apply to everyone in this great country of ours. But when the administration chooses to selectively enforce or not enforce provisions of the law or issue waivers for the favored few and the rest of us end up with the harsh reality of this law that is not working out as originally intended, it undermines the rule of law and the public's confidence that the same rules will apply to everyone. That shouldn't be too much to ask.

Madam President, I yield the floor, and I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. RUBIO. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. RUBIO. Madam President, there has been a lot of news over the last 24 hours about the nuclear option and how that has been averted here in the Senate and what good news that is for the institution. I do value the Senate, and I do value the ability of individual Senators—and particularly the minority, which I hope I won't be a part of forever—and of the minority to speak and to be heard. That is one of the things that make this institution unique.

But I think we have to answer a fundamental question about why we have these rules in place and in particular why we have these rules in place when we are dealing with nominees, people who are nominated to the Cabinet and other executive positions. It is because the Constitution gives the Senate the power to advise and consent, to basically review these nominees and find out information about them and then decide whether they should be confirmed.

There are two different standards with regard to that. The first standard is whether the nominee should be able to go forward, and that requires a supermajority vote—60 votes—to continue debate. It is kind of arcane and I don't want to do a tutorial on the Senate, but let me say that if you can't get those 60 votes, then you have to continue to debate that nominee. That is an important tool—not to obstruct but should be used judiciously. It is a tool that should be used to make sure that this process is being respected and that people are answering critical and valid questions. It is an important tool to use. It needs to be used judiciously. It needs to be used in a limited way. You can't do that on everybody. You shouldn't do that on everybody. Quite frankly, the minority has not done it on everybody, nor have I. I have been very careful in its use and have tried to ensure that when we do use it and when I do use it, I use it for reasons that are valid.

It is with that in mind that I am very concerned about a nominee who will be before this body as early as today on a 60-vote threshold about whether to cut off debate on this individual and proceed to final confirmation, and that is this nominee for the Secretary to head the Labor Department, which is a significant agency of our government that, quite frankly, has a direct impact on the ability of businesses to grow and hire people and so forth. This is an important nomination and one that I think deserves careful scrutiny.

Now, let me be frank and up-front. I have significant objections to this nomination on the basis of public policy, and I have stated that in the past. I believe this individual, Thomas Perez, who is currently an Assistant Attorney General, is a liberal activist who has used his position—not just in the Department of Justice but in other roles he has played—to advance a liberal agenda that, quite frankly, is out of touch with a majority of Americans and that I believe would be bad for our economy, hence the reason I don't think it is a good idea for him to head the Labor Department. But the President has a right to his nominees.

So that is a reason to vote against this nomination. That in and of itself may not always be a reason to block a nomination from moving forward. Where I do think there is a valid reason to block someone's nomination from moving forward is when that individual has refused to cooperate with the process that is in place to review their nomination.

When you are nominated to serve in the Cabinet or in the executive branch, you get asked questions about things you have done in the past, things you

have said in the past, and you are expected to answer those fully and truthfully so that the Members of this body can make a decision about your nomination based on the facts. I don't know of anyone here who would dispute that, including people in the majority. Irrespective of how you feel about the nominee, every single Senator here—and through us, the American people—has a right to fully know who it is we are confirming, whether it is to the bench or to the Cabinet or to some other executive position. That is a right that is critically important.

When a nominee refuses to cooperate with that process, I believe that is a valid reason to stand in the way of their confirmation and to block it from moving forward until those questions are fully and truthfully answered. I do believe that is a reason not to vote for what they call cloture around here. I think that is a case in point when it comes to this Labor nominee, Mr. Perez, and I want to take a few moments to argue to my colleagues why it is a bad idea for both Democrats and Republicans to allow this nomination to move forward until this nominee answers the questions he has been asked by the Congress. Let me give the background.

There was a case filed by the City of St. Paul in Minnesota, and this case had to do with a legal theory called disparate impact. It is not really on point per se, but it basically says that you look at how some policy is impacting people, and even if there wasn't the intent to discriminate against people, if the practical impact of it was that it was discriminating against people—let's say a bank was giving out loans, and although the loan officer wasn't looking to deny loans to minorities, if the way they had structured the program meant that fewer minorities were getting loans than should be under a percentage basis, then under this theory you would be allowed to go after whatever institution did that. That is the theory which is out there in law.

The City of St. Paul had a challenge to that in court that chose to define exactly what that meant, and it got all the way to the Supreme Court. It was on the Supreme Court's docket. At the same time, the Justice Department was being asked to intervene in a whistleblower case regarding Housing and Urban Development. Again, it would take too long to describe exactly why that is important, but the bottom line is that the case against the City of St. Paul, the separate case—the whistleblower case—because of the way the law is written, they couldn't move forward on that case unless the Department of Justice intervened. And that is where the nominee, Mr. Perez, stepped in. He is an enormous fan of the disparate impact theory. In fact, he had used it to go after banks, of all things, in his time at the Department of Justice.

At some point in the future I will come to the floor and detail why I object to his nomination, appointment, and confirmation, but today I am just making the argument as to why it is a bad idea to move forward on this nomination until certain questions are answered.

This is where Mr. Perez steps in. What he did is he basically went to the City of St. Paul and said: Look, if you drop your Supreme Court case, we will not intervene in the whistleblower case. It is what is known in Latin as a quid pro quo—you do this for me, I will do that for you. In essence, City of St. Paul, drop your Supreme Court case and I will not intervene on behalf of the Department of Justice.

He argues reasons why he did that were based—he told the House committee the reason why I did that is because I thought it was a bad case, I had bad facts and I didn't want to move forward on the HUD whistleblower case anyway. He claimed that. But, in fact, a subsequent investigation found that a career attorney in the Department of Justice actually did not feel that way at all. A career attorney who was involved in this case believed it was a good case and, in fact, at a meeting about the case he expressed concern that this looked like we were ''buying off'' the City of St. Paul.

Right away the nominee had, frankly, misled the congressional committee when he argued it was a bad case, everybody agreed that the facts were bad. In fact, that is not true. The career prosecutor who was looking at this case wanted to move forward and was concerned that the way this looked was that it was a buy-off.

Then the nominee was asked: By the way, did you use your personal e-mail to conduct this deal? Did you e-mail with people about it? We understand your Federal account, we have access to that, but did you use your personal accounts?

You know, we all have business accounts and we all have personal accounts. The question was did you use your personal accounts to cut this deal or negotiate this deal or even talk about it with anybody? His answer was he could not recall, he had no recollection of that.

Subsequently, however, it was discovered that, in fact, on at least one occasion initially, he had used his e-mail to discuss something with someone at the City of St. Paul. That is when the House oversight committee stepped in and it asked him voluntarily and the Justice Department voluntarily to produce any e-mails from his private account that had to do with his official capacity.

Understand the request. It wasn't: Send us e-mails between you and your children or between you and your family or about you planning your vacation. What they asked for were any e-mails from your private accounts that have to do with your official capacity.

The Justice Department responded to that request by saying: We have found 1,200 instances of the use of his personal e-mails for official business. We found at least—the number at least was 34, but then 35—instances where it violated the open records laws of the Federal Government. So he was voluntarily asked to produce these e-mails to the House. He refused.

The House then subpoenaed these records, a subpoena which has the power of Congress behind it basically compelling you: You must produce it now. Again, he refuses to produce these e-mails.

What we have before the Senate today is a nominee to head the Labor Department of the United States of America who refuses to comply with a congressional subpoena on his e-mail records regarding his official business conduct. He refuses to comply; will not even answer; ignores it.

Here is what I will say to you. How can we possibly vote to confirm somebody if they refuse to produce relevant information about their official conduct? Think about that. This is an invitation for any official in the executive branch to basically conduct all their business in their private accounts because they know they will never have to produce it, they can ignore the Congress.

The nominee, Mr. Perez, hides behind the Department of Justice and says: They are handling this for me. But the problem is the Department of Justice doesn't possess these e-mails. These are his e-mails from his personal account that he refuses to produce.

If, in fact, there is nothing to worry about—and I am not claiming—I have not seen the e-mails. I don't know what is in them. None of us do. That is the point. The fact is we are now being asked to vote to confirm someone—not just to confirm someone, to give him 60 votes to cut off debate on the nomination of someone who is in open contempt of a congressional subpoena and repeated requests, including a bipartisan request. I have it here with me, a bipartisan request signed by Mr. ISSA of California and Mr. CUMMINGS, the ranking minority member, dated May 8, 2013:

> We write to request you produce all documents responsive to the subpoena issued to you by the committee on April 10, 2013, regarding your use of a non-official e-mail account to conduct official Department of Justice business. The Department [Justice Department] has represented to the Committee that roughly 1,200 responsive e-mails exist. To allow the Committee to fully examine these e-mails, please produce all responsive documents in unredacted form to the Committee no later than Friday, May 20, 2013.

The answer: Nothing, silence, crickets.

This is wrong. How can we possibly move forward on a nominee—I don't care what deal has been cut—how can we possibly move forward on someone until we have information that they have been asked for by a congressional committee? This is outrageous. If ever there was an instance where someone's nomination should not move forward, this is a perfect example of it.

I am not standing here saying deny this nominee 60 votes because I think he is a liberal activist—I do, and I think that is the reason why he should not be confirmed. What I am saying to my Republican colleagues is: I don't care what deal you cut, how can you possibly agree to move forward on the nomination when the nominee refuses to comply with a congressional subpoena to turn over records about official business at the Justice Department?

By the way, we are not confirming him to an Ambassador post in some obscure country halfway around the world. This is the Labor Department. This is the Labor Department.

I am shocked that there are members of my own conference who would be willing to go forward, go ahead on a nomination like this, who are willing to give 60 votes on a nomination like this on a nominee who has, frankly, flat out refused to comply with a congressional subpoena and answer questions that are legitimate and important. We are about to make someone the head of one of the most powerful agencies in America, impacting the ability of businesses to grow and create jobs at a time, frankly, when our economy is not doing very well, we are about to confirm someone to chair that agency, head up that agency when that individual has refused to comply with a legitimate request. How can we possibly go along with that?

I understand how important it is to protect the rights of minorities here. I understand how important it is to protect the right of the minority party to speak out and block efforts to move forward. But, my goodness, what is the point of even having the 60-vote threshold if you cannot use it for legitimate reasons? This is not me saying I am going to block this nominee until I get something I want. This is a nominee who refuses to cooperate, who flat out has ignored Congress and told them to go pound sand. And you are going to vote for this individual and move forward before this question is answered?

I implore my colleagues, frankly on both sides of the aisle—because this sets a precedent. There will not be a Democratic President forever and there will not be a Senate Democratic majority forever. At some point in the future you will have a Republican President and they are going to nominate people and those people may refuse to comply with a records request. You are not going to want those records? In fact, you have in the past blocked people for that very purpose.

So I ask my colleagues again, how can you possibly move forward a nominee who refuses to comply with giving us the information we need to fully vet that nomination? This is a serious constitutional obligation we have. Do we have an obligation to the Senate and to this institution, being a unique legislative body? Absolutely. But we have an even more important obligation to our Constitution and to the role the Senate plays in reviewing nominations and the information behind that nomination, and we are being blatantly denied relevant information. We have colleagues of mine who say it doesn't matter, move forward. This is wrong. It is not just wrong, it is outrageous.

Again, I do not think that we should use—nor do I think we have, by the way, used the 60-vote threshold as a way to routinely block nominees from moving forward. You look at the record. This President has done very well with his nominations, across the board—judiciary, Cabinet, executive branch. But, my goodness, can we at least agree that I have a right as a Senator from Florida—as all of you have a right as Senators from your States—to have all the relevant information on these nominees before we move forward?

I am telling you, if you are going to concede that point, then what is the point of having the 60-vote threshold if you can never use it for legitimate purposes?

I would argue to my colleagues today, let's not have this vote today. Let's not give 60 votes on this nominee until he produces these e-mails and we have time to review them so we can fully understand what was behind not just this quid pro quo deal but behind his public service at the Justice Department as an assistant attorney general, frankly confirmed by this Senate with the support of Republicans.

This is not an unreasonable request. For us to surrender the right to ask these questions is a dereliction of duty and it is wrong. If ever there was a case in point for why the 60-vote threshold matters, this is an example of one. I am telling you, if this moves forward, there is no reason why any future nominee would not decide to give us the same answer; that is, you get nothing. I tell you nothing. I will tell you what I want you to know. Then we are forced to vote up or down on someone on whom we do not have information. And that is wrong.

There is still time to change our minds. I think this is a legitimate exercise—not forever. Let him produce these e-mails. Let us review these e-mails. Then bring him up for a vote and then you can vote on him, whether you like it or not based on all the information. But to allow someone to move forward who is basically telling an oversight committee of Congress: I don't have to answer your questions, I don't have to respond to your letters, I ignore you?

I want you to think about the precedent you are setting. I want you to think about how that undermines the constitutional—not just the right, the constitutional obligation of this body to produce advice and consent on Presidential nominees, and I think this is especially important when someone is going to be a member of the Cabinet and overseeing an agency with the scope and the power of the Labor Department.

I still hope there is time to convince as many of my colleagues as possible. I do not hold great hopes that I will convince a lot of my Democratic colleagues, but I hope I can convince a majority of my Republican colleagues to refuse to give the 60 votes to cut off debate on this nominee until Chairman ISSA and the oversight committee get answers to their questions that frankly we would want to know. They take leadership on asking these questions but we are the ones who have to vote on the nominee. They are doing us a favor asking these questions. We should, at a minimum, stand here and demand that these be answered before we move forward.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Ms. BALDWIN). The Republican leader.

OBAMACARE

Mr. MCCONNELL. As I mentioned yesterday, I am glad the majority saw the light and stepped back from committing a tragic mistake. It is good news for our country and good news for our democracy. Now that that is behind us, we can get back to debating the issues our constituents are the most concerned about, and for a lot of my constituents they are concerned about ObamaCare.

This is a law that was basically passed against their will and it is a law that is now being imposed upon them by a distant bureaucracy headquartered here in Washington. If the folks in DC are to be believed, its implementation is going just swimmingly. The Democratic leader in the House of Representatives called it ''fabulous.'' The President said the law is ''working the way it's supposed to.'' And my friend the majority leader said the other day that ''ObamaCare has been wonderful for America.''

Fabulous? Wonderful? These are not the kinds of words one normally associates with a deeply unpopular law, or one that media reports suggest is already having a very painful impact on Americans we represent. Which sets up an important question for Senators to consider: Just who are we prepared to believe here when it comes to ObamaCare: the politicians who have developed it or the people who are reacting to it?

The politicians in Washington who forced this law on the country say everything is fantastic. They spent millions on slick ads with smiling actors and sunny-sounding scripts that blissfully—I am being kind here—blissfully dismiss what the reality of this law will actually look like to so many Americans, or what the reality of the law has already become for some of them. That is why the people have taken an entirely different view. They are the ones worried about losing the coverage they like and want to keep, which is understandable given the growing number of news stories about insurance companies pulling out of States and markets altogether. They are the ones worried about their jobs and pay checks.

Each anecdote we hear about a college cutting hours for its employees or a restaurant freezing hiring or a small business already taking the ax to its workforce at such an early stage—each of them is a testament to just how well this law has been working out for the people we were sent to represent.

According to the chamber of commerce's small business survey released just yesterday, anxiety about the requirements of ObamaCare now surpass economic uncertainty as the top worry for small business. The impact of ObamaCare now surpasses economic uncertainty as the top worry for small business owners.

Here is another thing: When even cheerleaders for the law start to become its critics, that is when we know there is something to this train wreck everybody keeps talking about.

Unions are livid—even though they helped pass the law—because they see their members losing care and becoming less competitive as a result of it. That is why they fired off an angry letter to Congress just this week.

The California Insurance Commissioner is troubled too—even though he has been one of ObamaCare's biggest boosters. He is so worried about fraud that he warned we might ''have a real disaster on our hands.'' Well, it is hard to argue with him.

The President was so worried about some of this law turning into a disaster that he selectively delayed a big chunk of it, but he only did that for businesses. He just delayed it for businesses.

A constituent of mine was recently interviewed by a TV station in Paducah, and here is what she said about the President's decision: ''It ain't right.'' Well, she is not alone.

We can argue about whether the President even had the power to do what he did, but here is the point today: If businesses deserve a reprieve because the law is a disaster, then families and workers do too. If this law isn't working the way it is supposed to, then it is a terrible law. If it is not working as planned, then it is not right to foist it on the middle class while exempting business.

That is why the House will vote this week to at least try to remedy that. It is an important first step to giving all Americans and all businesses what they need, which is not a temporary delay for some but a permanent delay for everyone.

The politicians pushing ObamaCare might not like that, but they are not the ones who are having to live with this thing the same way most Americans will have to live with it.

I yield the floor and suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Ms. BALDWIN). The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. INHOFE. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. INHOFE. I ask unanimous consent that I be recognized as if in morning business for such time as I may consume.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

EPA REGULATIONS

Mr. INHOFE. Madam President, last Wednesday I came to the floor and spoke about the President's global warming speech and all that the White House is doing to help frame the debate with his talking points memo which we happened to intercept, and it is very interesting.

They also had a secret meeting that took place with alarmist Senators. That is the term used over the past 12 years of those individuals who say the world is coming to an end with global warming.

First, they changed the name from global warming because it was not acceptable. Then they tried climate change. The most recent is carbon pollution. One of these days they will find something that sells, but so far they haven't.

The first thing they don't want to talk about is cost. We have had several global warming and cap-and-trade bills over the past 12 years. When the first bills came out and the Republicans were in the majority, I was the chairman of the Environment and Public Works Committee and had responsibility for defeating them, and we did.

In the beginning, with the Kyoto treaty 12 years ago, and when Al Gore came back from Rio de Janeiro, a lot of people believed this was taking place. Then a group out of the Wharton School did a study and said if we regulate emissions from organizations emitting 25,000 tons or more of CO_2 a year, the cost would be between $300 billion and $400 billion a year. As a conservative, I get the most recent information I can from my State of Oklahoma in terms of the number of people filing Federal tax returns and I do the math. At that time, it meant it would cost each person about $3,000 a year if we had cap-and-trade.

This kept going throughout the years. The most recent one was authored by now-Senator MARKEY, who up until yesterday was Congressman MARKEY. I have a great deal of respect for him, but he had the last cap-and-trade bill regulating those with emissions of 25,000 tons a year or more.

The cost has never been debated much, because Charles River Associates later came out and said it would be between $300 billion and $400 billion a year and MIT said about the same. So we know that cost is there.

To my knowledge, while no one has actually calculated this, keep in mind the President is trying to pass a cap-and-trade policy for Americans through regulation because he was not able to pass it through legislation. If you do it through regulation, it has to be under the Clean Air Act.

The Clean Air Act requires us to regulate any source that puts the emissions at over 250 tons. So instead of 25,000 tons being regulated, it would be 250 tons. That would mean every hospital, apartment building, school, oil and gas well, and every farm would come under this. No one knows exactly what it would cost the economy, but it would be staggering.

To pull this off, the EPA alone would have to spend $21 billion and hire an additional 23,000 bureaucrats. Those are not my figures; those are their figures. So you have to stop and think, if the cap-and-trade bills cost $400 billion regulating the emitters of 25,000 tons a year or more, imagine what it would be when you drop it down to 250 tons.

The second thing the President doesn't want to talk about is the fact that it is a unilateral effort. If you pass a regulation in the United States of America, it is going to only affect the United States of America.

I have always had a lot of respect for Lisa Jackson. Lisa Jackson was the Administrator of the EPA under the Obama administration. While she is liberal and I am conservative, she was always honest in her answers.

I asked her this question: If we pass, by either legislation or any other way, cap-and-trade in the United States, is that going to reduce worldwide CO_2 emissions? Her answer was: No. Because if you do that, you are doing it just on the brightest sectors of our economy. Without China, without Mexico, without India and the rest of the world doing it, then U.S. manufacturers could have the reverse effect, because they could end up going to other countries where there are not restrictions on emissions, and so they would actually be emitting more. So there goes our jobs, overseas, seeking energy in areas where they are able to afford it.

Lisa Jackson's quote exactly: ''I believe . . . that U.S. action alone will not impact CO_2 levels.''

What the President doesn't want to talk about in his lust for overregulation in this country is, one, the fact it is going to cost a lot of money and would be the largest tax increase in the history of America, without question. The second is even if you do it, it doesn't lower emissions.

A lot of people say, Why do they want to do it? And I lose a lot of people when I make this statement, but there are a lot of liberals who believe the government should control our lives more. I had this observation back when I was first elected in the House. One of the differences between liberals and conservatives is that liberals have a basic philosophy that government can run our lives better than people can.

Dr. Richard Lindzen with MIT, one of the most outstanding and recognized scientists in this country and considered to be maybe the greatest source in terms of scientific knowledge, said, ''Controlling carbon is a bureaucrat's dream. If you control carbon, you control life.''

Tomorrow the Environment and Public Works Committee is going to conduct a hearing on climate change—or whatever they call it. I think they are starting out with global warming and may call it carbon pollution. That is the new word because that is more sellable. A lot around here is done with wordsmithing. Republicans and Democrats both do it. Global warming didn't work, climate change didn't work, so now it is CO_2 pollution. They are going to have a hearing, and the chairman of the committee, BARBARA BOXER, is going to have people come in and talk about the world coming to an end. However, the interesting thing is that the administration is sending alarmists to talk about how bad global warming is and how we are going to die, but they are not taking the process seriously enough to send any real official. We have no government officials as witnesses. This is highly unusual. This doesn't happen very often, but that is what we are going to be having.

It is important for Members to understand that greenhouse gas regulations are not the only EPA regulations that are threatening our economy. Again, it is all the regulations by government getting involved in our lives.

If you look at this chart, these are the ones they are actually working on right now in either the Environment and Public Works Committee or the Environmental Protection Agency:

Utility MACT. MACT means maximum achievable control technology. So where is our technology right now? How much can we control? The problem we are having is they are putting the emissions requirements at a level that is below where we have technology to make it happen. So utility MACT would cost $100 billion and 1.56 million jobs. That is in the law already. There are a lot of coal plants being shut down right now.

But, you might ask, how can they do that when right now we are reliant upon coal for 50 percent of the power it takes to run this machine called America?

Boiler MACT. Again, maximum achievable control technology. Every manufacturer has a boiler, so this controls all manufacturers. That is estimated to cost $63.3 billion and 800,000 jobs.

The NAAQS legislation would put a lot of counties out of attainment. When I was the mayor of Tulsa County and we were out of attainment, we were not able to do a lot of the things in order to recruit industry. So this would put 2,800 counties out of attainment, including all 77 counties in my State of Oklahoma. That causes emissions to increase, and then the company would be required to find an offset.

We are kind of in the weeds here, but the simple outcome would be that no new businesses would be able to come to an out-of-attainment area, and existing businesses wouldn't be allowed to expand.

The President is also issuing a new tier 3 standard that applies to refineries as they manufacture gasoline. This rule would cause gasoline to rise by 9 cents a gallon.

The EPA is also working tirelessly to tie groundwater contamination to the hydraulic fracturing process so they and the Federal Government can regulate this. They have tried that in Wyoming in the Pavilion case, they tried it in Pennsylvania in the Dimock case, and in Texas they tried several times.

I know something about that, because hydraulic fracturing started in the State of Oklahoma in 1949. Since then, there have been more than 1 million applications for hydraulic fracturing. Hydraulic fracturing is a way of getting oil and gas out of tight formations. There has never been a confirmed case of groundwater contamination, but they still want to have this regulated by the Federal Government and the Department of Interior is pressing ahead with regulations which would apply to Federal lands.

President Obama has had a war on fossil fuels now for longer than he has been President of the United States. If they could stop hydraulic fracturing and regulate that at the Federal level, then they can stop this boom that is going on in the country. We have had a 40-percent increase in the last 4 years in our production of oil and gas, but that is all on private and State land. We have actually had a reduction in our production on Federal lands.

The EPA has been developing a guidance document for the waters of the United States which would impose the Clean Water Restoration Act on the country. They tried to introduce and pass it 2 years ago. Senator Feingold from Wisconsin and Congressman Oberstar were the authors. Not only was it defeated, but they were both defeated in their next election. That effort is something the President is again trying to do, which they were not able to do through regulations.

What it means is this: We have rules saying that the Federal Government is in charge of water runoff in this country only to the extent it is navigable. That is the word written into the law. If you take the ''navigable'' out, then if you have standing water after a rain, that would be regulated by the Federal Government. That is a major problem that our farmers have—not just the Oklahoma Farm Bureau but farm bureaus throughout America. The Water Restoration Act and the cap-and-trade are the two major issues they are concerned with.

A lot of what the EPA has done is done through enforcement. About a year ago, one of our staff persons discovered that a guy named Al Armendariz, who was a regional EPA administrator, talking to a bunch of people in Texas, said:

> We need to ''crucify'' the oil and gas industry. Just like when the Romans conquered the villages . . . in Turkish towns and they'd find the first five guys they saw and crucify them . . . . . just to show who was in charge.

This is a perspective not just of Armendariz but the entire EPA to the fossil fuel industry.

By the way, Armendariz is no longer there. He is with one of the environmental groups I know, and I am sure he is a lot happier there.

The EPA is also dramatically expanding the number of permits they are required to obtain under the Clean Air Act by counting multiple well sites as though they were one site, even though they may be spread out in as many as 42 square miles.

All of this is so they can regulate more of what goes on at the wells and underscores how adversarial they have been to us having the fuel we need to run this country. The EPA was eventually sued and lost the case over this issue, the issue of what they are doing right now throughout America to try to force all the multiple well sites into one site as they did. They lost in the Sixth Circuit Court of Appeals. But everyplace outside of the Sixth Circuit the EPA is still using their own regulation. This is one we have been talking to them about.

The EPA is also targeting the agricultural community. We talked about what their top concerns are, but in addition to that, the EPA recently released the private sensitive data of pork producers and the concentrated animal feeding operations, that is CAFOs, to environmental groups. The environmental groups hate CAFOs and the EPA knows this, so by doing this the EPA has enabled the environmental groups to target CAFOs and put them out of business.

Those are our farmers. It seems to me when people come into my office and they talk about the abuses of this overregulation, all these things, it seems the ones who keep getting hit worse and worse are the farmers. I can remember when they tried to treat propane as a hazardous waste. We had a hearing. This was some years ago. I was at that time the chairman of the Environment and Public Works Committee. I can remember when they said this only costs the average farmer in Oklahoma another $600 or $700 a year. We went through this thing and were able to defeat that.

Farmers have been hit hard, but they are not alone. All these regulations have been devastating to the entire economy and they are preventing us from achieving our economic recovery. The President is engaged in all-out war on fossil fuels, and he is intent on completing this until his assault on the free enterprise system is completed. The business community knows how bad the regulations are. They have been fighting them tooth and nail since the beginning of Obama's first term.

This chart shows the rules that were approved during the President's first term. This is what he did. If you look at it, take some time—these will be printed in the RECORD so you need to be looking them up and realizing how

serious it is. The greenhouse gas, we talked about that, the EPA, on the diesel engines. All of these regulations are costing fortunes.

The second chart—those are the ones that were approved during the President's first administration. The second is more alarming because it shows several of the major rules the President began developing during his first term but delayed their finalization until after the election. They waited until after the election, knowing the American people would realize how costly this was and that could cost his campaign. He is gaming the system using his administration to advance a critical agenda but hiding the truth from the American people and he is doing it with secret talking points and doing it with the secrecy that shrouds bad rules.

These are the rules that were delayed until after the election. You can get a good idea of the cost. We take down the cost of each one. It is just an incredible amount.

The third chart is—that is what he is doing right now with no accountability to the electorate because he can do anything he wants to right now. Groups are on record opposing this. We have all these groups that are on record opposing this: U.S. Chamber of Commerce, National Association of Manufacturers, NFIB, American Railroads—all the way down through all the agricultural groups and including a lot of labor unions. Historically, the labor unions go right along with the Democrats and with the liberals, but they realize this is a jobs bill and consequently we have the United Mine Workers and others who are being affected by this and are trying to do something about overregulation. All these groups have opposed the rules being put out by the EPA.

Even the unions have opposed the rules because they kill all kinds of jobs, union and nonunion jobs alike. Cecil Roberts, the president of the United Mine Workers, said his organization supported my Congressional Review Act.

Let me explain what that was. You may have noticed in the first chart we had the first MACT bill that was passed. That would put coal out of business. What we have in this body is a rule that nobody uses very often—it has not been used very successfully—but it says if a regulator passes something that is not in the best interests of the people, if you get past the Congressional Review Act with just 30 cosponsors in the Senate, get a simple majority, you can stop that from going into effect.

I had a CRA on that Utility MACT, and Cecil Roberts, president of the United Mine Workers, said his organization supported my CRA to overturn the Utility MACT rule because the rule poses loss of jobs to United Mine Workers Association members.

We also had something recently about Jimmy Hoffa that came out.

These are jobs. These are important. The national unemployment rate is 7.6, but guess what. In Oklahoma we are at full employment. All throughout America, people used to think of the oil belt being west of the Mississippi. That is not true anymore. With the Marcellus chain going through—you have New York, Pennsylvania—in Pennsylvania I understand it is the second largest employer up there. If we were able to do throughout America what we do in Oklahoma, we would solve the problem we have right now. But the Obama rules are there and Obama wants to pursue more that are even worse.

I mention this. We are going to have a very fine lady, Gina McCarthy, who has been the Assistant Director of EPA in charge of air regulations for about 4 years. While we get along very well, she is the one who promotes these regulations. I will not be able to support her nomination. I understand the votes are all there, and we will be having a good working relationship.

But I think it is a wake-up call to the American people. They are going to have to realize the cost. The total cost of these regulations is well over $600 billion annually, which will cost us as many as 9 million jobs. The EPA is the reason our Nation has not returned to full employment. All of this is done intentionally by the Obama administration to cater to their extreme base—right now moveon.org, George Soros, Michael Moore, and that crowd from the far left environmentalists, Hollywood and their friends.

This is going to have to change through a major education endeavor. We have a country to save.

I know there is a lot of partisan politics going on. In this case, the least known destructive force in our country now is overregulation and all of these organizations that are going to pose it are going to have to pay for it. It is going to be paid for in American dollars and American jobs.

I see my colleague from Iowa is on the floor.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HEINRICH). The Senator from Iowa.

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, I will take a few minutes to talk about the President's nominee for Secretary of Labor Tom Perez. I have already spoken about Mr. Perez over the last few weeks. I will not repeat everything I said, but it is important for my colleagues to understand the basis of my opposition. We have had a lot of debate around here over the last few days about what grounds are appropriate to oppose an executive branch nominee. Many of my colleagues have suggested that Senators should not vote against such a nominee based on disagreement over policy. That may or may not be the appropriate view, but I am not going to get into that debate today.

I am quite sure I would disagree with Mr. Perez on a host of policy issues, but I wish to make clear to my colleagues those policy differences are not the reason I am vigorously opposed to this nominee. I am opposed to Mr. Perez because the record he has established of government service demonstrates that he is willing to use the levers of government power to manipulate the law in order to advance a political agenda.

Several of my colleagues cited examples of his track record in this regard, but in my view perhaps the most alarming example of Mr. Perez's willingness to manipulate the rule of law is his involvement in the quid pro quo between the City of St. Paul and the Department of Justice. In this deal that the Department of Justice cut with the City of St. Paul, the Department agreed not to join two False Claims Act cases in exchange for the City of St. Paul withdrawing its case before the Supreme Court in a case called Magner v. Gallagher.

Mr. Perez's actions in this case are extremely troubling for a number of reasons. At this point, no one disputes the fact that Mr. Perez actually orchestrated this entire arrangement. He manipulated the Supreme Court docket so that his favored legal theory, called disparate impact theory, would evade review by the High Court. In the process, Mr. Perez left a whistleblower twisting in the wind. Those are the facts and even Mr. Perez doesn't dispute them.

The fact that Mr. Perez struck a deal that potentially squandered up to 200 million taxpayer dollars in order to preserve a disparate impact theory that he favored is, of course, extremely troubling in and of itself. But in addition to that underlying quid pro quo, the evidence uncovered in my investigation revealed Mr. Perez sought to cover up the facts that the exchange ever took place.

Finally, and let me emphasize that this should concern all of my colleagues, when Mr. Perez testified under oath about the case, both to congressional investigators and during confirmation hearings, in those two instances, Mr. Perez told a different story. The fact is that the story Mr. Perez told is simply not supported by the evidence.

Let me begin by reviewing briefly the underlying quid pro quo. In the fall of 2011, the Department of Justice was poised to join a False Claims Act lawsuit against the City of St. Paul. That is where the $200 million comes in. That is what was expected to be recovered. The career lawyers in the U.S. Attorney's Office in Minnesota were recommending that the Department of Justice join the case. The career lawyers in the Civil Division of the Department of Justice were recommending the Department join the case. And the career lawyers in the Department of Housing and Urban Development were recommending that Justice join the case. At that point, all of the relevant components of government believed this case was a very good case.

They considered the case on the merits, and they supported moving forward, or as one of the line attorneys wrote in an e-mail in October, 2011: ''Looks like everyone is on board.'' But of course this was all before Mr. Perez got involved.

At about the same time, the Supreme Court agreed to hear the case called Magner v. Gallagher.

In Magner, the City of St. Paul was challenging the use of the disparate impact theory under the Fair Housing Act. The disparate impact theory is a mechanism Mr. Perez and the Civil Rights Division were using in lawsuits against banks for their lending practices. For instance, during this time period Mr. Perez and the Justice Department were suing Countrywide for its lending practices based upon disparate impact analysis. In fact, in December 2011 the Department announced it reached a $355 million settlement with Countrywide. Again, in July 2012 the Department of Justice announced a $175 million settlement with Wells Fargo addressing fair lending claims based upon that same disparate impact analysis. Of course, there are a string of additional examples, but I don't need to recite them here.

What is clear is that if that theory were undermined by the Supreme Court, it would likely spell trouble for Mr. Perez's lawsuits against the banks. Mr. Perez approached the lawyers handling the Magner case, and, quite simply, he cut a deal. The Department of Justice agreed not to join two False Claims Act cases in exchange for the City of St. Paul withdrawing Magner from the Supreme Court. Now we have an interference in the agenda of the Supreme Court at the same time that a deal is going to cut the taxpayers out of winning back $200 million under the False Claims Act.

In early February 2012 Mr. Perez flew to St. Paul, and he flew there solely to finalize the deal. The next week the Justice Department declined to join the first False Claims Act, called the Newell case. The next day the City of St. Paul kept their end of the bargain and withdrew the Magner case from the Supreme Court.

There are a couple of aspects of this deal that I wish to emphasize for my colleagues. First, as I mentioned, the evidence makes clear that Mr. Perez took steps to cover up the fact he had bartered away the False Claims Act cases and the $200 million.

On January 10, 2012, Mr. Perez called the line attorney in the U.S. Attorney's Office regarding the memo in the Newell case. Newell was the case that these same career attorneys I referred to and quoted previously were strongly recommending the United States join before Mr. Perez got involved. Mr. Perez called the line attorney and instructed him not to discuss the Magner case in the memo that he prepared outlining the reasons for the decisions not to join the case. Here is what Mr. Perez said on that call:

> Hey, Greg. This is Tom Perez calling you at—excuse me, calling you at 9 o'clock on Tuesday. I got your message. The main thing I want to ask you, I spoke to some folks in the Civil Division yesterday and wanted to make sure that the declination memo that you sent to the Civil Division—and I am sure it probably already does this—but it doesn't make any mention of the Magner case. It is just a memo on the merits of the two cases that are under review in the qui tam context.

It is pretty clear they didn't want anything in writing that led people to believe there was any deal being made.

After that telephone message was left, approximately 1 hour later Mr. Perez sent Mr. Brooker a followup e-mail, writing:

> I left a detailed voicemail. Call me if you can after you have a chance to review [the] voicemail.

Several hours later Mr. Perez sent another followup e-mail, writing:

> Were you able to listen to my message?

Mr. Perez's voicemail was quite clear and obvious. It told Mr. Brooker to ''make sure that the declination memo . . . doesn't make any mention of the Magner case. It is just a memo on the merits of the two cases.'' It is so very clear. In fact, it couldn't be more clear that this was an effort—that there was no paper trail that there was ever any deal made.

Yet, when congressional investigators asked Mr. Perez why he left the voicemail, he told an entirely different story. Here is what he told investigators:

> What I meant to communicate was, it is time to bring this to closure, and if the only issue that is standing in the way is how you talk about Magner, then don't talk about it.

Anyone who actually listens to the voicemail knows this is plainly not what he said in that voicemail. He didn't say anything about being concerned with the delay. He said: Make sure you don't mention Magner. It is just a memo on the merits. His intent was crystal clear.

Mr. Perez also testified that Mr. Brooker called him back the next day and refused to omit the discussion of Magner. Let's applaud that civil servant because he chose not to play that game. According to Mr. Perez, he told Mr. Brooker during this call to follow the normal process. Again, this story is not supported by the evidence.

One month later, after Mr. Perez flew to Minnesota to personally seal the deal with the city, a line attorney in the Civil Division e-mailed his superior to outline the ''additional facts'' about the deal.

Before I begin the quote, I want to give the definition of ''USA-MN,'' which stands for ''U.S. Attorney, Minnesota.''

Point 6 reads as follows:

> USA-MN considers it non-negotiable that its office will include a discussion of the Supreme Court case and the policy issues in its declination memo.

If Mr. Perez's story were true and the issue was resolved on January 11, why 1 month later would the U.S. Attorney's Office need to emphatically state that it would not hide the fact that the exchange took place?

As I just mentioned, Mr. Perez flew to Minneapolis to finalize the deal on February 3. You would think, wouldn't you, that a deal of this magnitude would be written down so the parties understood exactly what each side agreed to. But was this agreement written down? No, it wasn't. After Mr. Perez finalized the deal, the career attorneys asked if there was going to be a written agreement. What was Mr. Perez's response? He said: ''No, just oral discussions; word was your bond.''

So let me just review. At this point Mr. Perez had just orchestrated a deal where the United States declined to join a case worth up to $200 million of taxpayers' money in exchange for the City of St. Paul withdrawing a case from the Supreme Court. When the career lawyers asked if this deal will be written down, he said: ''No . . . [your] word was your bond.''

Of course, the reason you make agreements like this in writing is so that there is no disagreement down the road about what the parties agreed to. As it turns out, there was, in fact, a disagreement about the terms of this unwritten deal.

The lawyer for the city, Mr. Lillehaug, told congressional investigators that on January 9, approximately 1 month before the deal was finalized, Mr. Perez had assured him that ''HUD would be helpful'' if the Newell case proceeded after the Department of Justice declined to intervene. Mr. Lillehaug also told investigators that on February 4, the day after they finalized the deal, Mr. Perez told him that HUD had begun assembling information to assist the city in a motion to dismiss the Newell complaint on ''original source'' grounds. According to Mr. Lillehaug, this assistance disappeared after the lawyers in the Civil Division learned of it.

Why is that significant? Mr. Perez represents the United States. He represents the American people. Mr. Newell, the whistleblower, is bringing a case on behalf of the United States and indirectly the people. Mr. Perez is talking to the lawyers on the other side, and he tells the people, in essence: After the United States declines to join the case, we will give you information to help you defeat Mr. Newell, who is bringing the case on behalf of the United States.

Let me say that a different way. In effect, Mr. Perez is offering to give the other side information to help defeat his own client. Is that the way you represent the American people? Mr. Perez was asked about this under oath. Mr. Perez told congressional investigators, ''No, I don't recall ever suggesting that.''

So on the one hand, we have Mr. Lillehaug, who says Mr. Perez made this offer first in January and then again on February 4 but the assistance disappeared after the lawyers in the

Civil Division caught wind of it. On the other hand, it was Mr. Perez who testified under oath: ''I don't recall'' ever making such an offer. Whom should we believe? The documents support Mr. Lillehaug's version of the event.

On February 7, a line attorney sent an e-mail to the director of the Civil Fraud Section and relayed a conversation a line attorney in Minnesota had with Mr. Lillehaug. The line attorney wrote that Mr. Lillehaug stated that there were two additional items that were part of the deal. One of the two items was this:

> HUD will provide material to the City in support of their motion to dismiss on original source grounds.

Internal e-mails show that when the career lawyers learned of this promise, they strongly disagreed with it, and they conveyed their concern to Tony West, head of the Civil Division. During his transcribed interviews, Mr. West testified that it would have been ''inappropriate'' to provide this material outside of the normal discovery channels. Mr. West said:

> I just know that that wasn't going to happen, and it didn't happen.

In other words, when the lawyers at the Civil Division learned of this offer, they shut it down.

Again, why is this important? It is important because it demonstrates that the documentary evidence shows the events transpired exactly as Mr. Lillehaug said they did.

Mr. Perez offered to provide the other side with information that would help them defeat Mr. Newell in this case on behalf of the United States. In my opinion, this is simply stunning. Mr. Perez represents the United States. Any lawyer would say it is highly inappropriate to offer to help the other side defeat their own client.

This brings me to my final two points that I wish to highlight for my colleagues. Even though the Department traded away Mr. Newell's case and $200 million, Mr. Perez has defended his actions, in part by claiming that Mr. Newell still had his ''day in court.'' What Mr. Perez omits from his story is that Mr. Newell's case was dismissed precisely because the United States would not continue to be a party and would not be a party.

After the United States declined to join the case, the judge dismissed Mr. Newell's case based upon the ''public disclosure bar,'' finding that he was not the original source of information to the government.

I will remind my colleagues, we amended the False Claims Act several years ago precisely to prevent an outcome such as this. Specifically, the amendments made clear that the Justice Department can contest the ''original source'' dismissal even if it fails to intervene, as it did in this case.

So the Department didn't merely decline to intervene, which is bad enough, but, in fact, it affirmatively chose to leave Mr. Newell all alone in this case. And, of course, that was the whole point. That is why it was so important for the City of St. Paul to make sure the United States did not join the case. That is why the city was willing to trade away a strong case before the Supreme Court, and when the Newell case didn't go forward, they cut the taxpayers out of $200 million. The city knew if the United States joined the action the case would almost certainly go forward. Conversely, the city knew if the United States did not join the case and chose not to contest the original source, it would likely get dismissed.

The Department traded away a case worth millions of taxpayers' dollars. They did it precisely because of the impact the decision would have on the litigation. They knew as a result of their decision, the whole whistleblower case would get dismissed based upon ''original source'' grounds since the Department didn't contest it. Not only that, Mr. Perez went so far as to offer to provide documents to the other side that would help them defeat Mr. Newell in his case on behalf of Mr. Perez's client, the United States.

That is really looking out for the taxpayers. How would a person like to have a lawyer such as Mr. Perez defending them in some death penalty case? Yet when the Congress started asking questions, they had the guts to say: ''We didn't do anything improper because Mr. Newell still had his day in court.'' Well, Mr. Newell didn't have his day in court because the success of that $200 million case was dependent upon the United States staying in it.

Now, this brings me to my last point on the substance of this matter, and that has to do with the strength of the case. Throughout our investigation, the Department has tried to defend Mr. Perez's action by claiming the case was marginal and weak. Once again, however, the documents tell a far different story.

Before Mr. Perez got involved, the career lawyers at the Department wrote a memo recommending intervention in the case. In that memo, they described St. Paul's actions as ''a particularly egregious example of false certifications.''

In fact, the career lawyers in Minnesota felt so strongly about the case they took the unusual step of flying to Washington, DC, to meet with officials in the Department of Housing and Urban Development. The Department of Housing and Urban Development, of course, agreed the United States should intervene in this false claims case. But, of course, that was all before Mr. Perez got involved.

The documents make clear that career lawyers considered it a strong case, but the Department has claimed that Mike Hertz—the Department's expert on the False Claims Act—considered it a weak case. In fact, during his confirmation hearing, Mr. Perez testified before my colleagues on the Senate HELP Committee that Mr. Hertz ''had a very immediate and visceral reaction that it was a weak case.''

Once again, the documents tell a much different story than was told to Members of the Senate. Mr. Hertz knew about the case in November of 2011. Two months later, a Department official took notes of a meeting where the quid pro quo was discussed. The official wrote down Mr. Hertz's reaction. She wrote:

> Mike—odd—Looks like buying off St. Paul. Should be whether there are legit reasons to decline as to past practice.

The next day, the same official e-mailed the associate attorney general and said:

> Mike Hertz brought up the St. Paul disparate impact case in which the Solicitor General just filed an amicus brief in the Supreme Court. He's concerned about the recommendation that we decline to intervene in two qui tam cases against St. Paul.

These documents appear to show that Mr. Hertz's primary concern was not the strength of the case, as Mr. Perez led my Senate colleagues to believe. Mr. Hertz was concerned the quid pro quo Mr. Perez ultimately arranged was improper. Again, in his words, it ''looks like buying off St. Paul.'' Yet, Mr. Perez led my colleagues on the HELP Committee to believe that Mr. Hertz believed it was a bad case on the merits.

Let me make one final point regarding process and why it is premature to even be having this debate. As of today, when we vote on Mr. Perez's nomination, we will be voting on a nominee who, to date, has not complied with a congressional subpoena compelling him to turn over certain documents to Congress. I am referring to the fact that the House Committee on Oversight and Government Reform subpoenaed e-mails from Mr. Perez.

During the course of our investigation, we learned that Mr. Perez was routinely using his private e-mail account to conduct government business, including business related to the quid pro quo. In fact, the Department of Justice admitted that Mr. Perez had used his private e-mail account approximately 1,200 times to conduct government business. After Mr. Perez refused to turn those documents over voluntarily, then the House oversight committee was forced to issue a subpoena. Yet, today, Mr. Perez has refused to comply with the subpoena.

Here we have a person in the Justice Department doing all of these bad things. People want him to be Secretary of Labor, and we are supposed to confirm somebody who will not respond to a subpoena for information to which Congress is constitutionally entitled. We have people come before Congress who say, yes, they will respond to letters from Congress; they will come up and testify; they are going to cooperate in the spirit of checks and balances, and then we have somebody before the Senate who will not even respond to a subpoena.

So I find it quite troubling that this body would take this step and move forward with a nomination when the

nominee simply refuses to comply with an outstanding subpoena. Can any of my colleagues recall an instance in the past when we were asked to confirm a nominee who had flatly refused to comply with a congressional subpoena? Why would we want somebody in the Cabinet thumbing their nose at the elected representatives of the people of this country who have the constitutional responsibility of checks and balances to make sure the laws are faithfully executed? That is what they take an oath to do. It is quite extraordinary and should concern all of my colleagues, not just Republicans.

My colleagues are well aware of how I feel about the Whistleblower Protection Act, and my colleagues know how I feel about protecting whistleblowers who have the courage to step forward, often at great risk to their careers. But this is about much more than the whistleblower who was left dangling by Mr. Perez. This is about the fact that Mr. Perez manipulated the rule of law in order to get a case removed from the Supreme Court docket. And this is about the fact that when Congress started asking questions about this case, and when Mr. Perez was called upon to offer his testimony under oath, he chose to tell a different story.

The unavoidable conclusion is that the story he told is not supported by the facts. This is also about the fact that we are about to confirm a nominee who, even as of today, is still thumbing his nose at Congress by refusing to comply with a congressional subpoena.

I began by saying that although I disagree with Mr. Perez on a host of policy issues, those disagreements are not the primary reason my colleagues should reject this nomination. We should reject this nomination because Mr. Perez manipulated the levers of power available to few people in order to save a legal theory from Supreme Court review.

Perhaps more importantly, when Mr. Perez was called upon to answer questions about his actions under oath, I do not believe he gave us a straight story.

Finally, we should reject this nomination because Mr. Perez failed—and refuses still—to comply with a congressional subpoena.

For these reasons, I strongly oppose the nomination, and I urge my colleagues to do the same.

Mr. President, I have completed my statement and I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Maryland.

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. President, I have listened very carefully to my friend from Iowa, and I couldn't disagree with him more. I know he has very strong views about the nomination of Tom Perez, but let me go through the record.

I wish to spend a little bit of time speaking first about Tom Perez. I know him very well. We have served together in government in Maryland. He served on the county council of Montgomery County. I will mention that he was the first Latino to serve on the county council of Montgomery County. Montgomery County, which is very close to here, is larger than some of our States. It is a large government. It has very complex problems. He served with great distinction on the county council.

As the Presiding Officer knows, it is a very difficult responsibility to serve local government. One has to deal with the day-to-day problems of the people in the community. He served with such distinction that he was selected to be the president of the county council, the head of the county council of Montgomery County.

He then went on to become the Secretary of the Department of Labor, Licensing and Regulation under Governor O'Malley in the State of Maryland, which is a very comparable position to which President Obama has appointed him as Secretary of Labor in his Cabinet.

It is very interesting that as Secretary of Labor, Licensing and Regulation, he had to deal with very difficult issues—issues that can divide groups. But, instead, he brought labor and business together and resolved many issues.

It is very interesting, in his confirmation process, business leaders and labor leaders came forward to say this is the right person at the right time to serve as Secretary of Labor in the Obama administration.

I held a press briefing with the former head of the Republican party in Maryland and he was very quick to point out that Tom Perez and he did not agree on a lot of policy issues, but he is a professional, he listens, and tries to make the right judgment. That is why he should be confirmed as Secretary of Labor. That was the former head of the Republican party in Maryland who made those statements a few months ago.

Tom Perez has a long history of public service. He served originally in the Department of Justice in many different capacities. He started in the Department of Justice. He served in the Civil Rights Division and, of course, later became the head of the Civil Rights Division. He helped us in the Senate, serving as a staff person for Senator Kennedy.

I think the greatest testimony of his effectiveness is how he has taken the Civil Rights Division from a division that had lost a lot of its glamour, a lot of its objectivity under the previous administration, and is returning the Department of Justice to that great institution to protect the rights of all Americans.

Look at his record in the Department of Justice: Enforcement of the Shepard-Byrd Hate Crimes Prevention Act. The division convicted 141 defendants on hate crimes charges in 4 years. That is a 74-percent increase over the previous 4 years. The division brought 194 human trafficking cases. That is a 40-percent increase.

You could talk a good deal about what happened between 2004 and 2008 with Countrywide Financial Corporation, one of the Nation's largest residential mortgage lenders, engaging in systematic discrimination against African-American and Latino borrowers by steering them into subprime loans or requiring them to pay more for their mortgages. I know the pain that caused. I met with families who should have been in traditional mortgages who were steered into subprime loans, and they lost their homes. Tom Perez represented them in one of the largest recoveries ever. The division's settlement in 2011 required Bank of America—now the owner of Countrywide—to provide $335 million in monetary relief to the more than 230,000 victims of discriminatory lending—the largest fair lending settlement in history.

That is the record of Tom Perez as the head of the Civil Rights Division.

The division investigated Wells Fargo Bank, the largest residential home mortgage lender in the United States, alleging that the bank engaged in a nationwide pattern or practice of discrimination against minority borrowers placed, again, in subprime loans. The division's settlement—the largest per-victim recovery ever reached in a division lending discrimination case—required Wells Fargo to pay more than $184 million to compensate discrimination victims and to make a $50 million investment in a home buyer assistance program.

I could go on and on and on about the record Tom Perez has in his public service—at the county level, at the State level, and at the Federal level. He has devoted his career to public service and has gotten the praise of conservatives and progressives, Democrats and liberals, and business leaders and labor leaders. That is the person we need to head the Department of Labor.

So let my spend a few minutes talking about Senator GRASSLEY's two points that he raises as to why we should deny confirmation of the nomination of Tom Perez, the President's choice for his Cabinet.

He talked about the fact that Tom Perez has not answered all the information Senator GRASSLEY would like to see from a House committee—a partisan effort in the House of Representatives. It is not the only case. There is hardly a day or a week that goes by that there is not another partisan investigation in the House of Representatives. That is the matter the Senator from Iowa was talking about—not an effort that we try to do in this body, in the Senate, to work bipartisanly when we are doing investigations. This has been a partisan investigation.

Thousands of pages of documents have been made available to congressional committees by the Department of Justice. So let's get the record straight as to compliance. The Department of Justice, Tom Perez, has complied with the reasonable requests of

the Congress of the United States and spent a lot of time doing that. It is our responsibility for oversight, and we have carried out our responsibility for oversight. Any balanced review of the work done by the Department of Justice Civil Rights Division will give the highest marks to Tom Perez on restoring the integrity of that very important division in the Department of Justice.

Let me talk about the second matter Senator GRASSLEY brings up, and that deals with the City of St. Paul case—one case. It dealt with the city of St. Paul in the Supreme Court Magner case.

Senator GRASSLEY points out, and correctly so, this is a disparate impact case. It not only affects the individual case that is before the Court, it will have an impact on these types of cases generally. When you are deciding whether to litigate one of these cases, you have to make a judgment as to whether this is the case you want to present to the Court to make a point that will affect not only justice for the litigant but for many other litigants. You have to decide the risk of litigation versus the benefit of litigation. You have to make some tough choices as to whether the risk is worth the benefit.

In this case, the decision was made, not by Tom Perez, not by one person. Career attorneys were brought into the mix, and career attorneys—career attorneys—advised against the Department of Justice interceding in this case. HUD lawyers thought this was not a good case for the United States to intercede.

Senator GRASSLEY says: Well, this was a situation where there was a quid pro quo. It was not. There was a request that the United States intercede and dismiss. Tom Perez said: No, we are not going to do that. The litigation went forward. So a professional decision was made based upon the best advice, gotten by career attorneys—attorneys from the agency that was directly affected by the case that was before the Court—and a decision was made that most objective observers will tell you was a professional judgment that is hard to question. It made sense at the time.

I understand Senator GRASSLEY has a concern about the case. People can come to different conclusions. But look at the entire record of Tom Perez. I think he made the right decision in that case. But I know he has a proud record of leadership on behalf of the rights of all Americans, and that is the type of person we should have as Secretary of Labor.

Tom Perez has been through confirmation before. He was confirmed by the Judiciary Committee to serve as the head of the Civil Rights Division of the Department of Justice. Thorough vetting was done at that time. Questions were asked, debate was held on the floor of the Senate, and by a very comfortable margin he was confirmed to be the head of the Civil Rights Division.

Now the Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions Committee has held a hearing on Tom Perez to be Secretary of Labor. They held a vote several months ago and reported him favorably to the floor. It is time for us to have an up-or-down vote on the President's nomination for Secretary of Labor. I hope all my colleagues would vote to allow this nomination to be voted up or down.

I was listening to my distinguished friend from Iowa. I heard nothing that would deny us the right to have a vote on a Presidential nomination. That is the first vote we are going to have on whether we are going to filibuster a Cabinet position for the President of United States and a person whose record is distinguished with a long record of public service—and a proven record.

Then the second vote is on confirmation, and Senators may disagree. I respect every Senator to do what he or she thinks is in the best interests. But I would certainly hope on this first vote, when we are dealing with whether we are going to filibuster a President's nomination for Secretary of Labor, that we would get the overwhelming support of our colleagues to allow an up-or-down vote on Tom Perez to be the next Secretary of Labor.

I started by saying I have known Tom Perez for a long time, and I have. I know he is a good person, a person who is in public service for the right reasons, a person who believes each individual should be protected under our system, and that as Secretary of Labor he will use that position to bring the type of balance we need in our commercial communities to protect working people and businesses so the American economy can grow and everyone can benefit from our great economy.

I urge my colleagues to support this nomination and certainly to support moving forward on an up-or-down vote on the nomination to be Secretary of Labor.

With that, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Vermont.

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. President, let me begin by concurring with the remarks of Senator CARDIN. Tom Perez will make an excellent Secretary of Labor, and I strongly support his nomination.

GLOBAL WARMING

Mr. President, it is no great secret that the Congress is currently held in very low esteem by the American people, and there are a lot of reasons for that. But I think the major reason, perhaps, is, in the midst of so many serious problems facing our country, the American people perceive that we are not addressing those issues, and they are right.

Regardless of what your political point of view may be, we are looking at a middle class that is disappearing. Are we addressing that issue? No. Poverty is extraordinarily high. Are we moving aggressively to address that? No, we are not. We have the most expensive health care system in the world, enormously bureaucratic and wasteful. Are we addressing that? No, we are not. But the issue I want to talk about today—maybe more clearly than any other issue in terms of our neglect—is the issue of global warming.

At a time when virtually the entire scientific community—the people who spend their lives studying climate change—tells us that global warming is real, that it is significantly caused by human activity, and that it is already doing great damage, it is beyond comprehension that this Senate, this Congress, is not even discussing that enormously important issue on the floor of the Senate. Where is the debate? Where is the legislation on what might be considered the most significant planetary crisis we face? I fear very much that our children and our grandchildren—who will reap the pain from our neglect—will never forgive us for not moving in the way we should be moving.

I understand that some of my colleagues, including my good friend JIM INHOFE from Oklahoma—whom I like very much—that some of my Republican friends, especially, believe global warming is a hoax. They believe global warming is a hoax perpetrated by Al Gore, the United Nations, the Hollywood elite. This is what people such as JIM INHOFE actually believe.

Well, I have to say to my good friend Mr. INHOFE that he is dead wrong. Global warming is not just a crisis that will impact us in years to come, it is impacting us right now, and it is a crisis we must address. In fact, global warming is the most serious environmental crisis facing not just the United States of America but our entire planet, and we cannot continue to ignore that reality.

Science News reports that cities in America matched or broke at least 29,000 high-temperature records last year.

According to the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, 2012 was the warmest year ever recorded for the contiguous United States. It was the hottest year ever recorded in New York, in Washington, DC, in Louisville, KY, and in my hometown of Burlington, VT, and other cities across the Nation.

Our oceans also are warming quickly and catastrophically. A new study found that North Atlantic waters last summer were the warmest in 159 years of record-keeping. The United Nations World Meteorological Organization in May issued a warning about ''the loss of Arctic sea ice and extreme weather that is increasingly shaped by climate change.''

Scientists are now warning that the Arctic may experience entirely ice-free summers within 2 years. Let me repeat that. The Arctic may experience entirely ice-free summers within 2 years. Scientists are also reporting that carbon dioxide levels have reached a dangerous milestone level of 400 parts per

million, a level not seen on the planet Earth for millions of years.

In fact, the world's leading scientists unequivocally agree. A recent review of the scientific literature found that more than 98 percent of peer-reviewed scientific studies on climate change support the conclusion that human activity is causing climate change. The American Association for the Advancement of Science, one of the most important and prestigious scientific organizations in our country and the world, this is what they say:

> Among scientists, there is now overwhelming agreement based on multiple lines of scientific evidence that global climate change is real. It is happening right now. It will have broad impacts on society.

That is from the American Association for the Advancement of Science. We are not into speculation. We are not into debate. The conclusion is there. Global warming is real. It is happening right now. It is impacting the United States of America and the world right now. It will only get worse if we do not act.

The examples of that are so numerous that one can go on hour after hour. But let me give you just a few. Extreme weather events are now occurring with increased frequency and increased intensity; that is, extreme weather disturbances. In 2011 and 2012, the United States experienced an extraordinary 25 billion-dollar disasters—25 separate billion-dollar disasters, so called because they each caused more than $1 billion worth of damage.

That is unprecedented. NOAA's Climate Extreme Index, which is a system for assessing a wide range of extreme weather that includes extreme temperatures, extreme drought, extreme precipitation, tropical storms—NOAA's Climate Extreme Index tells us that 2012 was characterized by the second most extreme climate conditions ever recorded.

A number of colleagues make the point—they come up and say: Senator SANDERS and others, dealing with climate change is going to be expensive. Transforming our energy system away from fossil fuels is going to be expensive. They are right. It is going to be expensive.

But the question we have to ask is, compared to what? Compared to doing nothing? Compared to conducting business as usual? Compared to allowing a significant increase in drought, in floods, in extreme weather disturbances? Compared to that, acting now and acting boldly is cost-effective. Yes, it will be expensive. But it will be a lot less expensive, cause a lot less human pain and less human deaths than allowing global warming to continue unmitigated.

The cost—and this is an interesting point, especially for my conservative friends who look to the business community for information and for analysis. The cost of catastrophe and extreme weather events has been trending upward for 30 years. This is very much a budget and economic issue. Munich Re, the largest reinsurance company in the world, the company that insures the insurance companies, has already documented a fivefold increase in extreme weather events in North America since 1980.

They keep track of this stuff pretty closely because for them this is a dollars-and-cents issue. They are the ones who help others pay out the benefits when there is extreme damage as a result of storms and floods, et cetera. Munich Re calculated that the economic cost of damages due to natural catastrophes in the United States exceeded $139 billion in 2012 alone.

So when you talk about money and you talk about expense and you talk about cost, let's understand that we already are racking up recordbreaking costs in terms of dealing with the extreme weather disturbances we have seen in recent years.

The Allianz insurance company noted bluntly last fall, ''Climate change represents a threat to our business.'' That is an insurance company. But it is not just the insurance companies; it is the businesses that are seeing insurance become unaffordable when they are hit with floods and other disasters. That comes right out of their bottom line.

Global warming, of course, is closely tied to drought and fire as well. Last year's drought affecting two-thirds of the United States was the worst in half a century. But the United States is not the only country on Earth being impacted.

We obviously pay attention to what is happening within our borders. But global warming is having huge impacts all over this planet. Brazil is experiencing its worst drought in 50 years. It is directly affecting over 10 million people in that country. Because of impacts to wheat farms, the price of flour rose over 700 percent.

Australia just experienced a 4-month heat wave with severe wildfires, record-setting temperatures and torrential rains and flooding causing over $2 billion in damage in that country.

In recent years, other parts of the world—Russia, China, Southern Europe and Eastern Europe—have also suffered severe heat waves and droughts, with substantial impacts to agricultural communities and their economic well-being.

Just weeks ago, as everybody in America knows, we watched as fires raged across parts of the Western United States, including the massive and dangerously explosive West Fork fire in southwestern Colorado. Let me take a moment now to acknowledge the deaths of 19 unbelievably brave firefighters from Prescott, AZ, who lost their lives trying to protect their neighbors and property near Phoenix.

Wildfires such as these appear to be increasingly common. In fact, the Chief of the U.S. Forest Service Thomas Tidwell reported to Congress that America's wildfire season lasts 2 months longer than it did 40 years ago and burns twice as much land as it did then because of the hotter, drier conditions from climate change.

Last year's extraordinary wildfires burned more than 9 million acres of land, according to the National Interagency Fire Center. Chief Tidwell also warned of the increasing frequency of monster fires. When we are talking about drought, it is not just some kind of abstraction. When drought occurs, agriculture suffers. When agriculture suffers, the cost of food goes up. In parts of the world where people have very little money, this is catastrophic.

That is one of the points made by the CIA, the Department of Defense, many of our intelligence agencies. When they talk about national security issues, they often put at the top of the list or close to the top of the list global warming because they understand that drought and floods mean people do not have the food they need, people do not have the water they need, people are going to migrate from one area to another. It is going to cause tension. It is going to cause conflict. So global warming is also a major national security issue.

One of the issues we do not talk enough about—I know Senator WHITEHOUSE of Rhode Island does talk about it—is the impact that global warming is having on our oceans that is driving fish to deeper, cooler waters, threatening the fishing industry and food security. In the Pacific Northwest, for example, according to NOAA and as reported by USA Today, just this spring shellfish farmers on the west coast are increasingly experiencing collapses in both hatcheries and natural ecosystems.

Extreme weather and rising sea levels also threaten people across the planet. More than 31 million people fled their homes just last year because of disasters related to floods and storms tied to climate change. According to a number of sources, climate change will create, in years to come, even larger numbers of what we call climate refugees as low-lying countries lose land mass to rising seas and to desertification, consuming once-fertile territory.

In northern India, nearly 6,000 people are dead or missing from devastating floods and landslides just last month. Closer to home, Hurricane Sandy alone displaced three-quarters of a million people in the United States and is costing us up to 60 billion Federal dollars in helping those communities rebuild.

Permanent displacement is already occurring in the United States. In other words, people are permanently losing their residences. The Army Corps of Engineers predicted that the entire village of Newtok, AK, could be underwater by 2017, and more than 180 additional Native Alaskan villages are at risk. Parts of Alaska are literally vanishing.

Scientists believe that entire U.S. cities or parts of coastal cities are in danger of being flooded as well. In fact,

experts are telling us that cities such as Miami, Ft. Lauderdale, New York, New Orleans, and others will face a growing threat of partial submersion within just a few decades as sea levels and storm surge levels continue to climb and that entire countries—small island nations such as Micronesia and the Maldives and large nations such as Indonesia face similar risk.

Ironically, rising sea levels are even threatening key oil industry infrastructure. For example, scientists at NOAA are estimating that portions of the Louisiana State Highway 1 will be inundated by rising high tides 30 times per year. Highway 1 provides the only access to a port servicing nearly one out of every five barrels of the U.S. oil supply.

What is my point? My point is that we are facing a horrendous planetary crisis. We cannot continue to ignore it. We must act, and we must act now.

In my view, the first thing we must do is we must not make a terribly dangerous situation—i.e., global warming and greenhouse gas emissions—even worse than it is right now. We must break our dependence on fossil fuels, not expand it. We must modernize our grid and transform our energy system to one based on sustainable energy sources, and we must move aggressively toward energy efficiency.

In that process, we must reject the Keystone XL Pipeline proposal, which would dramatically increase carbon dioxide emissions, according to the EPA, by the equivalent of 18.7 million metric tons per year, releasing as much as 935 million metric tons over 50 years. In other words, the planet faces a crisis right now. Why would we think for one second about making that crisis even worse?

Further, Congress needs to end wasteful subsidies for the industries that are causing climate change. According to a report by DBL Investors, between 1918 and 2009, the oil and gas industry received government subsidies to the tune of $446 billion, to say nothing of State subsidies which have benefited from decades' worth of backroom political deals. In other words, why are we continuing to subsidize those industries that are helping to bring devastating damage to our planet.

Thirdly, even though fossil fuels are the most expensive fuels on Earth, the fossil fuel industry for too long has shifted these enormous costs onto the public, walking away with billions in profits while the American people have to bear the real costs of rising seas, monster storms, devastating droughts, heat waves, and other extreme weather. When people tell you that coal or oil is cheap, what they are forgetting about are the social costs in terms of infrastructure damage and in terms of human health. These fuels are not cheap.

As we transform our energy system away from fossil fuels, we must finally begin pricing carbon pollution emissions so the polluters themselves begin carrying the costs instead of passing them on to our children and grandchildren.

I am proud to have joined with Senator BARBARA BOXER, the chairperson of the Environment Committee in the Senate, to introduce the Climate Protection Act earlier this year. Our bill establishes a fee on carbon pollution emissions, an approach endorsed by people all across the political spectrum, including conservatives such as George Shultz, Nobel Laureate economist Gary Becker, Mitt Romney's former economic adviser Gregory Mankiw, former Reagan adviser Art Laffer, former Republican Congressman Bob Inglis, and others.

Our bill does a number of things. One of the things it does is return 60 percent of the revenue raised directly back to taxpayers in order to address increased fuel costs. It puts money, substantial sums of money, into supporting sustainable energy research, weatherizing homes, job creation, and helping manufacturing businesses save money through energy efficiency and deficit reduction.

This begins the process of transforming our energy system by imposing a fee on carbon. It deincentivizes fossil fuel by putting money into energy efficiency and sustainable energy. It helps us move in a very different and healthier direction.

Let me conclude by going back to the point that I made when we started. The American people are shaking their heads at what goes on in Washington.

This country is facing enormous problems, economic problems, social problems, and I would argue that in global warming we face a planetary crisis. The American people want us to act. It is incomprehensible that week after week, month after month, year after year, we are not addressing the issue of global warming.

I hope sooner rather than later we will bring serious legislation to the floor of the Senate, that we have that debate, and we do what the planetary crisis requires; that is, transform our energy system, move away from fossil fuel, and move to energy efficiency and sustainable energy.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MURPHY). The Senator from Texas.

PEREZ NOMINATION

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, I rise to express my deep concerns over the President's nomination of Thomas Perez to be Secretary of the Department of Labor.

When executing its advice-and-consent role, which, of course, is ensconced within the Constitution itself, it is the duty of the Senate to ensure that the people the President appoints to positions of power are of the highest caliber. It is our duty to examine their record and to determine whether each nominee ought to be granted the public trust.

While no one can deny that Mr. Perez has spent his career in public service, I am afraid his record raises serious concerns over his ability to fairly and impartially lead the Department of Labor. Mr. Perez has a documented record of acting with political motivation and being a partisan, selective enforcer of the law. He has been misleading in his sworn testimony and ethically questionable in some of his actions.

For example, during his tenure at the Department of Justice, Mr. Perez has been in charge of the Civil Rights Division, which includes the voting rights section. One would hope that if any part of the Department of Justice would be apolitical, it would be the Civil Rights Division. But under Mr. Perez's watch, the voting rights section has compiled a disturbing record of political discrimination and selective enforcement of the law.

You don't have to take my word for it. All you have to do is take a look at the 258-page report issued by the Department of Justice inspector general earlier this year.

The report cites a ''deep ideological polarization'' of the voting rights section under Mr. Perez. It goes on to say this polarization ''has at times been a significant impediment to the operation of the Section and has exacerbated the potential appearance of politicized decisionmaking.''

Instead of upholding and enforcing all laws equally, Mr. Perez launched politically motivated campaigns against commonsense constitutional provisions such as voter ID both in Texas and in South Carolina.

The Supreme Court of the United States, in an opinion written by John Paul Stevens, who was, by all accounts, an independent member of the Supreme Court, the Supreme Court of the United States held that commonsense voter identification requirements are not an undue burden on the right to cast one's ballot and, indeed, are a reasonable means by which voter fraud is combated and protection of the integrity of the ballot is ensured.

Yet Thomas Perez, working at the Department of Justice, targeted the voter ID requirement passed by the Texas Legislature and blocked it effectively, and the same thing in South Carolina, based on nothing but politics—certainly not based on U.S. Supreme Court precedent that states it was not an undue burden on the right to vote, and it was a legitimate means to protect the integrity of the ballot and to combat fraud.

The inspector general goes on to describe misleading testimony that Mr. Perez gave before the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights in 2010 about a prominent voting rights case, stating that it ''did not reflect the entire story regarding the involvement of political appointees.'' This is why, when you are sworn in as a witness in court, you are asked to tell the truth, the whole truth and nothing but the truth. When what you say is the truth but you leave out other information, it can, in effect, by

its context, not be truthful. This is part of the problem with the testimony Mr. Perez gave before the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights.

Going further back, we can see Mr. Perez's ideological roots started as a local official in Montgomery County, MD. During his tenure on the county council, he consistently opposed the proper enforcement of our immigration laws. In fact, he went so far as to testify against enforcement measures that were being considered by the Maryland State Legislature.

Finally, there is the matter of Mr. Perez's quid pro quo dealings with the City of St. Paul, MN. Of course, I am referring to the well-publicized decision of Mr. Perez to withhold Department of Justice support for a lawsuit against the City of St. Paul. He did so in exchange for the city withdrawing a case that it had before the Supreme Court, a case that many would have believed would have resulted in the Court rejecting an aggressive interpretation of the Fair Housing Act that guided Mr. Perez and the Department of Justice.

In fact, that is the reason he did it. He was afraid the Supreme Court would rebuke the Department of Justice's aggressive interpretation of the Fair Housing Act. While this may not have been a direct violation of any laws, it is, at best, ethically dubious.

In summation, we have a nominee for the Department of Labor who has a record of ideological, polarizing leadership; giving incomplete and thereby misleading testimony before official tribunals; and of enforcing the law in a partisan and selective manner—in essence, a ''you scratch my back, and I'll scratch yours'' way of going about the public's business.

As citizens we should ask, Is this the type of person we would want to serve in the President's Cabinet? As Senators, we ought to ask, Is this the best we can do for the Secretary of the Department of Labor?

I believe Mr. Perez's record disqualifies him from running this or any other executive agency of the Federal Government. I fear his leadership would needlessly politicize the Department and impose top-down ideological litmus tests. For all these reasons, I oppose his nomination and encourage my colleagues to do the same.

Mr. JOHNSON. Mr. President, I rise today in strong support of the nomination of Fred Hochberg to be the President and Chairman of the Export-Import Bank of the United States.

Despite taking the helm of the Bank in the midst of the worst financial crisis since the Great Depression, Mr. Hochberg's leadership expanded financing for American exporters when private financing was nearly impossible to acquire. In 2012, the Export-Import Bank helped to support an estimated 255,000 American jobs at 3,400 companies, and 85 percent of Export-Import Bank transactions directly benefited small businesses.

The Export-Import Bank is self-sustaining, charging fees to cover its expenses and creating no cost to U.S. taxpayers. Furthermore, since 2008, the Bank has been able to send nearly $1.6 billion in profits to the U.S. Treasury.

Mr. Hochberg was first nominated to be President and Chairman of the Export-Import Bank on April 20, 2009, and he was confirmed unanimously by this body on May 14, 2009. Mr. Hochberg was renominated by President Obama on March 21, 2013, and he was approved 20–2 in the Senate Banking Committee on June 6, 2013. I urge my colleagues to once again confirm Mr. Hochberg without delay.

If we fail to confirm Mr. Hochberg before July 20, we run the risk of leaving the Bank without a quorum to act on many of the transactions before it—creating an uneven playing field for American workers and exporters.

Mr. Hochberg's nomination is supported by both labor and business groups. These two groups understand the importance of the United States not unilaterally disarming against our global competitors. The Bank plays a very important part in this country's efforts to expand exports and create good, high-paying jobs in America. Mr. Hochberg has been instrumental in this effort and should be confirmed.

I urge all my colleagues to support President Hochberg's nomination today.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the vote on the confirmation of the Hochberg nomination occur at 3:40 p.m. today; that if the nomination is confirmed, the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table with no intervening action or debate; that no further motions be in order; that any related statements be printed in the RECORD; and that President Obama be immediately notified of the Senate's action.

What time is it right now?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It is 3:33 p.m.

Mr. REID. I wish to modify my request to reflect a voting time of 3:35.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. REID. Senators should expect two votes; the vote on confirmation of the Hochberg nomination to the Ex-Im Bank and the vote on the motion to invoke cloture on the Perez nomination.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the nomination of Fred P. Hochberg to be president of the Export-Import Bank of the United States?

Mr. REID. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from West Virginia (Mr. ROCKEFELLER) is necessarily absent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BROWN). Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 82, nays 17, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 176 Ex.]

YEAS—82

Alexander	Gillibrand	Murphy
Ayotte	Graham	Murray
Baldwin	Hagan	Nelson
Baucus	Harkin	Portman
Begich	Heinrich	Pryor
Bennet	Heitkamp	Reed
Blumenthal	Heller	Reid
Blunt	Hirono	Roberts
Boozman	Hoeven	Sanders
Boxer	Isakson	Schatz
Brown	Johanns	Schumer
Burr	Johnson (SD)	Scott
Cantwell	Kaine	Sessions
Cardin	King	Shaheen
Carper	Kirk	Shelby
Casey	Klobuchar	Stabenow
Chiesa	Landrieu	Tester
Coats	Leahy	Thune
Cochran	Levin	Udall (CO)
Collins	Manchin	Udall (NM)
Coons	Markey	Vitter
Corker	McCain	Warner
Crapo	McCaskill	Warren
Donnelly	Menendez	Whitehouse
Durbin	Merkley	Wicker
Feinstein	Mikulski	Wyden
Fischer	Moran	
Franken	Murkowski	

NAYS—17

Barrasso	Flake	McConnell
Chambliss	Grassley	Paul
Coburn	Hatch	Risch
Cornyn	Inhofe	Rubio
Cruz	Johnson (WI)	Toomey
Enzi	Lee	

NOT VOTING—1

Rockefeller

The nomination was confirmed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the motion to reconsider is considered made and laid upon the table. The President will be immediately notified of the Senate's action.

CLOTURE MOTION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Chair directs the clerk to read the motion.

The bill clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, hereby move to bring to a close debate on the nomination of Thomas Edward Perez, of Maryland, to be Secretary of Labor.

Harry Reid, Tom Harkin, Patrick J. Leahy, Bill Nelson, Christopher A. Coons, Amy Klobuchar, Tim Kaine, Jack Reed, Barbara A. Mikulski, Sheldon Whitehouse, Sherrod Brown, Benjamin L. Cardin, Robert P. Casey Jr., Bernard Sanders, Al Franken, Robert Menendez, Barbara Boxer.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. By unanimous consent, the mandatory quorum call has been waived.

The Senate will be in order.

The Senator from Florida.

Mr. RUBIO. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent for 1 minute so that I may be able to read a letter with regard to the upcoming vote.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Senate will be in order.

The Senator from Iowa is recognized.

Mr. HARKIN. Mr. President, is there a unanimous consent request pending?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There is a unanimous consent request pending. The Senator from Florida has asked unanimous consent for a minute to read a letter with regard to the nomination.

Mr. HARKIN. Then I ask for 1 minute following the Senator from Florida.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Florida? Without objection, it is so ordered.

The Senator from Florida is recognized.

Mr. RUBIO. Before we vote on this, especially to my colleagues on the Republican side, we are about to give 60 votes to a nominee who is not in compliance with a congressional subpoena.

I have in my hand a letter sent to me moments ago by DARRELL ISSA, the chairman of the Oversight Committee in the House, where he writes in part that ''Mr. Perez has not produced a single document responsive to the Committee's subpoena. I am extremely disappointed that Mr. Perez continues to willfully disregard a lawful subpoena issued by a standing Committee of the United States House of Representatives. . . . This continued noncompliance contravenes fundamental principles of separation of powers and the rule of law. Until Mr. Perez produces all responsive documents, he will continue to be noncompliant with the Committee's subpoena. Thank you for your attention to this matter.''

He goes on to note, by the way, that Mr. Perez has not produced a single document to the committee; therefore, he remains noncompliant.

Members, you are about to vote to give 60 votes to cut off debate on a nominee who has ignored a congressional subpoena from the House on information relevant to his background and to his qualifications for this office.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. MENENDEZ. The Senate is not in order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Iowa is recognized.

Mr. HARKIN. Mr. President, the contentions made by the Senator are absolutely wrong. We had a hearing on this. We explored it in our committee. Instead of the 1,200 e-mails they cite, we are talking about that over a 3½-year period there were 35 e-mails located on his personal emails that touched Department of Justice business and were not forwarded to the Department of Justice, and those have been looked at, and none of them demonstrate that he acted improperly or unethically. When they were discovered, the e-mails were immediately forwarded to the DOJ server and are now part of the DOJ record retention system.

I might add that the 35 e-mails were made available to the House Oversight Committee staff prior to Mr. Perez's confirmation hearing, and the Senate HELP Committee staff have also been offered access to review all of those e-mails.

The contentions made by the Senator from Florida are just absolutely wrong.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is, Is it the sense of the Senate that debate on the nomination of Thomas Edward Perez, of Maryland, to be Secretary of Labor shall be brought to a close?

The yeas and nays are mandatory under the rule.

The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk called the roll.

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 60, nays 40, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 177 Ex.]

YEAS—60

Alexander	Hagan	Murkowski
Baldwin	Harkin	Murphy
Baucus	Heinrich	Murray
Begich	Heitkamp	Nelson
Bennet	Hirono	Pryor
Blumenthal	Johnson (SD)	Reed
Boxer	Kaine	Reid
Brown	King	Rockefeller
Cantwell	Kirk	Sanders
Cardin	Klobuchar	Schatz
Carper	Landrieu	Schumer
Casey	Leahy	Shaheen
Collins	Levin	Stabenow
Coons	Manchin	Tester
Corker	Markey	Udall (CO)
Donnelly	McCain	Udall (NM)
Durbin	McCaskill	Warner
Feinstein	Menendez	Warren
Franken	Merkley	Whitehouse
Gillibrand	Mikulski	Wyden

NAYS—40

Ayotte	Fischer	Paul
Barrasso	Flake	Portman
Blunt	Graham	Risch
Boozman	Grassley	Roberts
Burr	Hatch	Rubio
Chambliss	Heller	Scott
Chiesa	Hoeven	Sessions
Coats	Inhofe	Shelby
Coburn	Isakson	Thune
Cochran	Johanns	Toomey
Cornyn	Johnson (WI)	Vitter
Crapo	Lee	Wicker
Cruz	McConnell	
Enzi	Moran	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. On this vote, the yeas are 60, the nays are 40. Three-fifths of the Senators duly chosen and sworn having voted in the affirmative, the motion is agreed to.

NOMINATION OF THOMAS EDWARD PEREZ TO BE SECRETARY OF LABOR

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BLUMENTHAL). Cloture having been invoked, the clerk will report the nomination.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Thomas Edward Perez, of Maryland, to be Secretary of Labor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Washington.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT REQUEST—S. CON. RES. 25

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, I am pleased that yesterday the Senate was able to come together and work out a bipartisan agreement to make some progress on approving President Obama's nominees. This is a great example of the kind of work I hope we can do more of going forward, because gridlock is getting in the way of progress on far too many issues that affect the families and communities we have a responsibility to serve.

One of the most egregious examples that still remains is the Republican leadership blocking a bipartisan budget conference—and the regular order they called for—in order, it appears, to gain leverage by manufacturing a crisis come this fall.

Democrats have come to the floor to talk about this a lot over the past few weeks. Unfortunately, it seems to be getting worse and not better.

We have heard from more and more tea party Republicans about their latest brinkmanship threat. They are now saying: Defund health care reform or we are going to shut down the government.

I wish I were making this up, but it is real. The House has already tried to repeal this law 37 times. In fact, just for good measure, they are voting on it again this week.

We all know that is not serious. It is certainly not governing. It is pointless pandering, and it does absolutely nothing to help the families and communities we represent.

There are so many real problems we all need to be focused on. We need to protect our fragile economic recovery and get more of our workers back on the job. We need to replace sequestration and we need to tackle our long-term deficit challenges responsibly. We have to stop this lurching from crisis to crisis and return to regular order and give families and communities the certainty they deserve. The only way we can do that is if we all work together, and the last thing we need to do right now is to rehash old political fights.

Based on what I am hearing more and more of in recent days, not only are tea party Republicans willing to push us toward a crisis this fall, but they will do that to cut off health care coverage for 25 million people and end the preventive care for our seniors that is free, and cause our seniors to pay more for prescriptions.

These political games may play well with the tea party base, but here is the reality: ObamaCare is the law of the land. It passed through this Senate with a majority. The Supreme Court upheld it. It is already today helping millions of Americans stay healthy and financially secure. We should all be working together right now to make sure it is implemented in the best way possible for our families and our businesses and our communities. Instead, what we are hearing is some empty political threats and a push for more gridlock here in the Senate.

I don't think it is a coincidence that the very people who are now pushing

for a government shutdown to defund the health care law are the ones who are blocking a budget conference. If the goal is to simply push this country into a crisis, as it now seems to be for the tea party and the Senate Republican leadership, then those both are ways to do it.

When the Senate budget passed, I was optimistic. We worked here for a very long time—hours and hours, well into the night, well into the hours of the morning—and we allowed everyone the opportunity to vote on their amendments. They were voted up or down, agreed to or not agreed to, and we passed a bill, because both Republicans and Democrats said they wanted to return to regular budget order, and they said if we did that, we would get back to a responsible process. I took them at their word.

At that time, we had 192 days to reach a bipartisan budget agreement. Three months later, Democrats have come to the floor 16 times to move to the next step of the process: to get us to a bipartisan budget conference with the House. Each time we have asked to do that, a tea party Republican or a Member of the Senate Republican leadership has stood up and said, No, I am not going to let us work out the differences with the House. We are not going to do a budget. We are going to allow things to plod along here until we have a crisis in the fall.

There are now less than 3 weeks before we are scheduled to return home—all of us—to our States for constituent work. If we can't get an agreement by then, we are going to return in September with very little time before a potential government shutdown on October 1.

We still have a window of opportunity to reach an agreement before we are in crisis mode. I will tell all of my colleagues, it is closing quickly.

My colleagues should ask their constituents. They are sick and tired of hearing about gridlock and partisanship coming out of Washington, DC. It has to end.

This body had a great conversation on Monday night in the Old Senate Chamber. Everybody had an opportunity to have their say. A group of Republicans, led by Senator MCCAIN, who are very interested in ending the gridlock, worked together with us to solve the problem. In fact, I have to say it has been very heartening to hear from the many Republicans who agree with the Democrats that despite our differences—and they are many—we should at least—at the very least—sit down in a bipartisan conference committee with the House and try to solve this problem and get an agreement.

It started with just a few who were willing to stand up to their leadership, but I think we all should know that chorus is getting louder. Senator MORAN, for example, said yesterday: ''I too hope we can have a budget conference because the process needs to work.''

I am sure Senator MORAN would agree with me that getting a bipartisan deal is not going to be easy. We know that. We know it is going to be difficult. But we all know it won't be easy unless we get to work now, rather than risking our economic recovery and hurting our families and communities by manufacturing a crisis this fall.

I am hopeful the bipartisan spirit we have seen this week will carry over into this budget debate, and that rather than listening to a few, Republicans will listen to the Republican Members who prefer a bipartisan, commonsense approach over brinkmanship and chaos.

We still have an opportunity to govern the way the American people rightly expect us to and to come together and try and reach an agreement. I am ready to sit down and go to work with the conservative House majority to try and solve the problem that all of us have come to Congress saying we want to work on, and that is a budget agreement.

A budget agreement means certainty for our constituents. It means the ability, no matter how tough the choices for us—and none of us are going to love any of them—to be able to give them certainty so they know how to move forward.

Mr. President, as if in legislative session, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 33, H. Con. Res. 25; that the amendment which is at the desk, the text of S. Con. Res. 8, the budget resolution passed by the Senate, be inserted in lieu thereof; that H. Con. Res. 25, as amended, be agreed to; the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table; that the Senate insist on its amendment, request a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses, and the Chair be authorized to appoint conferees on the part of the Senate; that following the authorization, two motions to instruct conferees be in order from each side—a motion to instruct relative to the debt limit and a motion to instruct relative to taxes and revenue; that there be 2 hours of debate equally divided between the two leaders or their designees prior to the votes in relation to the motions; further, that no amendments be in order to either of the motions prior to the votes; and all of the above occurring with no intervening action or debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

The Senator from Utah is recognized.

Mr. LEE. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, in a spirit of bipartisanship, I would like to ask my friend and colleague from Washington to make a very simple modification to her request. I am not objecting to a budget. I am not even objecting to the idea of having a conference. I just want the debt limit left out of the budget conference. The debt limit is a separate issue, one that warrants its own debate, its own discussion, its own legislation. My request is a simple one: no backroom deals on the debt limit.

Therefore, I ask unanimous consent that the Senator from Washington modify her request so that it not be in order for the Senate to consider a conference report that includes reconciliation instructions to raise the debt limit.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

The Senator from Washington.

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, let me explain so that the Senator understands. We are offering in this unanimous consent request to allow the Senate to speak on the very issue the Senator is requesting, to do it in what a democracy does, and to allow an amendment on it and let the Senate speak. That is what we do here.

I object to his request, and I reask our unanimous consent request that would allow an amendment on his issue of the debt ceiling and allow this body to speak on it before we go to conference.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard to the Lee unanimous consent request.

The question is on the unanimous consent request from the Senator from Washington. Is there objection?

The Senator from Utah.

Mr. LEE. Mr. President, in that case, I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

Mrs. MURRAY. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. VITTER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

MCCARTHY NOMINATION

Mr. VITTER. Mr. President, I rise to speak about the Gina McCarthy nomination to head the EPA and in particular efforts I have led with my Republican colleagues on the Environment and Public Works Committee to bring a whole lot more sunshine and transparency to EPA—something that has been sorely, sorely lacking for a long time and has been a particular problem, really reached new depths in terms of a problem in the last 4 years. When this important nomination first came up, I focused specifically on these important transparency, openness issues.

I have disagreed with the Obama administration EPA on all sorts of substantive issues, including, for instance, to take the most obvious, their war on coal. I disagree with both the past Administrator and this nominee, Gina McCarthy, on all of those key substantive issues, such as this war on coal, but I specifically chose not to focus on that in the nomination. I knew President Obama won the election. I knew he had a fundamentally different view than I do on those key

environmental and economic issues. What I focused on with other Republican members of our committee was something that should be beyond dispute, beyond partisanship, really beyond debate—the need for openness and transparency with regard to what EPA does and why they do it. This has been a battle I have been waging for a long time, including on the EPW Committee. I think this is a crucial issue.

For a long time, EPA, under multiple administrations, has lost the confidence of Congress and the American people. It used to be, including when EPA was first founded, in the first decade of its existence, that it was viewed as a nonideological group of experts. It was viewed as being led by real scientists and real science—peer-reviewed expert science—not by ideology, not by political agendas, not by partisanship. Unfortunately, I think EPA—and a lot of Federal agencies, but EPA is perhaps the worst example—has gotten far afield from that, and it is viewed by most Americans, myself included, as led by ideology, motivated by partisanship and a political agenda, not sober, sound science.

That is why we need to get back to complete openness and transparency so that we see what EPA is doing, why they are doing it, and try to hold them accountable so their decisions are based on objective science, not cherry-picking science, not partisan science, not what I would call New York Times or tabloid science.

Again, those are what all of my key requests of EPA and the nominee over this Gina McCarthy nomination went to. Over many, many weeks—in fact, months—I went back and forth with Ms. McCarthy and EPA over these very basic, sound, reasonable requests. The good news is, although it took a lot of back and forth, in each of the five key categories I identified on behalf of all of the Republican members of EPW, we were able to secure real, meaningful, and substantial commitments in terms of moving the ball forward in at least four of those categories, and we are going to move the ball across the goal line in the fifth category as well. So let me briefly outline those five important categories that all relate to openness and transparency and where we are getting with regard to our agreements with the EPA over the last several weeks.

Request No. 1 had to do with FOIA, the Freedom of Information Act. As anybody knows who has followed it in the news, EPA has really dragged its feet and frustrated a lot of legitimate FOIA requests by private citizens, by States affected, by other stakeholders.

The Freedom of Information Act was designed to put sunshine on the Federal Government, to allow everyday citizens—anyone—the ability to get basic, important information from any Federal agency. Yet, as news releases and certain incidents have illustrated over the last several years, EPA has really tried to frustrate that process. In fact, in certain documents we were able to obtain, we even got an e-mail from within the General Counsel's Office at EPA instructing all of the satellite offices of EPA around the country on how to frustrate legitimate FOIA requests—how to delay, how to frustrate, how to obfuscate. It was not about a particular FOIA request that they may have thought was out of bounds or inappropriate, it was just about how to frustrate in general. That is completely inappropriate. That is beyond the bounds of the law. So we talked in great detail to EPA about how they have to change that, and this basically summarizes the agreements we reached:

First, EPA agreed to mandate the retraining of all of their workforce—17,000-plus people—to tell them not how to frustrate FOIA requests but what FOIA is about, how to live by the law, how to honor FOIA requests in an open and timely way.

Secondly, EPA committed to issuing new guidance on records maintenance and the use of personal e-mail accounts. One way a lot of folks said EPA clearly was frustrating FOIA requests is they would do official business on personal e-mail accounts. So when a FOIA request was made, their EPA e-mails were produced, but lo and behold, the really important stuff, the stuff they wanted to hide, was on their personal accounts. That is clearly a pattern that has been used at EPA and other Federal agencies to frustrate openness and transparency and FOIA. So EPA is specifically going to issue new guidance to say that is absolutely illegal, that is absolutely off limits, and, most importantly, trust but verify, and here is the verify: The independent EPA inspector general will complete an audit about all of this stuff.

So we are going to put an end to FOIA abuse, and we are going to make sure every American has FOIA as a legitimate tool for information, for openness, and for transparency, as was intended when Congress passed that law.

The second category I focused on in my discussions with EPA was e-mails and communications—exactly what I was talking about before. There has been a pattern—and several high-ranking officials were involved, including Lisa Jackson, the former Administrator—there has been a pattern of using personal e-mail accounts and also fake e-mail names, to, in my opinion, hide important information from the public. The clearest example is what I said a minute ago. If you do the really important business on your personal account and somebody sends in a FOIA request and then the agency produces your official e-mails, guess what. The really important stuff is not produced. It is hidden. That has to stop.

So we demanded a lot of things in this category.

First of all, the nominee herself—we asked her to review her personal e-mail accounts and report back that she had not used it for agency-related matters. She did that. She confirmed that.

Secondly, EPW continues to coordinate with the House Oversight and Government Reform Committee to obtain further information. We do not have—and let me be crystal clear about this—Republicans on the EPW Committee have not obtained everything we have asked for or everything we deserve with regard to e-mails and communications. So we are working with the House committee with subpoena power, and we are working closely with them, and we are going to get, even if it takes using their subpoena power, what we deserve. And then both committees recently put the EPA on notice that they are considering issuing subpoenas with regard to just that.

So this is the category where we have gotten the least from the EPA with regard to our discussions regarding the Gina McCarthy nomination, but I want to make very clear, so no one is surprised, that we are going to get what we deserve, including through House subpoenas if it takes that.

The third category I focused on in my discussions with Gina McCarthy and the EPA is underlying research data. EPA has done a lot of really important rules, rulemaking in the last several years. In each of those cases they based that rulemaking on specific research. One big problem is that the world, the public, even including Members of Congress, has not had availability of that research data so we can simply sort of compare notes and enlist outside experts to say: Look, does this data really lead to that rule? Does it really lead to that conclusion?

Well, this has been an ongoing argument for a long time. Finally, in the midst of these discussions related to the Gina McCarthy nomination, we have scored a breakthrough. EPA has absolutely, categorically committed to obtaining the requested scientific information—that data from the researchers, from the institutions that did the research. They will absolutely request that and follow up on that.

Secondly, EPA has already reached out to relevant institutions for information on how to de-identify and code personally identifying information that may be in the data. None of us want personally identifying information. None of us want versions of the data that make it clear who the individuals involved in the studies were. We do not care about that. We want the overall data. So EPA is already talking to the institutions about how to scrub the data so they do not give us what we were never interested in—personal identifying information.

Third, for the first time we should be able to determine if there is any way of independently reanalyzing the science and benefits claims for these major regulations, which are mostly the major air regulations on which the nominee Gina McCarthy led the way.

So this really is a breakthrough because it is a path forward to get the

underlying data so we can examine—independently examine—have experts look at the data and ask: Does it really lead to this regulation? Does it really justify this regulation?

The fourth category I focused on in terms of my discussions with the EPA over the Gina McCarthy nomination is economic analysis. By law, EPA, like other Federal agencies, is supposed to do a cost-benefit analysis before they do a big rulemaking. So part of their rulemaking is supposed to be a cost-benefit analysis to see if the rule is justified.

In my opinion, that cost-benefit analysis is done in such a way as to be laughable in some cases, to be ludicrous. It is designed to reach a particular result, not designed to be an objective cost-benefit analysis. So we wanted EPA to go back to the drawing board, do a fair and open-ended cost-benefit analysis, not designed to reach a particular conclusion but just designed to truly, objectively compare cost and benefits.

As a result of our discussion, EPA has committed to convene an independent panel of economic experts with experience in whole economy modeling at the macro and micro level. They are going to review EPA's modeling and the agency's ability to measure full regulatory impacts.

That is sort of a bunch of gobbledygook, particularly with whole economy modeling. But that is where we need to do a true cost-benefit analysis, to look at all of the macro impacts, all of the impacts of a rule on the whole economy, not very narrowly defined—the analysis—in order to get to a certain conclusion.

A good example is when they are doing rulemaking, we need to understand the impact on energy prices throughout the entire economy. That is often a huge impact of their rulemaking, particularly in their recent air rulemaking in the so-called war on coal. We need to see how many jobs that really cost us in the whole economy; otherwise, this idea of cost-benefit is not meaningful.

So they have committed to convene this independent panel. This panel will be tasked with making recommendations to the agency so that the EPA does it right; so that it is a significant, objective, meaningful cost-benefit analysis, not just an exercise they have to go through and that they have designed to reach a certain result.

The fifth and final category on which I focused in terms of my discussions with the EPA over the Gina McCarthy nomination was the so-called sue and settle. Sue and settle is a tool the environmental left and their allies at EPA have used with increasing frequency in the last several years—the last 5 years in particular.

When the environmental left wants to reach an objective, what they often do is sue the EPA under environmental legislation and environmental statutes. So they are the plaintiff; the Obama EPA is the defendant. They have a lawsuit. Then after a few months they agree to settle the lawsuit. The judge signs off on it. Usually the judge is more than willing to do that because it gets a big and time-consuming and complicated case out of his hands, off his docket.

What is the matter with that? Well, what is the matter with that is essentially the environmental left and the EPA are on the same side of the issue. They usually agree on the fundamentals of the issue. The folks truly on the other side, who often include stakeholders, landowners, businesses, State and local government, they never have a seat at the table with regard to the settlement.

So this is a behind-closed-doors negotiation, which is one-sided and does not include anyone on the true other side of the issue. It does not include landowners. It does not include other stakeholders. It does not include State and local governments, which are often directly affected, which often have their role in some of these matters taken away.

So we need to make that sue-and-settle process more fair. We need to take the abuse out of it because we discussed this with EPA, and we got the following important concession.

First, to help resolve some of the challenges with lack of public input in closed-door settlement agreements, otherwise referred to as sue and settle, EPA will publish on two Web sites the notices of intent to sue and petitions for rulemaking upon receipt, so at least the world out there will know what is going on at the front end. At least the stakeholders, the landowners, State and local governments, other affected parties will know what is going on.

Secondly, the Web address for the petitions for rulemaking are that, and the web address for the notices of intent to sue is that. It is very important to know this with regard to potential sue-and-settle agreements so that affected parties can begin to have input. They cannot possibly have input if they do not even know there is a discussion going on, and they do not find that out until the final result is announced.

Those are the results of our discussions with EPA. As I said at the beginning, I do not agree with Barack Obama or Gina McCarthy's positions on most of the big issues at EPA, including the war on coal. I do not agree with their actions that are costing millions of jobs around the country, that are increasing significantly the price of American energy. But I am not going to be able to fix that given the last election. President Obama was reelected.

What we attempted to do is talk to EPA about things that we should be able to agree on, things that should be beyond dispute, beyond ideology, beyond argument. That is giving the American people, including their representatives in Congress, full and adequate information about what is going on, having people get the information they deserve, having that give-and-take which is supposed to be there and assured, cleaning up abuses in FOIA, cleaning up abuses in private and hidden and fake e-mail accounts.

Those are abuses that have gone on at EPA for a long time and have been particularly problematic in the last 5 years. Those are the sort of things we are going to fix through these agreements. I think that will get us down the road to having a real discussion about the true facts behind proposed EPA regulations—the true science, the true cost and benefits, and not allowing EPA to do so much that is so important behind closed doors without that full and open discussion of the true facts.

I think it is an important step forward. That is why I agreed, as I promised to at the beginning of the process, to vote for cloture on the Gina McCarthy nomination if we made this important progress. I set that metric. I made that commitment at the beginning of the process. I did not think we would get nearly as far as we did in terms of commitments out of EPA. But since we did, since we made all of that substantive progress, I am certainly going to honor that commitment with regard to the cloture vote.

I yield the floor.

Mr. HARKIN. Mr. President, today the Senate is now considering the nomination of Thomas Perez to serve as Secretary of Labor. It has been a long road to get here. I am pleased that we finally have the opportunity to consider Mr. Perez's nomination on its merits.

Tom Perez's life is a story of the American dream. The child of immigrants from the Dominican Republic, he lost his father at a young age. He worked very hard at not very glamorous jobs to put himself through Brown University, working at a warehouse as a garbage collector and the school dining hall.

His incredible work ethic helped him graduate with honors from the Harvard Law School and the Kennedy School of Government. With such an impressive resume, Tom Perez could have done pretty much anything with those degrees and accomplishments. He could have made a lot of money in the private sector. But, instead, Mr. Perez chose to become a public servant.

He has dedicated his career to ensuring that every American has the same opportunity he had to pursue the American dream. From his early years at the Department of Justice, where he helped to prosecute racially motivated hate crimes and chaired a task force to prevent worker exploitation, to his time at the Maryland Department of Labor, where he helped struggling families avoid foreclosure and revamped the State's adult education system, Mr. Perez has demonstrated his unwavering commitment to building opportunity for all Americans.

It is this commitment to building opportunity for all that makes Tom Perez an ideal choice for Secretary of Labor. Of all the executive agencies, it may be the Department of Labor that touches the lives of ordinary Americans the most on a day-to-day basis. The Department of Labor ensures that every American receives a fair day's pay for a hard day's work and can come home from work safely in the evening.

It helps ensure that a working mother can stay home to bond with her newborn child and still have a job to return to. It helps workers who have been laid off, veterans returning from military service, others who face special employment challenges to build new skills and build opportunities for a lifetime.

It helps guarantee that hard-working people who have saved all of their lives for retirement can enjoy their golden years with security and peace of mind. As our country continues to move down the road to economic recovery, the work of the Department of Labor will become even more critical. The Department will play a vital role in determining what kind of recovery we have, a recovery that benefits only a select few or one that rebuilds a strong American middle class where everyone who works hard and plays by the rules can build a better life.

Now more than ever we need a dynamic leader at the helm of the Department of Labor who will embrace a bold vision of shared prosperity and help make that vision a reality for American families. I am confident that Tom Perez is up for that challenge.

Without question, Tom Perez has the knowledge and experience needed to guide this critically important agency. Throughout his professional experiences and especially during his work as the secretary of the Maryland Department of Labor, Licensing and Regulation—that would be Maryland's equivalent of our Secretary of Labor. During that time, he has developed strong policy expertise on the many important issues for American workers and businesses that come before the Department of Labor each day. He also clearly has the management skills to run a large Federal agency effectively. Perhaps most importantly, Tom Perez knows how to bring people together to make progress on even controversial issues.

He knows how to hit the ground running, how to quickly and effectively become an agent of real change. That is exactly the kind of leadership we need at the Department of Labor. The fact is, Tom Perez is an extraordinary nominee to serve as Secretary of Labor. I hope the Senate will overwhelmingly confirm him to this vital position.

This is not the first time this body has considered Mr. Perez's qualifications. In October 2009, on a bipartisan 72-to-22 vote, the Senate confirmed Mr. Perez to serve as Assistant Attorney General for Civil Rights. In more than 3½ years in that position, Mr. Perez has skillfully and vigorously enforced our Nation's civil rights laws and has revitalized the Civil Rights Division.

As has been documented by numerous inspector general and Office of Professional Responsibility reports, as well as congressional investigations, the Bush administration had decimated the Civil Rights Division, failed to properly enforce our most critical civil rights laws, and politicized hiring and decisionmaking. That has changed dramatically under Mr. Perez.

As Attorney General Holder has said, Mr. Perez made it clear from the moment he was confirmed that the Civil Rights Division was ''once again open for business.'' During Mr. Perez's tenure as head of the Civil Rights Division, he stepped up enforcement of civil rights laws and restored integrity and professionalism.

I wish to review some of the successes under Mr. Perez's leadership at the Civil Rights Division.

That division settled the three largest fair lending cases in the history of the Fair Housing Act. Let me repeat that—three largest cases in the history of the Fair Housing Act.

As a result, the division in 2012 recovered more money for victims under the Fair Housing Act than in the previous 23 years combined. In total, $660 million in monetary relief has been obtained in lending settlements.

Later in my remarks I will go over some of the allegations made by Senators on the other side about Mr. Perez's handling of another situation of the Civil Rights Division that was also covered by the Fair Housing Act.

I wish to make this clear, that Mr. Perez, as I said, settled the three largest fair lending cases in the history of the Fair Housing Act. This shows he was vigorous in enforcing the Fair Housing Act.

The Civil Rights Division has been involved in 44 Olmstead matters in 23 States, matters that ensure that people with disabilities have the choice to live in their own homes and communities, rather than only in institutional settings. These efforts included four settlement agreements the division has signed with the States of Georgia, Delaware, Virginia, and North Carolina.

The Civil Rights Division obtained a $16 million settlement, the largest ever, to enforce the Americans With Disabilities Act. Reached in 2011, the settlement requires 10,000 bank and financial-related retail offices to ensure access for people with speech or hearing disabilities. Imagine that, almost 20 years after the passage of the Americans With Disabilities Act, we had banks and financial offices that were not making their services available to people with disabilities. The division had to go after them and, as I said, obtained a settlement, $16 million, the largest ever in the history of the Americans With Disabilities Act.

The Civil Rights Division handled more new cases under the Voting Rights Act in 2012 than in any previous year ever. The division increased the number of human trafficking prosecutions by 40 percent during the past 4 years, including a record number of cases in 2012.

The division, since 2009, brought 46 cases to protect the employment rights of servicemembers, a 39-percent increase over the previous 4 years of the Bush administration.

Based on his stellar record of achievement at the Department of Justice alone, Mr. Perez deserves to be confirmed. But despite these accomplishments, some of my Republican colleagues have claimed Mr. Perez should not be confirmed. In fact, we had about 40 who voted against Mr. Perez to move to cloture. Now they are trying to say we should not confirm him.

As the chairman of the committee with oversight jurisdiction, and as chairman of the Appropriations subcommittee that funds the Department of Labor, I can assure you I have looked carefully into Mr. Perez's background and record of service. I can assure everyone that Tom Perez has the strongest record possible of professional integrity and that any allegations to the contrary are totally unfounded.

What is clear is that Tom Perez is passionate about enforcing civil rights laws and protecting people's rights. In my view, that passion makes him not only qualified but the ideal person to be Secretary of Labor.

I do wish to address some of the specific claims we have heard and probably will continue to hear about Mr. Perez.

First, some have harped on the Justice Department's enforcement decision involving the New Black Panther Party. I hope my colleagues don't choose to rehash this matter. Mr. Perez had no involvement in this case, zero. Mr. Perez was not at the Department of Justice when the decision concerning the Black Panthers occurred. The charges were dismissed in May of 2009. Mr. Perez was not confirmed until October of 2009.

Second, some have questioned several enforcement actions related to the Voting Rights Act and the motor voter law, most notably in Louisiana, Texas, and South Carolina. They have pointed to these cases to claim that Mr. Perez is somehow biased in his enforcement of the law.

Again, I hope my colleagues don't try to rehash these meritless claims. The Department of Justice inspector general, an independent inspector general, investigated these claims and recently concluded: ''The decisions that Division or Section leadership made in controversial [voting] cases did not substantiate claims of political or racial bias.''

The inspector general specifically noted that ''allegations of politicized decisionmaking . . . were not substantiated.'' Anybody can make allegations, but you have to substantiate

them. The allegations that he was acting in a politically motivated or biased manner were never ever substantiated.

In fact, in the election-related cases Mr. Perez's critics have focused on, the courts ended up agreeing with the Department of Justice's conclusions that the law had been broken. This means that some oppose Mr. Perez's confirmation precisely because he did his job by enforcing newly enacted laws and by pursuing meritorious cases.

Is our confirmation process here so broken that the act, that act of enforcing duly enacted laws, becomes grounds for opposing a nominee?

Third, some Republicans assert Mr. Perez masterminded an improper deal whereby the City of St. Paul dropped an appeal in a case related to the Fair Housing Act in a case called Magner. In return, the Department of Justice decided not to intervene in a False Claims Act brought by a St. Paul resident in another case called the Newell case.

During this debate, I expect we will hear a lot about the alleged millions of dollars Mr. Perez himself personally cost the Federal Government in lost damages because the government did not intervene and prevail in the Newell case.

It is clear from all of the investigations we have done that rather than being the scandal as some Republicans claim, the evidence shows that Mr. Perez acted ethically and appropriately at all times. I wish to go through this because it is important to set the record straight from these kinds of phony allegations that have been made by some here about Mr. Perez.

The Magner case was a case involving the Fair Housing Act. In 2011, the Supreme Court granted certiorari to consider whether that act permits a disparate impact claim. This is a claim challenging actions that are not intentionally discriminatory but, in essence, having a discriminatory effect, called the disparate impact claim.

The case involved an unusual set of facts. Instead of minorities and low-income persons using the Fair Housing Act to challenge improper lending practices, zoning laws, or real estate practices, as is typical with the case with most Fair Housing Act litigation, this specific case involved slumlords—not low-income renters or people being taken advantage of. This case involved slumlords in St. Paul using the Fair Housing Act to challenge the city's efforts to better enforce their housing codes against those slumlords.

Let's look at this case. Lawyers make strategic judgments all the time about which cases should be appealed. Here it is clear why the Department of Justice had a strong interest in this matter. As they have often said, as we all learned in law school, bad facts make bad law. The Justice Department did not want the Supreme Court to consider the viability of the disparate impact principle in a case where slumlords were trying to abuse the law to their advantage. There was too much at stake here.

The Civil Rights Division, under Mr. Perez, had used, applying disparate impact principle, a standard of law recognized under the Fair Housing Act by each of the 11 courts of appeal to address the issue. They had used this, as I mentioned earlier, to reach settlements totaling $644 million against lenders who discriminated against potential homebuyers in violation of the Fair Housing Act. As I said earlier, that is more money for victims under the Fair Housing Act than in the previous 23 years combined. I think it is very clear that Mr. Perez led his division in applying the disparate impact principle to gain a lot of settlements and to help people who were discriminated against.

It was vital to preserve this valuable enforcement tool. Civil rights leaders, as well as Mr. Perez, encouraged the City of St. Paul to withdraw the appeal. Mr. Perez encouraged the City of St. Paul not to appeal the case to the Supreme Court against something entirely appropriate and entirely in the interests of the United States.

When Mr. Perez reached out to the city, the City of St. Paul raised the Newell matter, another case. This was the first time Mr. Perez had heard about the case. At that time the city suggested, the City of St. Paul, suggested it would drop its Magner appeal if the Department of Justice did not intervene in Newell, an unrelated False Claims Act case in which a St. Paul resident, Mr. Newell, had alleged—had alleged—that the City of St. Paul had not met its obligation to provide sufficient minority job-training programs despite certifying to HUD that it was doing so. As I said, it is a little complicated.

At this point, the evidence further demonstrates that Mr. Perez acted with the highest integrity and ethics. After this became known to him, Mr. Perez consulted two ethics and professional responsibility experts at the Department of Justice. It was made clear to him that because the United States is a unitary actor, the two matters could be considered together as long as the Civil Division, which deals with False Claims Act matters, retained the authority over the Newell case, which was a false claims matter, not a civil rights matter.

A written response Mr. Perez received said—this again is from the ethics people at the Department of Justice—''There is no ethics rule implicated by this situation and therefore no prohibition against your proposed course of action''—your proposed course of action, which was to get the City of St. Paul to drop its appeal. At all times, Mr. Perez acted appropriately within the ethical guidance he received.

Further, contrary to some Republican claims, Mr. Perez was not responsible for the Department's decision not to intervene in Newell. In fact, the decision not to intervene in Newell was made by career attorneys and experts on the False Claims Act within the Civil Division—not by Mr. Perez, who was head of the Civil Rights Division. The head of the Civil Division Tony West at all times retained the authority to make the decision regarding the Newell case.

At the time the Supreme Court agreed to hear the Magner case, both HUD—Housing and Urban Development—and the Minnesota U.S. Attorney's Office had recommended intervening in the Newell matter.

After learning of the Department of Justice concerns with regard to the Magner appeal, the general counsel for HUD—Department of Housing and Urban Development—told the House that she reversed her recommendation, stating:

> If the decision had been totally mine in October, and there weren't any dealings with the Department of Justice that I needed to worry about in terms of a relationship with the Department of Justice, we never—we never would have recommended intervening, and if it were my decision whether to intervene or not, I never would have intervened.

At the same time, the person who led consideration of the case in the Civil Division was a very senior career attorney and an expert on the False Claims Act, Mr. Mike Hertz. Although Mr. Hertz has since passed away, colleagues testified that he told them after meeting with the City of St. Paul that Mr. Hertz said, ''This case sucks,'' meaning the Newell case. Again, this was the view of the Newell matter by Mr. Mike Hertz, the leading career expert on the False Claims Act.

So upon learning that HUD had reversed its position, the U.S. Attorney's Office became concerned about the ability to proceed with the case. Staff in the U.S. Attorney's Office told staff at the Department of Justice they were also likely to change their position on intervening in the Newell case.

As the ultimate decisionmaker in the Newell matter, the head of the Department of Justice Civil Division, Tony West, told the House:

> [B]y early, mid-January, there was a consensus that had coalesced in the Civil Division that we were going to decline the Newell case. . . . My understanding is that certainly was Mike Hertz' view, it was Joyce Branda's view, and that represented the view of the branch, U.S. Attorney's Office. Also, I think around that time period would be included in that consensus, it was my view too. It was the view of the client agency, HUD.

So what he is saying is, when we looked at this, we found the Newell case was not a very good case. Earlier today, it was suggested Mr. Perez tried to cover up the fact that the Magner appeal played a role in the Department's decision not to intervene. This is not correct.

Despite indicating that they intended to change their recommendation, by mid-January the U.S. Attorney's Office formal decision memo recommending not intervening in the Newell case had not been received. Mr. Perez reached

out to an assistant U.S. attorney, leaving a voice message suggesting that the Magner case should not be included in that formal recommendation.

When he was asked about the voice mail, Mr. Perez explained to the House his concern was not with the specifics of what was in the memo but rather was directed at trying to resolve an issue he thought might be the source of the delay. Mr. Perez told the House that when he ultimately spoke to the U.S. attorney:

> [He] promptly corrected me and indicated that the Magner issue would be part of the discussion. I said fine, follow the standard protocols. But my aim and my goal in that message and in the ensuing conversations was to get him to communicate that, so that we could bring the matter to closure.

In early February, the Civil Division formalized the decision not to intervene in the Newell case with a written memo. Unsurprisingly, that memo was completely transparent and clearly indicates that the Magner appeal was a factor in the decision not to join the Newell matter, but that the decision is largely based on the flaws in the Newell case.

As Mr. West noted:

> [Declining to intervene] was a view we had all arrived to having taken into consideration the numerous factors, including the Magner case, as really as reflected in our memo. I think the memo—the declination memo that I signed, really does encapsulate what our view was.

Republicans claim Mr. Perez singlehandedly cost the United States millions of dollars. But the damage award received from a losing case is zero—zero. According to the Justice Department's leading expert on the False Claims Act, that is likely what the Newell matter was worth—zero. So Republicans say we lost millions of dollars. How can you lose millions when the experts say their chances of succeeding at it were zero?

When the general counsel of the Department of Housing and Urban Development was asked about HUD's interest in recovering funds from the City of St. Paul, she said:

> As a hypothetical matter, sure. Did we actually think that there was the capability to do that in this case? No.

To summarize, Mr. Perez consulted with two ethics and professional responsibility experts. Those experts made clear it was appropriate to advance a global resolution of the two cases as long as the Civil Division retained authority over the Newell matter, which it did at all times. Senior career Civil Division attorneys believed the Newell case lacked merit, and the lack of merit to that case was the primary reason for the Civil Division's decision not to intervene.

Based on these facts, I do not know what the controversy is. Mr. Perez acted appropriately and ethically to advance the interests of the United States.

It is no surprise that experts in the legal community have made clear Mr. Perez acted appropriately. As Professor Stephen Gillers, who has taught legal ethics for more than 30 years at New York University School of Law, wrote, the Republican report issued last month suggesting that Mr. Perez acted improperly ''cites no professional conduct rule, no court decision, no bar ethics opinion, and no secondary authority that supports'' this argument. In fact, no authority supports it.

So you can make all kinds of allegations, and the House majority report made allegations, but they have no professional conduct rule, no court decision, no bar ethics opinion, and no secondary authority that supports their allegation. No authority supports it.

So the confirmation process has been thorough. Mr. Perez has been thoroughly vetted. He has been fully responsive, forthcoming, and cooperative, including during a thorough confirmation hearing in my committee, the Health, Education, Labor & Pensions Committee. Mr. Perez's nomination was officially received on March 19, nearly 5 months ago. In contrast, Ms. Elaine Chao was confirmed as Secretary of Labor the very same day her nomination was received in the Senate—I might add under a Democratically led committee.

These allegations are simply that—allegations made of whole cloth. Quite frankly, Mr. Perez has acted ethically and appropriately at all times. Perhaps that is why some are opposed to him. He has been vigorous in enforcing our civil rights laws, vigorous in going after slum landlords and lending agencies that abuse poor people who are trying to get decent housing. Yes, he has been vigilant at that—very vigilant, as I said, getting some of the biggest settlements ever in the history of this division.

Perhaps they are afraid Mr. Perez will be vigilant and strong in his tenure as the Secretary of Labor. We can only hope so. We can only hope he will continue in the tradition set down by the former Secretary Hilda Solis, who did an outstanding job as our Secretary of Labor. A former Member of the House of Representatives, Hilda Solis turned that department around from a department that had been moribund for 8 years.

I can assure everyone that Mr. Perez will always act appropriately and ethically, but he will always act forcefully to defend the rights of people to make sure our laws are enforced—those laws that protect the health, the education, the labor, and the pensions of the American people.

With that, I yield the floor, and I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. President, earlier today my colleague Senator RUBIO came to the floor to talk about the very serious matter of the nomination of Thomas Perez that will be before us. Senator RUBIO specifically addressed Mr. Perez's refusal to comply with a bipartisan congressional subpoena into the investigation of his orchestration of a controversial quid pro quo with the City of St. Paul in a very important legal matter. Senator RUBIO talked about that ably and eloquently, and it is a very serious matter.

I was in the Department of Justice for a number of years. I am very uneasy about the way that matter was done. I don't believe that is normal business at all.

In the course of his tenure, Mr. Perez has identified approximately 1,200 personal e-mails that were related to his official duties and are responsive to the subpoena from the House, some of which reportedly disclosed nonpublic information about publicly traded companies. Yet he still refuses to turn them over to Congress despite what appears to be a clear obligation to do so. The failure to comply with a subpoena is a very serious matter.

First, he wants to go for the Department of Justice, which issues subpoenas all the time and demands that people comply with them. It doesn't matter if the subpoena is issued to a poor person or small business, they are expected to comply with the subpoena. Congress has the ability to issue subpoenas. A member of the Department of Justice ought to respond to those subpoenas. In my opinion, he has a high duty to respond to them.

I believe the Senate was incorrect in allowing his nomination to go forward to a full vote when we have not gotten the information. The failure to vote for cloture and moving to a vote on a nomination is not a rejection of a nomination. Fundamentally, it is a statement to say we are not ready to vote on it yet. We are not ready to have this matter before us because we need more information. He is not answering a subpoena issued to him by the House of Representatives.

I will not talk about that anymore, but I think it is a big deal. This is not the first problem Mr. Perez has had in abusing the legal process. Frankly, I wish to share some thoughts about other issues. I hate to do this. I was concerned about the nomination when he came forward.

Senator TOM COBURN and I met with Mr. Perez at some length, and I came away uneasy about it. I had a feeling his ideological political agenda was so strong and his legal commitment was not strong enough. I was concerned he would use this position in the Department of Justice to advance an agenda rather than enforce the law. I am afraid that is what has happened.

Many of my colleagues will recall that on election day in 2008 three members of the New Black Panther Party

stood at the entrance of a polling station in Philadelphia brandishing nightsticks and threatening voters. What more intimidation can you have than that at the voting place? They wore military-style uniforms, combat boots, battle dress pants, military-style insignia, and used racial slurs and insults to scare away would-be voters.

One of the men was Jerry Jackson, a member of Philadelphia's 14th Ward Democratic Committee and credentialed poll watcher for the Democratic Party on election day. This is not acceptable. This is clearly voter intimidation, dramatic voter intimidation.

A video of the incident was widely distributed on the Internet, made national news and headlines. The Justice Department, under the Bush administration, secured an affidavit from Bartle Bull, a long-time civil rights activist and a former aide to Robert F. Kennedy in his 1968 Presidential campaign. Mr. Bull called the conduct ''an outrageous affront to American democracy and the rights of voters to participate in an election without fear.''

None of the defendants in the case even filed a response to the complaint against him or appeared in the Federal district court in Philadelphia to answer the lawsuit. Maybe they didn't feel like they had a defense. It appeared almost certain that the Justice Department would have prevailed in their case.

According to a May 2009 article in the Washington Times, the Justice Department had been working on the case for months and had already secured a default judgment against the defendants by April 20, 2009—3 months after President Obama took office. However, President Obama's political appointee, Mr. Thomas Perrelli, then acting head of the Civil Rights Division, overruled career prosecutors and voluntarily dismissed the charges against two of the men with no penalty. He obtained an order against the third member that merely prohibited him from bringing a weapon to the polling place in future elections, which was already against the law. What a sad end of that case, and to me it is unthinkable.

In a 2009 memo, career Appellate Chief Diana K. Flynn wrote that the Justice Department could have made a ''reasonable argument in favor of default relief against all defendants, and probably should.'' That is what the career attorney said about the matter.

The Justice Department's highly unusual dismissal of the case of dramatic voter intimidation was the subject of a year-long investigation by the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights. This is an independent commission that is set up by our government and has appointees from both parties and they are focused on ensuring that civil rights are protected. They were trying to examine how it was this case was handled in this fashion.

On April 1, 2010, Chairman Gerald Reynolds sent a letter to Attorney General Holder asking whether the Department of Justice would fully cooperate with the Civil Rights Commission's investigation and allow two Department attorneys to testify in their investigation. The letter also pointed out that the Department failed to turn over requested documents. The Commission asked for requested documents. They have a right to do that.

According to Civil Rights Commissioner Peter Kirsanow, in total, the Civil Rights Division of the Department of Justice refused to answer 18 separate interrogatories, refused to provide witness statements for 12 key witnesses, refused to respond to 22 requests for production of documents, and refused to produce a privilege log. This happened in spite of the fact that the Justice Department has a statutory obligation to fully comply with the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights and their investigations. Does the Department of Justice think they are above the law?

I spent 15 years in the Department of Justice. I loved the Department of Justice. I never saw some of the things that have happened in recent years. I believe the public needs to know more about it. I will try not to be too critical of Attorney General Holder, but I am concerned about this.

Later, two attorneys from the Department of Justice defied the Department and actually agreed to testify against the Department's recommendation before the Commission on Civil Rights at considerable risk to their careers—J. Christian Adams and Christopher Coates. Mr. Coates was the former chief of the voting rights section. Mr. Adams and Mr. Coates stated that political appointees declined to prosecute the New Black Panther case because they were interested only in civil rights cases that involved equality for racial and ethnic minorities and would not prosecute civil rights cases in a race-neutral way.

Adams called the actions in the New Black Panther case—this is what the attorney at the Department of Justice said about the case—''the simplest and most obvious violation of federal law'' that he had ever seen in his career at the Justice Department. He resigned as a result of the dismissal of the obviously justified case.

In his sworn testimony before the Commission, Mr. Perez unequivocally denied the allegations. Commissioner Peter Kirsanow asked him:

> Was there any political leadership involved in the decision not to pursue this particular case any further than it was?

The answer by Mr. Perez:

> No. The decisions were made by [Justice Department career attorneys] Loretta King in consultation with Steve Rosenbaum who is the acting Deputy Assistant Attorney General.

In a recent letter to Members of the Senate regarding Mr. Perez's nomination, Commissioner Kirsanow stated Mr. Perez's testimony ''should be a tremendous concern to all Senators regardless of party.'' Indeed it should.

In fact, it was not until a Freedom of Information Act lawsuit filed by Judicial Watch that the Justice Department finally produced a privileged log identifying more than 50 e-mails between high-level Justice Department political appointees and career attorneys regarding the government's ''decision-making process'' in this case, all around the time the Department's otherwise bewildering decision to drop a case it had already won by default.

Judge Reggie Walton, an African-American Federal judge in the U.S. District Court for the District of Columbia stated in his opinion that the internal documents ''appear to contradict Assistant Attorney General Perez's testimony that political leadership was not involved.''

Let me repeat that. This is a Federal judge in the District of Columbia who said the internal documents ''appear to contradict Assistant Attorney General Perez's testimony that political leadership was not involved.'' Indeed it does. We have a Federal judge finding this in his opinion.

Judge Walton further said, ''Surely the public has an interest in documents that cast doubt on the accuracy of government officials.'' He was referring to the fact that they weren't producing documents and that they ought to—the public was entitled to have documents that cast doubt on the accuracy of the testimony of government officials, and, he says, ''representations regarding the possible politicalization of the agency decision-making.''

Mr. Walton himself at one time was in the Department of Justice. I am sure he had to have an opinion of the Department of Justice. He is not trying to abuse them. He is just saying Department of Justice officials have an obligation to tell the truth, and if they don't, they ought to be found out.

The handling of the case was so extraordinary that the Justice Department's inspector general, appointed by President Obama, initiated an investigation of the matter. The inspector general's report confirmed testimony of Mr. Adams and Mr. Coates and, importantly, it concluded this:

> Perez's testimony did not reflect the entire story regarding the involvement of political appointees in the [New Black Panther Party] decisionmaking. In particular, Perez's characterizations omitted that [political appointees] Associate Attorney General Perrelli and Deputy Associate Attorney General Hirsch were involved in consultations about the decision as shown in testimony and contemporaneous e-mails. Specifically, they set clear outer limits on what [career attorneys] could decide on the . . . matter, (including prohibiting them from dismissing a case in its entirety) without seeking additional approval from the Office of the Associate Attorney General.

So the Department's own inspector general looked at the matter and concluded Mr. Perez's testimony that the political appointees didn't have anything to do with it—it was all career attorneys who decided on the merits not to prosecute this case—was not accurate. And he went on to explain why.

This isn't a House committee having a hearing on it; this is the inspector general of the Department of Justice, the inspector general basically appointed by President Obama and selected by the Attorney General himself.

Basically, the political appointees put a fence around the case and said you can't take any real action on it until we get our approval.

Continuing to quote:

> In his . . . interview, Perez said he did not believe that these incidents constituted political appointees being ''involved'' in the decision.

Give me a break.

> We believe these facts evidence ''involvement'' in—

Well, let me go back and get this precisely correct. This was the inspector general's report. The inspector general found:

> In his interview . . . Perez said he did not believe that these incidents constituted political appointees being ''involved'' in the decision. We believe these facts evidence ''involvement'' in the decision by political appointees within the ordinary meaning of that word, and that Perez's acknowledgment, in his statements on behalf of the Department, that political appointees were briefed on and could have overruled this decision did not capture the full extent of that involvement.

That is what the inspector general said. To me, that sounds like a bureaucratic way of saying Mr. Perez did not tell the truth to the inspector general during the course of an official investigation of his conduct. So now we are going to promote him. Apparently, that is what goes on around here.

True, the original decision to dismiss the case predated Mr. Perez's appointment to the Civil Rights Division. He was not there at that time. That is true. But instead of reinstating the case—which would have been the correct decision—he became directly involved in and managed—according to the inspector general—what was, in fact, a coverup of the processes that occurred. That in and of itself should disqualify him for this position.

This is not good, to be found by your own inspector general in the U.S. Department of Justice to not respond truthfully; to have a Federal judge find that; to have their own inspector general find that. We are far too blase about high officials in this government not telling the truth. He should not be rewarded with a promotion for his work protecting political appointees in the Department of Justice.

The inspector general's report also confirmed Mr. Perez has overseen most of the unprecedented racial polarization and politicalization of the Department of Justice Civil Rights Division. There has been a lot of turmoil there over the disagreement about what is the right thing to do. There has been a consistent theme of his, which is to advance certain political and ideological agendas, it seems to me. I will explain what I mean. I want to be fair to him, but I am not—I have been around a lot of litigation for a long time and I am not comfortable with his actions.

He has sued States for implementing voter identification laws—sued the States for that which has been rejected by Federal courts—to intimidate them and stop them from saying you have to have an identification of some kind before you are allowed to waltz in and say you are John Jones and you are entitled to vote. What if you are not John Jones? States have passed laws such as that and the Federal court has rejected his view, including a three-judge panel on the U.S. District Court for the District of Columbia in Washington, including Judge Colleen Kollar-Kotelly, who was a Clinton appointee.

Mr. Perez's arguments have been rebuked by courts in Arkansas about the Civil Rights for Institutionalized Persons Act; in New York in an education case, U.S. v. Brennan; in a Florida case where Perez's team was abusively prosecuting peaceful pro-life protesters; and in a major loss in court in Florida when he was trying to force the State not to remove noncitizens from the voter rolls. Apparently, Florida, in his mind, was violating civil rights by saying nonvoters—noncitizens—shouldn't be on the voting rolls.

Is this who is running the Department of Justice? Is this the philosophy they are having in Washington?

The Department has filed and is considering lawsuits against a growing list of States that have enacted immigration legislation, including Alabama, Arizona, Utah, Indiana, Georgia, and South Carolina. Although Mr. Perez was not involved in the Department's lawsuit against Alabama—my State—he has issued threats and engaged in intimidating tactics against Alabama law enforcement officials who reported to me shock at the nature of those events.

For example, he took the unprecedented action of creating a toll-free hotline for people to report allegations of discrimination due to Alabama's immigration law, although the Attorney General of Alabama said he will prosecute anybody who violates people's right to vote. Also, Mr. Strange said, tell me who has made complaints, that you say have made complaints, about not being treated fairly and I will investigate it. Mr. Perez said there were bullying and harassment complaints out there, but when asked to produce some of them he refused to provide the information. Alabama officials have been questioned whether reports of complaints were, in fact, true. They won't say what they are.

In October of 2011, Mr. Perez sent a letter to the superintendent of every school district in Alabama requesting the names of all students who had withdrawn from school and the date, without any apparent authority to do so. He just wanted to snoop into that, I guess.

In December of 2011, he sent a letter to all Alabama sheriffs and police departments that receive Federal funds—many of them through the Department of Justice where he was—warning them, I think without basis, not to infringe on constitutional rights in enforcing Alabama's immigration law. There is no proof anybody had violated constitutional rights in enforcing that law. Mr. Perez actually threatened to withdraw Federal funding from any of the 156 offices that implement ''the law in a manner that has the purpose or effect of discriminating against Latino or any other community.''

He also warned that the Civil Rights Division is ''loosely monitoring the impact of [the law].''

On January 20, Mr. Perez met in Tuscaloosa with Tuscaloosa County Sheriff Ted Sexton and other high public safety officers in the Federal Government in Washington, and several other sheriffs around the country. Sheriff Sexton told Mr. Perez that he perceived his letter as a threat in asking whether he should expect any lawsuits against him or any other law enforcement officials. Mr. Perez wouldn't comment.

Sheriff Sexton also pressed for examples of reports of discrimination in Alabama that Mr. Perez had purportedly received, but he again refused to comment or provide evidence. According to Sheriff Sexton, a sheriff from Georgia was present and asked another Justice Department representative who was present with Mr. Perez whether States such as Alabama and Georgia were ''being penalized for the sins of our grandfathers'' and the official reportedly responded, ''More than likely.''

I received a letter from Sheriff Huey Mack of Baldwin County, a fine sheriff who responded after 9/11 in New York and did forensic work there, and Sheriff Mack states in opposition to this nomination:

> Following the issuance of this letter, several law enforcement officers met with Mr. Perez in Mobile, Alabama . . . During this meeting, Mr. Perez made several false allegations relating to law enforcement's handling of Alabama's Immigration Law. This continued for a short period of time during which it became evident Mr. Perez was not interested in the truth, but wanted to rely strictly upon his biased and preconceived notions regarding the State of Alabama. Mr. Perez should not be confirmed to any cabinet level post. In my opinion, Mr. Perez should be relieved of all of his duties as it relates to the U.S. Federal Government and seek employment outside of serving the citizens of this Nation.

Well, I wasn't there, but I know Sheriff Mack and something was wrong for him to write such a strong letter. Sheriff Sexton was in another meeting that he was referring to, a very able sheriff.

When Mr. Perez was nominated to lead the Civil Rights Division, I had serious concerns about whether he would work to protect the civil rights of all Americans regardless of race, and whether he would ensure that the division remained free from partisanship and not be used as a tool to further an agenda or some ideology.

These concerns had a basis in fact from looking at his prior record. That was the concern I had. When he ran for the Montgomery County, MD, council,

he responded to a question asking ''What would you like the voters to know about?'' with: ''I am a progressive Democrat and always was and always will be.'' Well, that is OK. But when you get to be in the Department of Justice, you have to put that aside. So I asked him about that in our meetings.

In an April 3, 2005, Washington Post article, he was described as ''about as liberal as Democrats get.'' Well, there is nothing wrong with that. But you have to be able to put it aside if you are going to serve in the U.S. Department of Justice.

As a councilman, he expressed disdain for Republicans, at one point giving ''a 5-minute speech about how some conservative Republicans do not care about the poor.'' Well, that is his opinion, but it should not affect his duties as an official in the Department of Justice.

From 1995 to 2002, while employed as an attorney in the Civil Rights Division, he served on the board of CASA de Maryland. He later became president of that organization. CASA—which is actually an acronym for Central American Solidarity Association—is an advocacy organization with some extreme views, funded in part by George Soros, that opposes enforcement of immigration laws. They are just flat out there active about it.

In the Department of Justice, you need somebody who favors enforcing the law, not not enforcing the law. What are the prosecutors supposed to do in the Department of Justice? Undermine law or enforce law? When I was in the Department of Justice, we understood our job was to enforce the law, not make it.

For example, this CASA de Maryland group issued a pamphlet encouraging illegal aliens not to speak to police officers or immigration agents. It promoted day labor sites. That is where illegal workers go out and get jobs. So they promoted that. It fought restrictions on illegal immigrants receiving driver's licenses. And it supported in-State tuition for illegal immigrants. This is the organization he was president of.

I talked to him about that, and I was not convinced that he could set that aside when he became an official in the Department of Justice who would be required to enforce those kinds of laws passed by the Congress and the States.

Mr. Perez has spoken in favor of measures that would assist illegal aliens in skirting immigration laws. While a councilman in 2003, he supported the use of the matricula consular ID cards issued by Mexico and Guatemala as a valid form of identification for local residents who worked and used government services, without having any U.S.-issued documents to prove they are lawfully here. Notably, no major bank in Mexico accepts these identification documents. They are not a valid identification document.

Unfortunately, my initial concerns about Mr. Perez's nomination have been confirmed, I hate to say. I do not feel like—and I have to say I do not doubt—that he will continue, if confirmed as the Secretary of Labor, to do all that he can within his power to hamstring the enforcement of immigration laws and to advance his political agenda. That is what his background is, that is what he has done, as I have documented here.

His misleading testimony before the U.S. Civil Rights Commission, as Mr. Kirsanow pointed out—the veracity of which was questioned by a U.S. Federal judge here in the District of Columbia—his false statements to the inspector general of the Department of Justice—who wrote about it in his analysis and report on the incident—his refusal to comply with a congressional subpoena by the House of Representatives, and, really, his abysmal record at the Department of Justice disqualifies him, in my view, for this position.

Frankly, we should not have closed debate on his nomination and moved it forward until we got the information that is out there. What if this information is produced next month and it is very incriminating or unacceptable? Are we then going to ask him to quit? That is not the way you should do business here. We have hearings. We ask questions of nominees. If they do not answer questions, normally they do not move to the floor for confirmation.

I think this is a legitimate concern that the American people ought to know about. I believe the American people have a right to know all the information about Mr. Perez's tenure in office, the criticisms of a very serious nature that he has received, and the fact that he seems to have a strong bent toward allowing his own ideological and political views to affect his decisionmaking process—all of which is unacceptable for a high position in this government of the United States of America.

I appreciate the Chair's indulgence and yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Connecticut.

MCCARTHY NOMINATION

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. President, I rise today to speak in support of the nomination of Gina McCarthy to be this Nation's next EPA Administrator.

Mr. President, you and I know Gina McCarthy's work firsthand because, prior to joining the EPA, she was our commissioner in the State of Connecticut of the Department of Environmental Protection, where she served under a Republican Governor and worked with both parties to advance the environmental and business interests of the State.

So first I want to very briefly share with my colleagues why I support Gina McCarthy. But then I, frankly, want to talk about why I believe my Republican colleagues—who may not be supportive every single day of the year of the mission of the EPA—should support her as well.

I support Gina McCarthy because for her entire career she has been a champion of public health. A lot of people who rise to lead Federal agencies spend the majority of their career here in Washington, and there is nothing wrong with that, but there is something special that comes with somebody like Gina McCarthy, who started her career as a local public health official in Canton, MA. She learned public health at the ground level, and she understood very early on that the government, working together with the business community, can have an enormously positive effect on the health of our Nation.

I support her because she has come up the right way, through the grassroots of America's public health infrastructure. I support her because of the great work she did in Connecticut when she was, as I mentioned, our Republican-appointed commissioner of the Department of Environmental Protection.

One of the things she did is work with States all throughout the Northeast on something called RGGI, which is a voluntary association of States throughout the Northeast region to try to reduce carbon emissions.

There is nothing but success when you tell the story of RGGI. She did this under a Republican Governor. There are a number of Republican Governors along with Democrats who participated in this plan. But over time, the plan was to reduce carbon emissions from northeastern States by 10 percent, moving toward 2018. Through this mechanism, what we have seen is not just a reduction in carbon emissions from Connecticut and the States that participate, but a pretty amazing reduction in the amount ratepayers are paying. Why? Because through this rather modest cap-and-trade regime, we were able to take the money gleaned through the system and put it right back into efficiencies so that ratepayers were paying less, so much so that the estimates are that consumer bills will be $1.1 billion less because of the work Gina McCarthy did. It is an average of about $25 off the bill of a residential homeowner, and about $181 off the bill of commercial consumers.

I support her because of what she has done since she has come to the EPA, leading the air quality initiatives at the EPA. She has made a huge difference. You take a look at the Mercury and Air Toxics Rule alone, and the estimates are almost hard to comprehend. Mr. President, 11,000 premature deaths will be prevented because of work she did on that one effort alone; 4,700 heart attacks will be prevented because of these toxins disappearing from our air; and maybe most importantly to those of us with little kids at home, 130,000 asthma attacks will not happen in this country, largely to children, because we will have cleaner air to breathe.

I support Gina McCarthy because of the work she has done her entire career

to be a great steward of the environment and a resolute champion of clean air.

But I want to talk for a few minutes about why I think our Republican colleagues should support her as well.

We had a breakthrough this week on the issue of how this body will treat at least this set of nominees. I think there was agreement between Republicans and Democrats that the President, of whatever party he or she may be, should get his or her team in place, and that this body should work to make sure that occurs, and maybe with the one caveat that there should be a responsibility of the President to put people with a pragmatic mind in charge of agencies that might be ones in which there is disagreement here over their mission. I might not expect my Republican colleagues to support somebody going to the CFPB or to the EPA who is a rigid ideologue. But I think there is agreement that if the President does choose a pragmatist—somebody who is willing to reach out across the aisle, who is willing to build coalitions—then this body should support the President's team.

I want to make the case to my Republican colleagues, as they make their final decision as to how they are going to vote on Gina McCarthy, that is exactly who she is. Lots has been made of the fact that she, with the exception of her appointment to the EPA during her tenure under President Obama, has been a Republican appointee. It was not just Governor Jodi Rell, a Republican—who I disagreed with on a lot of things back in Connecticut—who appointed her to head up our DEP, but she also, of course, got her start in the higher ranks of environmental protection from Mitt Romney in Massachusetts. So she has clearly demonstrated that she is someone who is able to work across the aisle.

But what I think Republicans want to know is, as she presides over an EPA that is going to move forward with new regulations for proposed powerplants and, we hope, will move ahead with new clean air regulations for existing powerplants, is she going to do that in a rigid, arbitrary fashion or is she going to be willing to listen to industry as well?

I want to give you a couple quotes that come from people who work in the industry, people, frankly, whom I do not agree with, that the President does not agree with, and, frankly, that Gina McCarthy is not going to agree with all the time, but people who have worked with her who have at worst a begrudging respect for the work she has done and at best, frankly, an admiration.

William Bumpers, who is a partner at a law firm in town and represents powerplants and other industry clients, says:

> [Gina McCarthy] is one of these avid environmental program managers who is exceptionally competent but practical. My experience with her in the past four years, I can meet with her. She's very forthright. There's no guile with her. While I haven't always agreed with the rules that come out of there, there's never been any guess work about what comes out of there.

Gloria Berquist, who is the vice president of the Alliance of Automobile Manufacturers, says:

> She is a pragmatic policymaker. She has aspirational environmental goals, but she accepts real world economics.

Charles Warren, who was a top EPA official in the Reagan administration and who now represents a lot of people in the industry, says:

> At EPA, as a regulator, you're also asking people to do the things they don't want to do. But Gina's made an effort to reach out to industries while they're developing regulations. She has got a good reputation.

Even the spokesman for the National Mining Association—this might come under the category of ''grudging respect,'' but he says:

> She is very knowledgeable. I don't think anyone is questioning her understanding or ability. She will not be caught off-guard in any defense of what they have done. I would expect her to be well-informed. She just doesn't strike me as an ideologue.

This is what the industry says. We know the Republicans support her because that is how she got the jobs that led to her position at the EPA. But even within industry, they recognize that they are going to disagree with her. They are not going to come down to the EPA in a parade of support for some of the things she may do. But they acknowledge that she is going to listen and that to the extent possible she is going to work with them.

I think that is what we want at the EPA. I think that is who Gina McCarthy will be. I do not think that just because of speculation, I think that because as the junior Senator from Connecticut, I watched her walk the walk and talk the talk in Connecticut. I know she did it in Massachusetts because that is why we picked her in Connecticut. I have certainly seen her do it in her years heading clean air policy at the EPA.

For my friends who want a strong, passionate advocate for clean air, you got one in Gina McCarthy. For my friends who want a pragmatist who, though they may disagree with her, is going to at least be practical in how she implements the policies of this administration, you have that voice too. Gina McCarthy will be a great pick at the EPA. I urge my colleagues to support her.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Rhode Island.

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. Mr. President, it is a pleasure to see both Senators from Connecticut here, one speaking and one presiding. To reflect on the junior Senator's comments about the EPA nominee Gina McCarthy, who has not only worked in Connecticut but in Massachusetts, she has surrounded my State of Rhode Island. We have had plenty, I would say, indirect exposure to her. I think she is terrific. I could not agree more with the Senator's comments. I look forward to a swift confirmation for her to get to work rapidly on the issue that brings me to the floor again for the 39th time, which is to try to get this body to wake up to the threat of climate change.

SENATOR MARKEY

Speaking of Massachusetts, I will also welcome our new Senator from Massachusetts, my New England neighbor ED MARKEY. For decades Ed has been a passionate leader in Congress on energy and environmental issues. He has been a true champion on climate change. He and I serve as cochairs of the Bicameral Task Force on Climate Change, along with our colleagues Representative WAXMAN and Senator CARDIN. So I really look forward to continuing to work alongside now-Senator Markey to forge commonsense solutions to the crisis of climate change.

CLIMATE CHANGE

We need common sense in a place where the barricade of special interest influence has blocked action on climate change and where even the debate itself is polluted—polluted with falsehood and fallacy and fantasy. Look no further than the Republican response to the announcement last month of President Obama's national climate action plan.

The President described in his speech some of the overwhelming evidence that our planet is changing. The 12 warmest years in recorded history have all come in the last 15 years, he said. Last year temperatures in some areas of the ocean reached record highs, and ice in the Arctic sank to its smallest size on record faster than most models had predicted it would. These are the facts. That is what the President said.

Here in the Senate, the President's facts were challenged. Those are not the facts, Mr. President, flatly replied one of my Republican colleagues. It is not even true. So let's look. Where were the facts and where were the falsehoods?

Well, according to NASA, the President had the facts right on warming. Indeed, he may actually have understated the severity of global warming. In fact, the 13 hottest years on record—the red ones—have all occurred in the last 15 years. The 13 hottest years on record have been in the last 15 years.

I remind my colleagues that NASA is the organization that right now is driving a rover around on Mars. We might want to consider that these are scientists who know what they are talking about.

As to ocean temperatures—the other part of the President's assertion—NOAA says that ''sea surface temperatures in the northeast shelf's large marine ecosystem during 2012 were the highest recorded in 150 years.'' The President's facts were right again. This chart from the National Snow and Ice Data Center at the University of Colorado shows, just as the President said, that ''the 2012 early sea ice melt in the

Arctic smashed previous records.'' Furthermore, the data center confirms that—and I will quote them again—''ice extent has declined faster than the models predicted.''

So in the contest between fact and falsehood, the President was completely accurate on his facts. Facts, as John Adams said, are stubborn, not to be easily brushed aside for convenient falsehoods.

Falsehoods, fallacies, and fantasies. Let's go on to a fallacy. My Senate colleague warned against accepting what he called ''the extreme position of saying that carbon dioxide is the cause of climate change or of global warming.'' He suggested that carbon dioxide cannot be a threat because it is found in nature. We exhale it. Well, that is a fallacy, an incorrect argument in logic and rhetoric resulting in a lack of validity or, more generally, a lack of soundness. That is the definition of a ''fallacy.'' Arsenic is found in nature, but in the wrong concentration and in the wrong places, it is nevertheless still dangerous. And the principle that carbon dioxide warms the atmosphere dates back to the time of the American Civil War. It is not late-breaking news. It is sound, solid, established science.

Quite simply, the position that carbon dioxide is not causing climate change is the extreme one. The overwhelming majority of climate scientists—at least 95 percent of them—accept that global climate change is driven by the carbon pollution caused by our human activity.

We are having a hearing this week on climate change in the Environment and Public Works Committee. Even the witnesses invited by the minority to that EPW hearing acknowledge the effects of carbon on our climate. In a recent interview, minority witness Dr. Roy Spencer of the University of Alabama-Huntsville said:

> I don't deny that there's been warming. In fact, I do not even deny that some of the warming is due to mankind.

In another interview, he said:

> I'm one of those scientists that think adding carbon dioxide to the atmosphere should cause some amount of warming. The question is, how much?

Another minority witness, Dr. Roger Pielke of the University of Colorado, testified before the House Committee on Government Reform back in 2006. Here is what he said:

> Human-caused climate change is real and requires attention by policy makers to both mitigation and adaptation—but there is no quick fix; the issue will be with us for decades and longer.

These are statements by the witnesses invited by the Republican side.

It is simply not credible any longer to just deny climate change. The view that carbon emissions have caused climate change is shared by virtually every major scientific organization, from the American Association for the Advancement of Science, to the American Geophysical Union, to the American Meteorological Society.

But, of course, to the polluters, this is not about the facts. It is about political power. They bought this clout and they are going to use it, facts be damned.

The Republican response to the President's climate plan even served up the old climategate fantasy; that is, the faux scandal in which hacked e-mails between climate scientists were selectively quoted to try to throw doubt on years of peer-reviewed research. The scientists, my colleague said, ''were exposed for lying about the science for all those years.'' Nothing of the kind is true. None of it. Because of the kerfuffle about this, eight groups, including the Office of the Inspector General of the U.S. Department of Commerce and the National Science Foundation, reviewed those whipped-up allegations against the researchers and found no evidence of fraud—none.

It turns out the so-called climategate scandal is pure fantasy, but even that fantasy flies in low orbit compared to the high-flying Republican fantasies about what regulating carbon pollution would do. According to my colleague, putting a price on carbon pollution will cost ''about $3,000 a year for each taxpayer.'' There is some history here. This scary misleading number has been kicked around by Republicans since 2009. As the colleague noted, the $3,000-per-year figure is derived from a 2007 MIT assessment of cap-and-trade proposals. But there is more. When Politifact asked one of the study's authors what he thought of the Republican characterization of his work, here is what he said:

> It is just wrong. It is wrong in so many ways, it is hard to begin.

That is the assertion that is being quoted on the Senate floor—one that is wrong, according to the authors, wrong in so many ways, it is hard to begin.

Politifact rates political statements generally from true to false, but it reserves a special designation for fantasies. Politifact, all the way back in 2009, gave these comments that very special designation: ''Pants On Fire.''

The fact, according to the nonpartisan Congressional Budget Office, is that the cap-and-trade bill's actual costs were modest, about 48 cents per household per day. Further, it is worth noting that these environmental rules, such as the Clean Air Act—let's use that as an example—actually save money overall. In the case of the Clean Air Act, it has been documented, $40 saved for every $1 spent. There is a 40-to-1 return on the cost of the Clean Air Act for the benefit of all of us.

Just as fantastical, our colleagues claim that new Environmental Protection Agency greenhouse gas regulations would cover ''every apartment building, church, and every school.'' Here is another good one: '' . . . that EPA will need to hire 230,000 additional employees and spend an additional $21 billion to implement its greenhouse gas regime.''

That may be true in fantasyland, but in reality EPA has specifically issued a rule limiting the regulation of greenhouse gases to only the largest sources such as powerplants, refineries, and other large industrial plants while exempting smaller sources such as restaurants, schools, and other small buildings. In fact, EPA filed a court brief, a signed court brief, a representation to the courts of the United States, that regulating ''every apartment building, church and every school,'' as my colleague put it, is wholly unrealistic.

EPA has fewer than 18,000 employees. To add 230,000 new employees, it would have to increase its workforce by 1,300 percent. Really?

If EPA had 230,000 employees, it would be equivalent to the 20th largest corporation in the United States. It would be larger than General Motors and Walgreens. In fact, back here on Earth, this claim has been evaluated by PolitiFact when it was made by other Republicans. Those similar statements received a rating of ''false.''

I applaud the President for courageously taking the lead on protecting the American people and the American economy from the devastating effects of carbon pollution on our oceans and our atmosphere.

I hope my Republican colleagues would consider the differences between the administration's regulatory approach and the market-based solutions we could implement through bipartisan legislation. I hope they will decide if they are content to holler from the back seat about this or whether they are willing to come forward and join with us, put hands on the wheel, and design commonsense solutions for a very real problem.

Unfortunately, instead of seizing this opportunity, the other side of this debate can't let go of the falsehood, the fallacy, and the fantasy. We were together the other night, Monday night, as a Senate. We joined together, and we went to the Old Senate Chamber to discuss a lot of issues related to the filibuster and to the Senate. A lot of high-minded things were said that Monday night, a lot of good things about the traditions and the institution of the Senate.

Traditions of the Senate worth preserving include that we don't traffic in falsehoods, fallacies, and in ''pants on fire'' fantasies, that we face even unpleasant facts squarely—that is our job—and that we do our job. We have received credible and convincing warnings. We have received compelling calls to act. The denial position has shown itself to be nonsense, a sham. It is time to wake up and for us to do the work necessary to hold back, to mitigate, and to adapt for the climate change that our carbon pollution is causing.

Yet we sleepwalk in this Chamber. We sleepwalk in Congress.

It is time to shelve the falsehood, fallacy and fantasy and have an honest discussion about how we are going to address the very real threat of climate change.

It is time to wake up.

I yield the floor, and I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HEINRICH). The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. I ask that the Senate proceed to a period of morning business, with Senators permitted to speak for up to 10 minutes each.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

EXECUTIVE NOMINATIONS

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, yesterday was a good day for the Senate. I want to praise the majority leader, who brought the Senate back from the brink, and the hard work of Senators from both parties who listened to each other during a lengthy discussion. In particular, I thank Senator WICKER for suggesting Monday night's bipartisan caucus, which allowed for a much needed dialogue among all Senators, and Senator MCCAIN for his efforts to bring both sides together. The last time we held a bipartisan caucus meeting, in April, it was to hear Senator MCCAIN discuss his experience as a prisoner of war. In all my time in the Senate, that was a particularly memorable evening for me. It is my hope these kinds of bipartisan discussions, like the one we had Monday night, will lead to better communication in the Senate and help us work together more effectively so we can address the problems that Americans face.

Until yesterday, Senate Republicans had been blocking votes on several important Executive nominations, including Richard Cordray to be Director of the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau; Gina McCarthy to be Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency; Tom Perez to be Secretary of Labor; and three of the five nominees to the National Labor Relations Board. Rather than arising from substantive opposition to these individual nominees, this obstruction was a partisan attempt to sabotage and eviscerate these agencies which protect consumers, the clean air and water that the American people want and deserve, and American workers. For example, I am unaware of any personal opposition to Richard Cordray, but Senate Republicans simply refused even to allow a confirmation vote for the director of an agency that they dislike. His confirmation last night, 2 years after he was first nominated, means that the CFPB is now truly empowered to protect American consumers.

During my 38 years in the Senate, I have served with Democratic majorities and Republican majorities, during Republican administrations and Democratic ones. Whether in the majority or the minority, whether the chairman or ranking member of a committee, I have always stood for the protection of the rights of the minority. Even when the minority has voted differently than I have or opposed what I have supported, I have defended their rights and held to my belief that the best traditions of the Senate would win out and that the 100 of us who represent over 310 million Americans would do the right thing.

Yet over the last 4 years, Senate Republicans have changed the tradition of the Senate with their escalating obstruction, and these actions threaten the Senate's ability to do the work of the American people.

Instead of trying to work across the aisle on efforts to help the American people at a time of economic challenges, Senate Republicans have relied on the unprecedented use of the filibuster to thwart progress. They have long since crossed the line from use of the Senate rules to abuse of the rules, exploiting them to undermine our ability to solve national problems.

Filibusters that were once used rarely have now become a common occurrence, with Senate Republicans raising procedural barriers even to considering legislation or to voting on the kinds of noncontroversial nominations the Senate once confirmed regularly and quickly by unanimous consent. The majority leader has been required to file cloture just to ensure that the Senate makes any progress at all to address our national and economic security, and a supermajority of the Senate is now needed even to allow a vote on basic issues.

That is not how the Senate should work or has worked. The Senate has a tradition of comity, with rules that function only with the kind of consent that previously was almost always given. The rules are not designed to encourage Senators to obstruct at every turn. The Senate does not function if an entire caucus takes every opportunity to use obscure procedural loopholes to stand in the way of a vote because they might disagree with the result. Without serious steps to curtail these abuses, the approach taken during the Obama administration by Senate Republicans risks turning the rules of the Senate into a farce and calls into question the ability of the Senate to perform its constitutional functions.

I was hopeful that the agreement reached earlier this year by the majority leader and the Republican leader represented a serious step toward restoring the Senate's ability to work for the American people. I was hopeful that the Republican Senators who joined with Senate Democrats in January would follow through on their commitment to curtail the abuse of Senate rules and practices that have marred the last 4 years.

That is why I was so disappointed by the continued obstruction President Obama's nominees have been facing. This obstruction has serious consequences for the American people. The harm being done is no more readily apparent than with the Republican effort to shut down the National Labor Relations Board. It was critical that we reach a workable agreement with Senate Republicans to confirm nominees to the NLRB to ensure it will be able to function—rather than leave it in its current situation of facing a shutdown due to lack of quorum at the end of next month. Shutting down the NLRB would deny justice to American workers, stripping them of their right to organize and to speak out in favor of fair wages and decent working conditions without fear of retaliation. It would also prevent employees from creating a union, or for that matter, voting to end union representation. Without an NLRB, employers will also be hurt because they will be unable to stop unlawful activities by unions, including unlawful strikes. Workers and employers depend on the NLRB, and Senate Republicans should allow votes on the President's nominees so that the Board can do its job.

Last week, some Senate Republicans declared that they could never allow a vote on the NLRB nominees who had received recess appointments to those positions, because the recess appointments have been determined by the DC Circuit to be illegal. However, according to that ruling by the DC Circuit, a total of 141 of President Bush's recess appointments were illegal. I do not recall any Senate Republicans arguing that those nominees should not be allowed a vote.

Senate Republicans should have considered President Obama's NLRB nominees on their own merits, and, even if they would ultimately have opposed them, they should have allowed the Senate to hold an up-or-down vote. I have no doubt that if considered on their own merits the two previously recess-appointed NLRB nominees would have been confirmed and would have continued to serve the Nation well.

These filibusters have been damaging to the Senate and our Nation. When it comes to Executive nominations, a President should have wide discretion to staff his or her administration.

Our form of representative democracy requires a degree of self-restraint from all of us for the legislative system to work for the good of the Nation and for the well-being of the American people. I believe that the strong cloture and confirmation votes on Richard Cordray's nomination yesterday reflect an acknowledgement of this principle by some Senate Republicans. While this deal leaves in place both the majority's ability to pursue further rules reform and the minority's ability to filibuster executive branch nominations, I hope that neither tool will be used. If the Senate Republicans who voted with us yesterday to invoke cloture on Richard Cordray continue to cooperate and work with us to allow

fair consideration of President Obama's, or any President's, executive branch nominations, the deal reached yesterday will rightfully be seen as an important step in restoring the Senate's ability to function.

SAFE ACT

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the following seven letters expressing support for S. 1270, the Secure Annuities for Employee (SAFE) Retirement Act of 2013: Fidelity Investments, National Benefit Services, LLC, National Rural Electric Cooperative Association, Principal Life Insurance Company, Small Business Council of America, Transamerica Retirement Solutions, and the U.S. Chamber of Commerce.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FIDELITY INVESTMENTS,
July 11, 2013.

Hon. ORRIN HATCH,
Hart Senate Office Building,
Washington, DC.

DEAR SENATOR HATCH: On behalf of Fidelity Investments, I would like to thank you for advancing the discussion on retirement security. The private employer pension system has been a great success; however, we share your concerns that more needs to be done to ensure that millions of Americans are ready for retirement.

The SAFE Retirement Act of 2013 includes several provisions that will improve retirement security. For example, the bill would enhance the use of automatic enrollment—a tool that has proven to increase participation in workplace savings plans. We recordkeep over 20,000 corporate defined contribution plans, representing over 12 million participants. Our data and analysis reveal that participation rates in plans with automatic enrollment is on average 90%. Currently 60% of those defined contribution plans that offer automatic-enrollment have elected the safe harbor default deferral of three percent. A higher minimum default rate, such as six percent in the bill, may result in more participants saving at higher rates sooner.

The bill also facilitates electronic delivery and includes other provisions that would simplify plan administration, making it easier for small businesses to adopt plans. Our data show that participants who receive electronic statements and notices are more likely to take actions than participants who receive paper statements and communications. We find that electronic mail yields response rates three times higher than print (13.7% vs. 3.8%).

We applaud your leadership on retirement security and appreciate your efforts to advance needed reforms to the private retirement system. We look forward to working with you on these important issues.

Regards,

PAMELA D. EVERHART,
Senior Vice President.

NATIONAL BENEFIT SERVICES, LLC,
Jordan, UT, June 24, 2013.

Hon. ORRIN HATCH,
Hart Senate Office Building, U.S. Senate, Washington, DC.

DEAR SENATOR HATCH: I am writing to you to express my support for the Pension Reform Bill, a New Pension Plan for State and Local Governments. The Pension Bill proposes many improvements and needed changes to the pension/retirement system. Among its many proposed improvements, it supports and strengthens the need to work through employers to promote retirement savings programs. In my opinion, the proposal would make it easier and less costly for an employer to implement and maintain a retirement plan for either employees. The Multiple Employer Plan proposals are particularly encouraging, as many employers and administrators are discouraged with the current statute of the law in this area. As you may know, National Benefit Services, LLC (''NBS'') is committed to helping employers design and maintain productive retirement savings programs. As a whole, the Pensions Bill is important to NBS because we have experienced firsthand how positive legislation can help small employers offer a full-fledged retirement program to employees at a fraction of the cost.

Thank you for the opportunity to share my views on the Pension Bill. I support and appreciate your offices efforts in improving the retirement system. If there is anything I can do to help in your further pension reform efforts, please let me know. Thank you again for your time and interest.

Sincerely,

SCOTT F. BETTS,
Senior Vice President,
National Benefit Services, LLC.

NATIONAL RURAL ELECTRIC COOPERATIVE ASSOCIATION,
Arlington, VA, July 3, 2013.

Re SAFE Retirement Act of 2013.

Hon. ORRIN HATCH,
Ranking Republican Member, U.S. Senate, Committee on Finance, Washington, DC.

DEAR SENATOR HATCH: Thank you for your consistent leadership on so many issues affecting rural electric cooperatives in Utah, and throughout the country.

NRECA members are committed to preserving and enhancing the voluntary employer-sponsored retirement system and the tax policies that support it. We applaud your consistent leadership on private retirement plan issues, and look forward to working with you on your most recent bill, the ''SAFE Retirement Act of 2013'', which would help address many critical challenges facing the private retirement plan system.

NRECA is proud that the vast majority of its members offer comprehensive retirement benefits through a traditional defined-benefit plan (the NRECA Retirement Security Plan) and a defined-contribution plan (the NRECA 401(k) Plan). Both of these critical ''multiple-employer'' benefit plans (under § 413(c) of the Internal Revenue Code) are operated to maximize retirement savings for employees, retirees and their families and provides each co-op employee the financial means to enjoy a comfortable and secure retirement.

Your support for rural electric cooperatives has been critical to our success, and we look forward to continuing our work with you on the important issues that impact our dedicated employees and our consumer-owners.

Sincerely,

KIRK D. JOHNSON,
Senior Vice President, Government Relations.

PRINCIPAL LIFE INSURANCE COMPANY,
Des Moines, IA, July 2, 2013.

Re Title II of ''Secure Annuities for Employee Retirement Act of 2013''.

Hon. ORRIN HATCH,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, DC.

DEAR SENATOR HATCH: Employer sponsored 401(k) plans and other worksite retirement plans have helped millions of workers save trillions of dollars. These plans have proven to be resilient even in challenging times but more is needed to expand access to worksite retirement plans. By removing barriers to new retirement plan formation and encouraging plan designs that increase participation and savings, more Americans can gain access to retirement plans and be encouraged to save more effectively through them.

On behalf of Principal Financial Group, I want to thank you for furthering this discussion through the inclusion of Title II, ''Private Pension Reform'' as contained in ''Secure Annuities for Employee Retirement Pension Act of 2013.'' In our view, the key challenges that need to be addressed to expand retirement savings are: expand coverage of employees in voluntary, employer-sponsored retirement plans; increase retirement savings to adequate levels; and secure income to last through retirement. Each of these areas is addressed in the proposed legislation.

Thank you for your leadership in this area. We are still reviewing the specifics of the bill and look forward to working with you as the process continues. Seeking solutions to these important policy considerations to expand the current employer based retirement system is vital to the economic wellbeing of millions of future retirees.

Sincerely,

GREGORY J. BURROWS,
Senior Vice President.

SMALL BUSINESS COUNCIL OF AMERICA,
July 2, 2013.

Hon. ORRIN HATCH,
Ranking Member, Senate Finance Committee,
Washington, DC.

DEAR RANKING MEMBER HATCH: On behalf of the members of the Small Business Council of America (''SBCA'') and its advisory boards, we want to thank you for all of your efforts in support of the private retirement system and express our strong support for the private retirement system provisions in Title II and 111 of the SAFE Retirement Act of 2013.

The Small Business Council of America (SBCA) is a national nonprofit organization which has represented the interests of privately-held and family-owned businesses solely on federal tax, health care, pension and other employee benefit matters since 1979. The SBCA, through its members, represents well over 20,000 enterprises in retail, manufacturing and service industries, virtually all of which provide health insurance and retirement plans. SBCA's Advisory Boards contain many of the nation's leading small business advisors in the legal, actuarial, accounting and plan administration fields. The expertise of these board members in the small business retirement plan area is unmatched in the small business world.

Longer life expectancies are requiring increased retirement savings. The present qualified retirement plan system, which is largely dependent on federal tax laws, has been very successful in providing retirement security. However, there is still room for significant improvement. By simplifying the administrative requirements of sponsoring a qualified retirement plan and providing employers with new options, the private pension reform provisions of the SAFE Retirement Act will encourage employers to both maintain existing plans as well as to establish new plans.

The existing notice and other administrative requirements of sponsoring a plan are costly and burdensome. For small business owners, the decision of whether to sponsor a qualified retirement plan is largely based on the balance between the burdens of sponsoring a plan and the benefit to its key employees. By simplifying the operation of

qualified retirement plans, the SAFE Retirement Act will make it easier for small business owners to rationalize sponsoring plans.

The SBCA believes that this bill will increase the retirement security of small business employees throughout the nation and we will make ourselves available to fully support your efforts to protect America's retirement system.

Sincerely yours,

PAULA CALIMAFDE, ESQ.,
SBCA, Chairman.

TRANSAMERICA®,
Harrison, NY, July 3, 2013.

Re Discussion Draft SAFE Retirement Act of 2013.

Hon. ORRIN HATCH,
U.S. Senate, Hart Office Building, Washington, DC.

DEAR SENATOR HATCH: As President & CEO of Transamerica Retirement Solutions, I would like to thank you for your leadership on retirement security issues as most recently evidenced by your discussion draft of the SAFE Retirement Act of 2013.

Your discussion draft addresses in a comprehensive manner problems faced by small and large employers in providing their employees the means to save for a secure retirement, as well as by individuals in trying to achieve a secure retirement through workforce savings. In particular, removing impediments to the adoption of multiple employer plans, expanding the auto enrollment safe harbor, facilitating the use of in-plan annuities and providing annuities as a distribution option are matters in which Transamerica has been extremely active, both from a policy and market development standpoint. I and others at Transamerica look forward to working with you and your staff as you finalize these and other provisions of the SAFE Retirement Act of 2013.

The Transamerica companies market life insurance, annuities, pensions and supplemental health insurance, as well as mutual funds and related investment products throughout the U.S. and in selected countries worldwide. Transamerica Retirement Solutions provides and services workforce retirement savings plans in the small and mid-large employer markets. Transamerica helps more than three million retirement plan participants save and invest wisely to secure their retirement dreams. The Transamerica companies are ranked among the top insurance groups in the U.S., based on admitted assets, and employ approximately 12,000 people nationwide.

Please do not hesitate to contact either me or Jeanne de Cervens, VP, Transamerica Federal Government Affairs, if I can provide any specific information regarding our retirement plan business or market expertise to support your efforts.

Very truly yours,

PETER KUNKEL,
President & CEO.

CHAMBER OF COMMERCE OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,
Washington, DC, July 8, 2013

Hon. ORRIN HATCH,
U.S. Senate, Washington, DC.

DEAR SENATOR HATCH: The U.S. Chamber of Commerce, the world's largest business federation representing the interests of more than three million businesses of all sizes, sectors, and regions, as well as state and local chambers and industry associations, and dedicated to promoting, protecting, and defending America's free enterprise system, thanks you for introducing the ''Secure Annuities for Employees (SAFE) Retirement Act of 2013. '' Retirement security is a critical issue facing all Americans, and our members support your efforts to encourage participation in retirement savings plans.

The SAFE Retirement Act includes several provisions that the Chamber believes are important reforms to the retirement system: enhancing the start-up credit for small businesses; eliminating barriers to the use of multiple employer plans; reducing discrimination testing and other administrative burdens; reducing administrative restrictions on hardship distributions; and simplifying notice requirements. Overall, the Chamber believes that the SAFE Retirement Act would provide meaningful reform and encourage participation by both plan sponsors and plan participants in the employer-provided retirement system.

The Chamber appreciates your leadership on this issue, and looks forward to working with you and your colleagues to enact this legislation.

Sincerely,

R. BRUCE JOSTEN.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD two letters expressing appreciation for my having introduced S. 1270, the Secure Annuities for Employees—SAFE—Retirement Act of 2013. One is from the National Association of Insurance Commissioners and the other is from the National Organization of Life and Health Insurance Guaranty Associations.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF INSURANCE COMMISSIONERS,
Washington, DC, July 2, 2013.

Hon. ORRIN G. HATCH,
Ranking Member, U.S. Senate Committee on Finance, Dirksen Senate Office Building, Washington, DC.

DEAR RANKING MEMBER HATCH: I write on behalf of the National Association of Insurance Commissioners (NAIC)[1] to express our appreciation for your reaching out to the NAIC with respect to your legislative proposal to address pension issues and retirement planning needs. We also appreciate your long history of support for state-based insurance regulation.

We note that the draft bill would rely on state insurance regulators' oversight of the life insurance and annuities industry. State insurance regulators have a strong track record of protecting policyholders by ensuring the solvency of insurers and ensuring policyholders are treated fairly. We appreciate your leadership in seeking to find solutions to our nation's retirement and lifetime income needs, and we look forward to continuing to work with you as you move forward with your legislation.

Sincerely,

COMMISSIONER JAMES J. DONELON,
NAIC President and Louisiana Insurance Commissioner.

[1] The NAIC is the U.S. standard-setting and regulatory support organization created and governed by the chief insurance regulators from the 50 states, the District of Columbia and the five U.S. territories. Through the NAIC, state insurance regulators establish standards and best practices, conduct peer review, and coordinate their regulatory oversight. NAIC members, together with the central resources of the NAIC, form the national system of state-based insurance regulation in the U.S.

NATIONAL ORGANIZATION OF LIFE AND HEALTH INSURANCE GUARANTY ASSOCIATIONS,
Herndon, VA, July 4, 2013.

Hon. ORRIN G. HATCH,
Ranking Member, U.S. Senate Committee on Finance, Dirksen Senate Office Building, Washington, DC.

DEAR RANKING MEMBER HATCH: I write to offer my personal thanks to you for supporting the prudent use of annuities to help meet Americans' retirement needs.

Secure lifetime retirement income is a priority for Americans. Annuities are an important option that should be considered as part of the solution for meeting this need. Annuities historically have proven to be safe and prudent components of a sound financial plan, thanks to the efforts of a financially conservative insurance industry, effective regulation, and an established consumer safety net system.

You and your colleagues are to be lauded for encouraging the consideration of annuities to help Americans meet their overall retirement security objectives.

In my personal opinion, facilitating the consideration of annuities to help achieve secure, lifetime retirement income will redound significantly to the benefit of both individual retirees and the overall American economy, and I appreciate your leadership on this important matter.

Sincerely,

PETER G. GALLANIS,
President.

CORDRAY CONFIRMATION

Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota. Mr. President, 3 years ago this week, the Senate passed the Wall Street reform act to address the historic instability of our financial system. Turmoil in our financial system had revealed that many Americans were trapped with financial products they did not fully understand, and that no Federal agency was looking out for consumers. This act created the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau—the first Federal agency tasked with putting consumers first—and over the past 2 years, the Bureau has taken significant steps to improve the consumer experience in many parts of the financial marketplace.

The Senate has taken a crucial step for consumers in confirming the first Director of the CFPB, Richard Cordray, to a 5-year term. I am glad that the Senate set aside partisan politics and allowed this vote on Mr. Cordray's merits to go forward. Mr. Cordray has done excellent work at the CFPB, first as its first head of enforcement, and as President Obama's first nominee to head the Bureau. I am confident that the CFPB will continue to flourish under Mr. Cordray's leadership.

TRIBUTE TO ELIZABETH CHING

Mr. BAUCUS. Mr. President, today I wish to pay tribute to a very special person who has served the people of Montana for 37 years: Elizabeth Ching. Our Liz retired from the U.S. Senate on June 30, 2013. Of course, she started her new job the very next day, on July 1. Her so-called retirement lasted less than 24-hours. That is the kind of work

ethic that has made Liz famous. When she has a task to accomplish, she simply doesn't rest until it is done.

She is a workhorse and one of the kindest, most dedicated people I know.

Liz was a staff assistant on the Select Committee for Presidential Campaigns and the Budget Committee before joining my team in the U.S. House of Representatives in 1975. Liz continued her career in the U.S. Senate. As one of the first members of my team, Liz has literally helped thousands of Montanans over the years.

She has also worn many hats over the last thirty-seven years proving that no job is too small or too large for her to tackle with heart and soul.

In many ways, Liz and I grew up together learning the ropes of Congress. Little did we know back in 1975 when I first hired her how much we would be able to accomplish for Montanans. She has helped support Montana outreach efforts on three farm bills, four highway bills, four major rural water project bills, and the Affordable Care Act.

In her early years in my Washington, DC office, she was my office manager. In 1995, she moved to Montana to be assistant to the state director. Her titles from 1996 through today include grants coordinator, State casework director, agriculture issues eastern Montana and director of constituent services, and Montana economic development director. As our economic development director, Liz has played a key role in making our Montana Economic Development Summits a success—helping make connections that have resulted in hundreds of Montana jobs. More recently, she has been an ambassador to energy-impacted communities in the Bakken region helping them to understand and access the myriad of Federal programs available to absorb the pressures of the Bakken oil and gas boom. While we will all miss having her on staff, I am thrilled to know that she will have the opportunity to continue serving Montanans through her passion for economic development.

Liz has worked on more than 17,000 cases for Montanans on issues such as small business, labor, agriculture, veterans, appropriations, transportation, housing, postal services, health, environment, energy, banking, and economic issues. I have always been thankful to have Liz in my corner. I can only imagine how each and every one of those 17,000 individuals felt knowing that Liz answered the call when they needed help.

In addition to her legislative achievements and impressive constituent work, Liz mentored thousands of interns and young staff assistants over the years, gently educating them in all facets of protocol, policy, and poise.

Always on the road, working tirelessly on individual casework and larger community issues, often I received e-mails and notes from Montanans sharing their gratitude for Liz's support and knowledge of the issues that matter most to them. One of her greatest talents is bringing key people together for discussions and setting the table for meaningful teamwork.

While she is known statewide for her work, Liz is truly a pillar of the Billings community. Whether there is a road to build, a bridge to fix, a new store opening, or a building burnt down, Liz has always been there to uplift those in need or help with the groundbreakings, ribbon-cuttings, dedications, and donations. I cannot fully express how amazing Liz has been as a liaison for our office.

While I could go on and on about Liz's professional accomplishments, I know she is most proud of her wonderful marriage to Kevin Dowling and the beautiful family they have raised together. Her amazing family is truly a testament to the type of person she is. Liz and Kevin have three terrific children: Tierney, Aidan, and Seanan, and one grandson Kaiven.

Everyone privileged to know Liz is touched by her contagious zest for life and endless energy. Her colleagues in Washington, DC, and Montana have the highest regard and appreciation for her many years of service, friendship, and determination to do everything she can for all Montanans in need of any kind of assistance.

I personally owe her a big thank-you. Liz, you are truly one of a kind. We are all rooting for you on your new adventures.

HONORING STAFF SERGEANT JEFFREY KEAS

Mr. COBURN. Mr. President, as we confront the many challenges facing this institution, it can be easy to lose sight of what is so unique and special about America. From time to time, though, we are reminded of the America we all know and love—a Nation filled with men and women of character and a remarkable ability to put the interest of others ahead of self.

I was recently reminded of the true American character in reading the story of an Oklahoman and true American patriot, SSG Jeffrey Keas, who recently succumbed to cancer at the age of 44.

As the Tulsa World recently reported, Jeff's journey to military career began at an age when others are usually leaving the service. At the age of 38, Jeff attended a local baseball game that paid tribute to active duty military and veterans. He later told family members that he felt ashamed that he could not stand with his son that day, a recent enlistee, as service men and women were asked to rise for recognition. So Jeff signed up for a long-term commitment with the Army and went on to serve our Nation in Iraq and Korea and most recently at Fort Hood, TX.

At the time of his enlistment, Jeff's dad asked him, ''Why in the world, at your age, would you do this, Jeff, when the military is designed for a 19-year-old?''

Jeff's answer says a lot about him and the country he loved so dearly. He said, ''If I can go to Iraq or Afghanistan, and that can allow some 19-year-old to come home to his mom and dad or girlfriend, then that's what I want to do.''

Tragically, SSG Jeffrey Keas passed from this world earlier this month, but not before he inspired countless Americans with his selflessness, his courage, and his service.

With men and women like SSG Jeffrey Keas, we should never count America out. We face many challenges, but this land of freedom and opportunity was built and is defended by men and women like Staff Sergeant Keas. I am in awe of the example he set for his own family, his neighbors and all those who came in contact with him.

This is the America I know.

On behalf of my fellow Oklahomans, I want to thank Staff Sergeant Keas for this remarkable example and to share our great sadness with the Keas family. Thank you for your sacrifices, and for sharing Jeff, as he served so honorably.

375TH ANNIVERSARY OF PORTSMOUTH, RHODE ISLAND

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I am pleased to join with my colleague, Senator WHITEHOUSE, to help mark the 375th anniversary of the settlement of Portsmouth, RI.

Portsmouth is predominantly located on Aquidneck Island in Narragansett Bay, and also encompasses a number of smaller islands including Prudence, Hog, Patience, and Hope. It is the second oldest community in Rhode Island and is home to over 17,000 people. With over 50 miles of coastline, Portsmouth enjoys beautiful views of the surrounding bay and islands.

Portsmouth has a long and rich history. In 1638, Roger Williams convinced religious dissenters from the Boston Colony to settle the area now known as Portsmouth. One of these dissenters, Anne Hutchinson, perhaps the most well-known of the founders of Portsmouth, rebelled against the Puritanical lifestyle in Massachusetts Bay, undergoing a rigorous trial before being banished and excommunicated from the Boston Church. Hutchinson founded the town of Portsmouth with fellow colonists who were also searching for religious freedom. Portsmouth is believed to be the first town in the New World that was established by a woman. The signing of the Portsmouth Compact in March of 1638 created the first true democracy in America.

The town played a role in our Nation's fight for independence. The Battle of Rhode Island, which took place in 1778, was significant to the history of the Revolutionary War because it was the first joint operation of American and French forces and also was the only battle in which black Americans fought as their own unit as part of the First Rhode Island Regiment, alongside Native Americans. The site

of the battle is designated as a National Historic Landmark by a plaque and monuments at Patriots Park. Portsmouth was also home to a general army hospital that treated thousands of wounded Union soldiers and Confederate prisoners during the Civil War.

With its vast shoreline, Portsmouth's maritime legacy is historically noteworthy. It was the site of the Navy's first PT-boat training facility, the Motor Torpedo Boat Squadron Training Center in Melville, where President John F. Kennedy trained. Portsmouth is now fittingly the home of US Sailing, which is the governing body for the sport of sailing in the United States.

As we celebrate the 375th anniversary of Portsmouth's settlement, I would like to recognize the residents of Portsmouth for all of their efforts to preserve one of our country's most treasured places. Like the town's motto for this anniversary celebration proclaims, Portsmouth has a proud heritage and a bright future. Congratulations to the Town of Portsmouth on its 375th anniversary.

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. Mr. President, in 1638—375 years ago—a small, brave group of free thinkers banded together to establish an independent democratic community founded upon civil liberty and religious toleration.

The settlers were followers of Anne Hutchinson, a highly educated midwife and controversial figure in the Massachusetts Bay Colony, where ideological conformity was enforced by the gallows and the lash. Hutchinson and many of her allies were banished from Massachusetts for challenging the orthodoxy of the Puritan establishment. At the urging of Roger Williams, who had founded the colony of Providence Plantation just 2 years earlier, they settled on nearby Aquidneck Island in Narragansett Bay. The group called themselves the freemen of Pocasset, after the Native American name for the area. Eventually the new community settled on the name of Portsmouth.

With the signing of the Portsmouth Compact on March 7, 1638, these religious dissenters, including John Clarke and William Coddington, formed a ''Bodie Politick'' that held forth the freedom to worship according to one's own conscience. Together with Roger Williams and his Providence colony, they blazed the path for American freedom of religion, one of our enduring national blessings.

Their bold declaration would echo 25 years later in the Royal Charter granted in 1663 by King Charles II to establish the colony of Rhode Island and Providence Plantations in New England, which provided the world's first formal establishment of freedom of religion. Their principles of tolerance are the foundation upon which our State, and afterwards our Nation, were built.

Portsmouth, RI, was also the first community in the New World to be founded by a woman. It was in Portsmouth in 1778 that the First Rhode Island Regiment, with its complement of over 100 African-American soldiers, valiantly repulsed British forces in the Battle of Rhode Island. And it was Portsmouth abolitionist and suffragist Julia Ward Howe who penned the patriotic poem, ''The Battle Hymn of the Republic,'' in 1861. The history of Portsmouth is a legacy of America.

I am proud to join with our State's senior senator, JACK REED, and all Rhode Islanders in congratulating the people of Portsmouth on this historic milestone.

RECOGNIZING THE BUFFALO SOLDIERS

Ms. LANDRIEU. Mr. President, I rise today to ask my colleagues to join me in recognizing the 9th and 10th (Horse) Cavalry Association of the Buffalo Soldiers, who on July 22–28, 2013, will celebrate their 147th Anniversary Reunion in New Orleans, LA. The cavalry association will honor allied members who have demonstrated tremendous work and leadership in the association, their community, or the United States through their exceptional service.

On July 28, 1866, the 29th Congress passed the Army Organization Act, creating two cavalry and six overall regiments of African-American troops. The 9th Cavalry was activated in New Orleans, LA, and the 10th was called into service at Fort Levenworth, KS, beginning the Buffalo Soldiers' rich heritage of professional service to their communities and the Nation. The cavalry units of the Buffalo Soldiers played an integral role in the settlement and development of the West in the crucial years that followed the Civil War, serving courageously and victoriously on the frontier from Texas to Montana.

Buffalo Soldiers wear the name proudly and respectfully, sharing a common passion for the historical significance and contributions of those who have served before them. The Buffalo Soldiers performed admirably in and out of battle, assisting in the economic growth and cultural development of Western territories and communities. Today, the Buffalo Soldiers honor their heritage through mentorship, community service, and volunteerism. In this capacity, the soldiers work tirelessly to provide education and support services in numerous communities throughout the Nation. Their outstanding leadership in these endeavors and services they perform continue to provide unparalleled contributions to the citizens and communities impacted and will benefit generations to come.

In 2001, at the 135th Anniversary Reunion of the 9th and 10th Cavalry Association, Mr. George Jones, along with nine members of the cavalry association, was awarded a national charter to form the Greater New Orleans Area Chapter #22. This chapter was the first in the State of Louisiana to receive a chapter charter from the national office. The Greater New Orleans Area Chapter has embodied the values and mission embraced by the 9th and 10th Cavalry for 147 years, and has continuously educated Louisiana's communities on the invaluable traditions and contributions of the Buffalo Soldiers in the service of the United States.

The 9th and 10th (Horse) Cavalry Association of Buffalo Soldiers has been and continues to be an inspiration to all those who have been impacted by their tireless service. It is with my greatest sincerity that I ask my colleagues to join me in recognizing the hard work, dedication, and many accomplishments of these incredible leaders.

REPORT RELATIVE TO THE CONTINUATION OF THE NATIONAL EMERGENCY WITH RESPECT TO THE FORMER LIBERIAN REGIME OF CHARLES TAYLOR THAT WAS ESTABLISHED IN EXECUTIVE ORDER 13348 ON JULY 22, 2004—PM 16

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, together with an accompanying report; which was referred to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs:

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.*

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

At 12:05 p.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Mr. Novotny, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House has passed the following bills, in which it requests the concurrence of the Senate:

H.R. 1848. An act to ensure that the Federal Aviation Administration advances the safety of small airplanes, and the continued development of the general aviation industry, and for other purposes.

H.R. 2576. An act to amend title 49, United States Code, to modify requirements relating to the availability of pipeline safety regulatory documents, and for other purposes.

H.R. 2611. An act to designate the headquarters building of the Coast Guard on the campus located at 2701 Martin Luther King, Jr., Avenue Southeast in the District of Columbia as the ''Douglas A. Munro Coast Guard Headquarters Building'', and for other purposes.

The message also announced that pursuant to section 13101 of the Health Information Technology for Economic and Clinical Health (HITECH) Act (Public Law 111–5), the Minority Leader reappoints the following member on the part of the House of Representatives to the HIT Policy Committee for a term of 3 years: Mr. Paul Egerman of Weston, Massachusetts.

MEASURES REFERRED

The following bills were read the first and the second times by unanimous consent, and referred as indicated:

H.R. 1848. An act to ensure that the Federal Aviation Administration advances the safety of small airplanes, and the continued development of the general aviation industry, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

H.R. 2576. An act to amend title 49, United States Code, to modify requirements relating to the availability of pipeline safety regulatory documents, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

MEASURES READ THE FIRST TIME

The following bills were read the first time:

H.R. 1911. To amend the Higher Education Act of 1965 to establish interest rates for new loans made on or after July 1, 2013, to direct the Secretary of Education to convene the Advisory Committee on Improving Postsecondary Education Data to conduct a study on improvements to postsecondary education transparency at the Federal level, and for other purposes.

S. 1315. A bill to prohibit the Secretary of the Treasury from enforcing the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act and the Health Care and Education Reconciliation Act of 2010.

S. 1316. A bill to repeal the provisions of the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act providing for the Independent Payment Advisory Board.

EXECUTIVE AND OTHER COMMUNICATIONS

The following communications were laid before the Senate, together with accompanying papers, reports, and documents, and were referred as indicated:

EC–2276. A communication from the Paralegal Specialist, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Airworthiness Directives; The Boeing Company Airplanes'' ((RIN2120–AA64) (Docket No. FAA–2012–0856)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 9, 2013; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–2277. A communication from the Paralegal Specialist, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Airworthiness Directives; Airbus Airplanes'' ((RIN2120–AA64) (Docket No. FAA–2012–1000)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 9, 2013; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–2278. A communication from the Paralegal Specialist, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Airworthiness Directives; Bell Helicopter Textron, Inc. (BELL) Helicopters'' ((RIN2120–AA64) (Docket No. FAA–2013–0470)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 9, 2013; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–2279. A communication from the Paralegal Specialist, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Airworthiness Directives; Bombardier, Inc. Airplanes'' ((RIN2120–AA64) (Docket No. FAA–2012–0930)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 9, 2013; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–2280. A communication from the Paralegal Specialist, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Airworthiness Directives; Rolls-Royce plc Turbojet Engines'' ((RIN2120–AA64) (Docket No. FAA–2012–1331)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 9, 2013; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–2281. A communication from the Paralegal Specialist, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Airworthiness Directives; DASSAULT AVIATION Airplanes'' ((RIN2120–AA64) (Docket No. FAA–2012–1322)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 9, 2013; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–2282. A communication from the Paralegal Specialist, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Airworthiness Directives; Embraer S.A. Airplanes'' ((RIN2120–AA64) (Docket No. FAA–2012–1227)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 9, 2013; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–2283. A communication from the Paralegal Specialist, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Airworthiness Directives; Iniziative Industriali Italiane S.p.A. Airplanes'' ((RIN2120–AA64) (Docket No. FAA–2013–0455)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 9, 2013; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–2284. A communication from the Paralegal Specialist, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Establishment of Class E Airspace; Boca Grande, FL'' ((RIN2120–AA66) (Docket No. FAA–2012–1337)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 9, 2013; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–2285. A communication from the Paralegal Specialist, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Establishment of Class E Airspace; Sanibel, FL'' ((RIN2120–AA66) (Docket No. FAA–2012–1334)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 9, 2013; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–2286. A communication from the Paralegal Specialist, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Establishment of Class E Airspace; Captiva, FL'' ((RIN2120–AA66) (Docket No. FAA–2012–1335)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 9, 2013; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–2287. A communication from the Paralegal Specialist, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Establishment of Class E Airspace; Pine Island, FL'' ((RIN2120–AA66) (Docket No. FAA–2012–1336)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 9, 2013; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–2288. A communication from the Paralegal Specialist, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Establishment of Class E Airspace; Boothbay, ME'' ((RIN2120–AA66) (Docket No. FAA–2012–0792)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 9, 2013; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–2289. A communication from the Paralegal Specialist, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Establishment of Class E Airspace; Linton, ND'' ((RIN2120–AA66) (Docket No. FAA–2012–1097)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 9, 2013; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–2290. A communication from the Paralegal Specialist, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Establishment of Class E Airspace; Immokalee-Big Cypress Airfield, FL'' ((RIN2120–AA66) (Docket No. FAA–2012–1051)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 9, 2013; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–2291. A communication from the Paralegal Specialist, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Amendment of Class E Airspace; Bend, OR'' ((RIN2120–AA66) (Docket No. FAA–2013–0026)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 9, 2013; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–2292. A communication from the Paralegal Specialist, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Establishment of Class E Airspace; Blue Mesa, CO'' ((RIN2120–AA66) (Docket No. FAA–2013–0193)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 9, 2013; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–2293. A communication from the Paralegal Specialist, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Modification of Class D and Class E Airspace and Establishment of Class E Airspace; Pasco, WA'' ((RIN2120–AA66) (Docket No. FAA–2012–1345)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 9, 2013; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–2294. A communication from the Paralegal Specialist, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Establishment of Class E Airspace; Tobe, CO'' ((RIN2120–AA66) (Docket No. FAA–2013–0194)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 9, 2013; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–2295. A communication from the Paralegal Specialist, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Modification of Class E Airspace; Clifton/Morenci, AZ'' ((RIN2120–AA66) (Docket No. FAA–2012–1237)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 9, 2013; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–2296. A communication from the Paralegal Specialist, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Amendment of Class E Airspace; Atwood, KS'' ((RIN2120–AA66) (Docket No. FAA–2011–1431)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 9, 2013; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–2297. A communication from the Paralegal Specialist, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Amendment of Class E Airspace; La Pryor, Chaparrosa Ranch Airport, TX'' ((RIN2120–AA66) (Docket No. FAA–2012–1099)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 9, 2013; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–2298. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Hexythiazox; Pesticide Tolerances'' (FRL No. 9391–1) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 12, 2013; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC–2299. A communication from the Acting Under Secretary of Defense (Personnel and Readiness), transmitting the report of an officer authorized to wear the insignia of the grade of brigadier general in accordance with title 10, United States Code, section 777; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC–2300. A communication from the Acting Under Secretary of Defense (Personnel and Readiness), transmitting the report of ten (10) officers authorized to wear the insignia of the grade of rear admiral (lower half) in accordance with title 10, United States Code, section 777; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC–2301. A communication from the Acting Under Secretary of Defense (Personnel and Readiness), transmitting the report of six (6) officers authorized to wear the insignia of the grade of brigadier general in accordance with title 10, United States Code, section 777; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC–2302. A communication from the Assistant Secretary of Defense (Global Strategic Affairs), transmitting, pursuant to law, a report entitled ''Report on Proposed Obligations for Cooperative Threat Reduction'' ; to the Committee on Armed Services.

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

The following bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first and second times by unanimous consent, and referred as indicated:

By Mr. BARRASSO (for himself, Mr. ENZI, and Mr. BROWN):

S. 1311. A bill to provide for phased-in payment of Social Security Disability Insurance payments during the waiting period for individuals with a terminal illness; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. COBURN (for himself, Mr. ALEXANDER, Mr. BARRASSO, Mr. BURR, Mr. CORNYN, Mr. ENZI, Mr. INHOFE, Mr. ISAKSON, Mr. LEE, Mr. PORTMAN, Mr. RISCH, Mr. RUBIO, Mr. THUNE, Mr. VITTER, and Mr. JOHNSON of Wisconsin):

S. 1312. A bill to amend title 5, United States Code, to limit the circumstances in which official time may be used by a Federal employee; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

By Mr. RUBIO:

S. 1313. A bill to promote transparency, accountability, and reform within the United Nations system, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Ms. KLOBUCHAR:

S. 1314. A bill to amend title 31, United States Code, to provide that the President's annual budget submission to Congress list the current fiscal year spending level for each proposed program and a separate amount for any proposed spending increases, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Budget.

By Mr. CORNYN:

S. 1315. A bill to prohibit the Secretary of the Treasury from enforcing the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act and the Health Care and Education Reconciliation Act of 2010; read the first time.

By Mr. CORNYN:

S. 1316. A bill to repeal the provisions of the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act providing for the Independent Payment Advisory Board; read the first time.

By Mr. NELSON (for himself and Mr. ROCKEFELLER):

S. 1317. A bill to authorize the programs of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration for fiscal years 2014 through 2016 and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

SUBMISSION OF CONCURRENT AND SENATE RESOLUTIONS

The following concurrent resolutions and Senate resolutions were read, and referred (or acted upon), as indicated:

By Mr. MURPHY:

S. Res. 197. A resolution recommending the posthumous award of the Navy Cross to Lieutenant Thomas M. Conway of Waterbury, Connecticut; to the Committee on Armed Services.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

S. 217

At the request of Mrs. MURRAY, the name of the Senator from California (Mrs. FEINSTEIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 217, a bill to amend the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 to require the Secretary of Education to collect information from coeducational elementary schools and secondary schools on such schools' athletic programs, and for other purposes.

S. 323

At the request of Mr. DURBIN, the names of the Senator from Maine (Mr. KING) and the Senator from Massachusetts (Ms. WARREN) were added as cosponsors of S. 323, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide for extended months of Medicare coverage of immunosuppressive drugs for kidney transplant patients and other renal dialysis provisions.

S. 411

At the request of Mr. ROCKEFELLER, the names of the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. BOOZMAN) and the Senator from Minnesota (Mr. FRANKEN) were added as cosponsors of S. 411, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to extend and modify the railroad track maintenance credit.

S. 635

At the request of Mr. BROWN, the names of the Senator from Alabama (Mr. SESSIONS) and the Senator from Delaware (Mr. COONS) were added as cosponsors of S. 635, a bill to amend the Gramm-Leach-Bliley Act to provide an exception to the annual written privacy notice requirement.

S. 695

At the request of Mr. BOOZMAN, the name of the Senator from Kansas (Mr. MORAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 695, a bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to extend the authorization of appropriations for the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to pay a monthly assistance allowance to disabled veterans training or competing for the Paralympic Team and the authorization of appropriations for the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to provide assistance to United States Paralympics, Inc., and for other purposes.

S. 734

At the request of Mr. NELSON, the names of the Senator from North Carolina (Mrs. HAGAN) and the Senator from California (Mrs. FEINSTEIN) were added as cosponsors of S. 734, a bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to repeal the requirement for reduction of survivor annuities under the Survivor Benefit Plan by veterans' dependency and indemnity compensation.

S. 892

At the request of Mr. KIRK, the name of the Senator from Oregon (Mr. WYDEN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 892, a bill to amend the Iran Threat Reduction and Syria Human Rights Act of 2012 to impose sanctions with respect to certain transactions in foreign currencies, and for other purposes.

S. 917

At the request of Mr. CARDIN, the name of the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. BOOZMAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 917, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide a

reduced rate of excise tax on beer produced domestically by certain qualifying producers.

S. 971

At the request of Mr. WYDEN, the name of the Senator from Florida (Mr. RUBIO) was added as a cosponsor of S. 971, a bill to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act to exempt the conduct of silvicultural activities from national pollutant discharge elimination system permitting requirements.

S. 987

At the request of Mr. SCHUMER, the name of the Senator from Missouri (Mrs. MCCASKILL) was added as a cosponsor of S. 987, a bill to maintain the free flow of information to the public by providing conditions for the federally compelled disclosure of information by certain persons connected with the news media.

S. 1048

At the request of Mr. ISAKSON, the name of the Senator from Alaska (Mr. BEGICH) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1048, a bill to revoke the charters for the Federal National Mortgage Corporation and the Federal Home Loan Mortgage Corporation upon resolution of their obligations, to create a new Mortgage Finance Agency for the securitization of single family and multifamily mortgages, and for other purposes.

S. 1272

At the request of Mr. ROBERTS, the name of the Senator from South Carolina (Mr. GRAHAM) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1272, a bill to provide that certain requirements of the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act do not apply if the American Health Benefit Exchanges are not operating on October 1, 2013.

S. 1279

At the request of Ms. LANDRIEU, the name of the Senator from South Carolina (Mr. GRAHAM) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1279, a bill to prohibit the revocation or withholding of Federal funds to programs whose participants carry out voluntary religious activities.

S. 1303

At the request of Mr. BLUMENTHAL, the name of the Senator from New York (Mrs. GILLIBRAND) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1303, a bill to amend certain appropriations Acts to repeal the requirement directing the Administrator of General Services to sell Federal property and assets that support the operations of the Plum Island Animal Disease Center in Plum Island, New York, and for other purposes.

S. 1310

At the request of Mr. PORTMAN, the names of the Senator from North Dakota (Mr. HOEVEN), the Senator from Alaska (Ms. MURKOWSKI), the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. BOOZMAN) and the Senator from Georgia (Mr. ISAKSON) were added as cosponsors of S. 1310, a bill to require Senate confirmation of Inspector General of the Bureau of Consumer Financial Protection, and for other purposes.

S.J. RES. 18

At the request of Mr. TESTER, the name of the Senator from Alaska (Mr. BEGICH) was added as a cosponsor of S.J. Res. 18, a joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States to clarify the authority of Congress and the States to regulate corporations, limited liability companies or other corporate entities established by the laws of any State, the United States, or any foreign state.

S.J. RES. 19

At the request of Mr. UDALL of New Mexico, the names of the Senator from California (Mrs. FEINSTEIN) and the Senator from Alaska (Mr. BEGICH) were added as cosponsors of S.J. Res. 19, a joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relating to contributions and expenditures intended to affect elections.

S. CON. RES. 15

At the request of Mr. HARKIN, the name of the Senator from North Dakota (Ms. HEITKAMP) was added as a cosponsor of S. Con. Res. 15, a concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress that the Chained Consumer Price Index should not be used to calculate cost-of-living adjustments for Social Security or veterans benefits, or to increase the tax burden on low- and middle-income taxpayers.

STATEMENTS ON INTRODUCED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

By Mr. CORNYN:

S. 1315. A bill to prohibit the Secretary of the Treasury from enforcing the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act and the Health Care and Education Reconciliation Act of 2010; read the first time.

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the text of the bill was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 1315

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the ''Keep the IRS Off Your Health Care Act of 2013''.

SEC. 2. FINDINGS.

Congress finds the following:

(1) On May 10, 2013, the Internal Revenue Service admitted that it singled out advocacy groups, based on ideology, seeking tax-exempt status.

(2) This action raises pertinent questions about the agency's ability to implement and oversee the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act (Public Law 111–148) and the Health Care and Education Reconciliation Act of 2010 (Public Law 111–152).

(3) This action could be an indication of future Internal Revenue Service abuses in relation to the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act and the Health Care and Education Reconciliation Act of 2010, given that it is their responsibility to enforce a key provision, the individual mandate.

(4) Americans accept the principle that patients, families, and doctors should be making medical decisions, not the Federal Government.

SEC. 3. PROHIBITING ENFORCEMENT OF PPACA AND HCERA.

The Secretary of the Treasury, or any delegate of the Secretary, shall not implement or enforce any provisions of or amendments made by the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act (Public Law 111–148) or the Health Care and Education Reconciliation Act of 2010 (Public Law 111–152).

By Mr. CORNYN:

S. 1316. A bill to repeal the provisions of the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act providing for the Independent Payment Advisory Board; read the first time.

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the text of the bill was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 1316

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 ''Protecting Seniors' Access to Medicare Act of 2013''.

SEC. 2. REPEAL OF THE INDEPENDENT PAYMENT ADVISORY BOARD.

Effective as of the enactment of the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act (Public Law 111–148), sections 3403 and 10320 of such Act (including the amendments made by such sections) are repealed, and any provision of law amended by such sections is hereby restored as if such sections had not been enacted into law.

SUBMITTED RESOLUTIONS

SENATE RESOLUTION 197—RECOMMENDING THE POSTHUMOUS AWARD OF THE NAVY CROSS TO LIEUTENANT THOMAS M. CONWAY OF WATERBURY, CONNECTICUT

Mr. MURPHY submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Armed Services:

S. RES. 197

Whereas, on July 16, 1945, the USS Indianapolis departed San Francisco carrying the trigger and radioactive core for the atomic bomb Little Boy, destined to be dropped on Hiroshima;

Whereas upon completing its delivery mission to Tinian Island on July 26, the USS Indianapolis proceeded to Okinawa in order to join a larger naval fleet in preparation for an invasion of the Japanese mainland;

Whereas in the early hours of July 30, the USS Indianapolis was critically damaged by 2 torpedoes from a Japanese submarine;

Whereas the USS Indianapolis sunk as a result of the damage, killing some 300 of the 1,196 sailors aboard;

Whereas most of the estimated 900 survivors relied only on their kapok life jackets and belts and some did not even have that equipment;

Whereas Lieutenant (Chaplain) Thomas M. Conway and the rest of the remaining crew were set adrift in the shark-infested waters

with no way of further notifying Navy command;

Whereas with complete disregard for his own safety, Lieutenant Conway swam back and forth among terrified crew members, administered aid to them, dragged loners back to the growing mass of survivors, organized prayer groups, and urged the increasingly dehydrated and delirious men not to give up hope of rescue;

Whereas Lieutenant Conway expired on the third day, shortly before the remaining 321 sailors were rescued after being spotted by Navy pilots;

Whereas the sinking of the USS Indianapolis was the single greatest loss of life at sea in the history of the Navy;

Whereas the successful completion of the mission of the USS Indianapolis was critical to ending World War II; and

Whereas Lieutenant Conway risked his own life in order to retrieve fellow sailors and went from lifeboat to lifeboat in shark-infested waters to tend to the dying and dispirited, acting in a manner far above the call of duty: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) honors Lieutenant Conway for his heroics, which were above reproach, reflect great credit upon himself, and upheld the highest traditions of the U.S. Navy;

(2) recognizes that the courageous and selfless actions of Lieutenant Conway saved the lives of many of his fellow sailors;

(3) concurs that the actions of Lieutenant Conway are in the spirit and tradition of the Navy Cross; and

(4) recommends that Lieutenant Conway posthumously be awarded the Navy Cross.

AUTHORITY FOR COMMITTEES TO MEET

COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE, NUTRITION, AND FORESTRY

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry be authorized to conduct a hearing entitled, ''Reauthorization of the Commodity Futures Trading Commission,'' during the session of the Senate on July 17, 2013 at 2:30 a.m. in room SH–216 of the Hart Senate Office Building.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE ON COMMERCE, SCIENCE, AND TRANSPORTATION

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on July 17, 2013 at 2:30 p.m. in room 253 of the Russell Senate Office Building.

The Committee will hold a hearing entitled, ''E-Rate 2.0: Connecting Every Child to the Transformative Power of Technology.''

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE ON FINANCE

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Finance be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on July 17, 2013, at 10 a.m. in room SD–215 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building, to conduct a hearing entitled ''Health Information Technology: A Building Block to Quality Health Care.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Foreign Relations be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on July 17, 2013 at 10 a.m.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Foreign Relations be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on July 17, 2013 at 2:30 p.m.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE ON HOMELAND SECURITY AND GOVERNMENTAL AFFAIRS

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on July 17, 2013, at 10 a.m. to conduct a hearing entitled ''The Department of Homeland Security at 10 Years: Harnessing Science and Technology to Protect National Security and Enhance Government Efficiency.''

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on the Judiciary be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate, on July 17, 2013, at 1 p.m., in room SD–226 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building, to conduct a hearing entitled ''From Selma to Shelby County: Working Together to Restore the Protections of the Voting Rights Act.''

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE ON SMALL BUSINESS AND ENTREPRENEURSHIP

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Small Business and Entrepreneurship be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on July 17, 2013, at 3 p.m. in room 428A Russell Senate Office building to conduct a hearing entitled ''Small Business Tax Reform: Making the Tax Code Work for Entrepreneurs and Startups.''

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE ON VETERANS' AFFAIRS

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Veterans' Affairs be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on July 17, 2013, at 10 a.m. in room SR–418 of the Russell Senate Office Building.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON CONSUMER PROTECTION, PRODUCT SAFETY, AND INSURANCE

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Subcommittee on Consumer Protection, Product Safety, and Insurance of the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation be authorized to hold a meeting during the session of the Senate on July 17, 2013, at 10 a.m. in room 253 of the Russell Senate Office Building.

The Committee will hold a hearing entitled, ''The Expansion of Internet Gambling: Assessing Consumer Protection Concerns.''

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON FINANCIAL INSTITUTIONS AND CONSUMER PROTECTION

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Banking, Housing and Urban Affairs Subcommittee on Financial Institutions and Consumer Protection be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on July 17, 2013, at 10 a.m., to conduct a hearing entitled ''Shining a Light on the Consumer Debt Industry.''

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON SEAPOWER

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Subcommittee on Seapower of the Committee on Armed Services be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on July 17, 2013, at 9:30 a.m.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON STRATEGIC FORCES

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Subcommittee on Strategic Forces of the Committee on Armed Services be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on July 17, 2013 p.m.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

PRIVILEGES OF THE FLOOR

Mr. HARKIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Carly Rush and Colby Steele, interns with my HELP Committee staff, be granted floor privileges for the remainder of the debate on the confirmation of Thomas Perez.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMEMORATING THE RELAUNCHING OF 172-YEAR-OLD CHARLES W. MORGAN

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. I ask unanimous consent the Judiciary Committee be discharged from further consideration of S. Res. 183 and the Senate proceed to its consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The clerk will report the resolution by title.

The assistant legislative clerk read the title as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 183), commemorating the relaunching of 172-year-old Charles W. Morgan by Mystic Seaport: The Museum of America and the Sea.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be agreed to, the preamble be agreed to, and the motions to reconsider be laid upon the table, with no intervening action or debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The resolution (S. Res. 183) was agreed to.

The preamble was agreed to.

(The resolution, with its preamble, is printed in the RECORD of June 24, 2013, under ''Submitted Resolutions.'')

MEASURES READ THE FIRST TIME EN BLOC—S. 1315, S. 1316, AND H.R. 1911

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. Mr. President, I understand that there are three bills at the desk, and I ask for their first reading en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct. The clerk will read the titles of the bills en bloc.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 1315) to prohibit the Secretary of the Treasury from enforcing the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act and the Health Care and Education Reconciliation Act of 2010.

A bill (S. 1316) to repeal the provisions of the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act providing for the Independent Payment Advisory Board.

A bill (H.R. 1911) to amend the Higher Education Act of 1965 to establish interest rates for new loans made on or after July 1, 2013, to direct the Secretary of Education to convene the Advisory Committee on Improving Postsecondary Education Data to conduct a study on improvements to postsecondary education transparency at the Federal level, and for other purposes.

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. I now ask for a second reading en bloc, and I object to my own request en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection having been heard, the bills will be read for a second time on the next legislative day.

ORDERS FOR THURSDAY, JULY 18, 2013

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it adjourn until 9:30 a.m. on Thursday, July 18, 2013; that following the prayer and pledge, the morning hour be deemed expired, the Journal of proceedings be approved to date, and the time for the two leaders be reserved for their use later in the day; that the majority leader be recognized; that following the remarks of the two leaders, the Senate be in a period of morning business for 1 hour, with Senators permitted to speak therein for up to 10 minutes each, with the time equally divided and controlled between the two leaders or their designees, with the first half controlled by the majority and the second half controlled by the Republicans; that following morning business, the Senate resume executive session to consider Calendar No. 99, the nomination of Thomas Perez to be Secretary of Labor, postcloture; further, that all time during adjournment, morning business, legislative session, and recess count postcloture on the Perez nomination.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

PROGRAM

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. Mr. President, I am informed by the leader that we hope to confirm both the Perez and McCarthy nominations on Thursday.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL 9:30 A.M. TOMORROW

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. Mr. President, if there is no further business to come before the Senate, I ask unanimous consent that it adjourn under the previous order.

There being no objection, the Senate, at 7:25 p.m., adjourned until Thursday, July 18, 2013, at 9:30 a.m.

CONFIRMATION

Executive nomination confirmed by the Senate July 17, 2013:

EXPORT-IMPORT BANK OF THE UNITED STATES

FRED P. HOCHBERG, OF NEW YORK, TO BE PRESIDENT OF THE EXPORT-IMPORT BANK OF THE UNITED STATES FOR A TERM EXPIRING JANUARY 20, 2017.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

IN HONOR OF DR. JEFF THOMPSON FOR BEING NAMED A WHITE HOUSE HEALTH AND CLIMATE CHAMPION OF CHANGE

HON. RON KIND

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 17, 2013

Mr. KIND. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate Dr. Jeff Thompson, CEO of Gundersen Health System in La Crosse, Wisconsin, for being honored as a White House Health and Climate Champion of Change. Dr. Thompson is not only a nationally recognized health care leader but he is also a visionary leader in promoting environmental responsibility for health care organizations. This Climate and Health Champion of Change award was given to a select group of national leaders who promote public health through such environmental stewardship.

Dr. Thompson's record of extraordinary leadership starts with Gundersen's core mission of providing high-quality care to patients in western Wisconsin, southeast Minnesota, and northern Iowa. Dr. Thompson has been a leader in developing the type of coordinated, integrated and patient centered care that is the model for the direction we need to move our nation's health care system. His successful leadership can be seen through the long list of accolades Gundersen has received for their quality care and innovation, including being named one of Becker's Hospital Review 100 Integrated Health Systems to Know, winning Healthgrades Distinguished Hospital Award for Clinic Excellence for the 6th consecutive year in 2013, ranking as the fourth safest hospital in the country as measured by Consumer Reports, and being named one of the 100 Most Wired hospitals according to a report from Hospitals and Health Networks magazine. Dr. Thompson was also personally named one of the Top 100 Physician Leaders of Hospital and Health Systems by Becker's Hospital Review last year. The additional honor of being named a White House Health and Climate Champion of Change is further confirmation of the extraordinary role Gundersen Health, under Dr. Thompson's leadership, has taken to improve patient health and promote an environmentally sustainable health care system.

Gundersen Health is setting the standard for how to make health systems environmentally responsible. They are on track to be 100 percent energy independent in 2014. Gundersen partners with businesses and communities to encourage environmentally and economically sustainable business practices and economic growth. They are developing their own energy infrastructure, using equipment owned by the health system, instead of purchasing renewable power at premium rates. This initiative demonstrates their commitment to lowering the cost of healthcare for the people and businesses that pay for it through socially responsible and environmentally friendly means.

Gundersen has invested in a wide variety of renewable energy programs, including a dairy digester, wind farms, biomass boiler, solar panels, and geothermal systems to provide a diverse portfolio of renewable resources to offer clean, green energy. Those initiatives are all directed toward the goal of making Gundersen the first fully energy independent hospital in the country by next year.

Dr. Thompson has provided national leadership in changing the way health care is delivered in America toward a more quality, value based focus. Combined with his leadership in setting the national standard for promoting renewable energy, energy efficiency and sustainability programs within health care systems, Dr. Thompson is very deserving of the White House Health and Climate Champion of Change award. It is with great pleasure that I congratulate Dr. Thompson on receiving this prestigious honor.

CELEBRATING THE 100 YEAR ANNIVERSARY OF ST. FRANCIS MEDICAL CENTER

HON. RODNEY ALEXANDER

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 17, 2013

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. Speaker, I am proud to honor the St. Francis Medical Center in Monroe, LA. as it celebrates its 100th anniversary. The men and women of this center have dedicated countless hours to help those during times of need, and I am evermore grateful for all that they have done to serve the 5th Congressional District.

On opening day, July 22, 1913, the St. Francis Sanitarium and School of Nursing had four patients and by late September, 193 had been admitted. Named after St. Francis of Assisi, the patron saint of the Franciscan Sisters, its mission would be to extend the healing ministry of Jesus Christ to God's people, especially those most in need. A century later, this mission has remained constant.

From its modest beginning as a three-story red brick building with 75 patient beds, St. Francis Medical Center has grown to become Northeast Louisiana's largest healthcare provider with 550 licensed beds.

In addition to the remarkable progression of care St. Francis Medical Center provides to its patients and loved ones, it has turned into one of the largest employers in Ouachita Parish boasting over 2,200 employees and an annual payroll of $100 million.

As St. Francis Medical Center embarks on its second century of service to our community, I am confident the goal of providing excellent healthcare with love, compassion, humility and respect for all entrusted to them will continue.

It is with deep appreciation for the organization's many contributions to the 5th Congressional District that I rise today to recognize St. Francis Medical Center's 100th year. To say that this group is a source of strength within Northeast Louisiana is an understatement. Bringing comfort and hope to patients and their families is a priceless gift. They have made a real difference in the lives of many, and I commend each individual, past and present, for their admirable service and leadership.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me today in applauding such an outstanding benchmark.

HONORING FIRE CAPTAIN PAUL MOSES

HON. ADAM KINZINGER

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 17, 2013

Mr. KINZINGER of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Captain Paul B. Moses of the Belvidere Fire Department, and to recognize his years of dedicated public service.

Captain Moses began his career on January 10th, 1979 and was one of the first firefighters to complete Emergency Medical Technician training within the department. Since then he has worked in many different capacities during his tenure. In August of 1983, he became lieutenant and then six years later, in 1989, was appointed Chief of the department, a position he held for the next six years. Over his remaining years he completed his career as both Lieutenant and finally as Captain.

He was a member of the Illinois Fire Chiefs Association, the Winnebago Fire Chiefs Association, and served on Boone County's 911 Board for over 15 years, serving many years as Chairman. While Chief he was instrumental in upgrading department equipment with the purchase of a new Fire Engine and Ladder Truck. He improved training within the department and was instrumental in the computerization of records.

Most importantly, Captain Moses led from the front, never asking someone to do something he couldn't or wouldn't do himself. He is what you envision a firefighter to be, courageous, dedicated, strong, and passionate about his service.

On July 11th, Captain Moses retired from the Belvidere Fire Department after more than 34 years of sacrifice and service. Captain Moses has played an invaluable role in the Belvidere Fire Department for decades and he will be missed.

Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the 16th District of Illinois, I wish to express our deepest thanks to Captain Moses for devoting his life's work to protecting and serving his community.

IN RECOGNITION OF OFFICER ROBERT HORNSBY

HON. JOHN R. CARTER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 17, 2013

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor a fallen hero of the 31st District of Texas, Police Officer Robert "Bobby" Hornsby. Officer Hornsby, of the Killeen Police Department SWAT team, was fatally shot in the line of duty on Saturday, July 14, 2013. After four years of service on the force, he was accepted by the SWAT team in November of 2012. Officer Hornsby was a valued asset and one of Killeen's finest. He is described by his fellow officers as dedicated, patient man who was a strength to the department. Officer Hornsby is survived by his loving wife, daughter and son.

I am deeply saddened by this tragic loss; it is unfair whenever a young life is taken from us too soon. Officer Hornsby's bravery and commitment to the badge will be honored and remembered. My prayers are with Officer Hornsby's family, his brothers and sisters in blue at the Killeen Police Department, and the Killeen community as they mourn this remarkable life.

I would also like to recognize Officer Juan Obregon Jr. of the Killeen, Texas Police Department SWAT team. Officer Obregon was injured in the line of duty next to his fallen brother, Officer Hornsby. My prayers of healing are with him and his family as he begins his road to recovery.

I thank Officer Hornsby and Officer Obregon for their service, as well as all law enforcement. We are safe because heroic men, like Officer Hornsby and Officer Obregon, put themselves in harm's way to defend others. Their bravery and commitment to the badge will be honored.

HONORING MS. JAN N. ROCHE ON HER SELECTION TO THE NAFCU BOARD

HON. JAMES P. MORAN

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 17, 2013

Mr. MORAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate Jan Roche on her recent election to the Board of Directors at the National Association of Federal Credit Unions (NAFCU).

Ms. Roche is the President and CEO of State Department Federal Credit Union headquartered in Alexandria, Virginia. She has served in this role for over 10 years and has used her extensive accounting and credit union management experience to ensure that the State Department Federal Credit Union remains wholly committed to serving its 68,000 members at home and abroad. Ms. Roche is a Certified Public Accountant and graduated cum laude from the University of Richmond.

In addition to her service on NAFCU's Board of Directors, Ms. Roche also serves on the Administrative Board of the Filene Research Institute and is the vice chair of the Richmond Fed's Community Development Institutions Advisory Board. Ms. Roche is active in the betterment of our local community through her work supporting Credit Union Miracle Day, which helps plan the Cherry Blossom 10-miler each year benefitting the Children's Miracle Network Hospitals.

Undoubtedly, Ms. Roche will bring a tremendous amount of expertise to the NAFCU Board in navigating laws and regulations impacting the credit union community.

I wish Ms. Roche the best of luck in her new role on the NAFCU Board and look forward to working with her in this capacity. I ask that my colleagues join me today in congratulating her on this achievement.

UNITED HEALTH FOUNDATION DIVERSE SCHOLARS INITIATIVE

HON. ERIK PAULSEN

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 17, 2013

Mr. PAULSEN. Mr. Speaker, investing in the next generation of health care professionals to equip them with the tools and skills to improve the quality and delivery of health care is essential to the successful modernization of our nation's health care system. For the past six years, United Health Foundation has helped more than 1,000 multicultural students from across the country reach their higher education dreams while inspiring them to pursue careers in health care through their Diverse Scholars Initiative. This year's scholars represent an impressive group of individuals who are dedicated to creating a more culturally relevant and effective health care system, particularly in underserved communities. I would like to congratulate these individuals for their academic achievements and their commitment to enter the health care workforce.

Mycolette Anderson, Lukachukai, Arizona, 1st Congressional District of Arizona.

Kaitlyn Benally, Tuba City, Arizona, 1st Congressional District of Arizona.

Wilma Hunter, Chinle, Arizona, 1st Congressional District of Arizona.

Regis Maloney, Tonalea, Arizona, 1st Congressional District of Arizona.

Jeffery Sleppy, Chinle, Arizona, 1st Congressional District of Arizona.

Cecilia Espinoza, El Mirage, Arizona, 8th Congressional District of Arizona.

Lorenza Villegas-Murphy, Litchfield Park, Arizona, 8th Congressional District of Arizona.

Nancy Rivera, Davis, California, 3rd Congressional District of California.

Tria Vue, Sacramento, California, 6th Congressional District of California.

Brian Daniel, San Pablo, California, 11th Congressional District of California.

Ricky Vides, Moraga, California, 11th Congressional District of California.

Hannah Yemane, Danville, California, 11th Congressional District of California.

Lois Chen, Oakland, California, 13th Congressional District of California.

Jose Mata, Los Angeles, California, 28th Congressional District of California.

Angelyn Reyes, Los Angeles, California, 33rd Congressional District of California.

Elisa Parmentier, Sun City, California, 42nd Congressional District of California.

Sophia Jimenez, Imperial Beach, California, 51st Congressional District of California.

Blanca Pacheco, San Diego, California, 53rd Congressional District of California.

Kelly Sanchez, New Haven, Connecticut, 3rd Congressional District of Connecticut.

Dianelis Martin, Lehigh Acres, Florida, 19th Congressional District of Florida.

Emmanuel Adejo, Miami Gardens, Florida, 24th Congressional District of Florida.

Alison Morales, Key West, Florida, 26th Congressional District of Florida.

Karla Arevalo-Alas, Morrow, Georgia, 5th Congressional District of Georgia.

Sharmori Lewis, Hampton, Georgia, 13th Congressional District of Georgia.

Carolina González, Pocatello, Idaho, 2nd Congressional District of Idaho.

Jessica Smith, Chicago, Illinois, 7th Congressional District of Illinois.

Raymond Morales, Urbana, Illinois, 13th Congressional District of Illinois.

Christian Figueroa, Garden City, Kansas, 1st Congressional District of Kansas.

Marcus Rushing, Overland Park, Kansas, 3rd Congressional District of Kansas.

Stephen Igwe, New Orleans, Louisiana, 2nd Congressional District of Louisiana.

Julius Unamba, Upper Marlboro, Maryland, 4th Congressional District of Maryland.

Alba Ortega, Lynn, Massachusetts, 6th Congressional District of Massachusetts.

Erez Gueta, Bath, Michigan, 4th Congressional District of Michigan.

Linda Kerandi, Plymouth, Minnesota, 3rd Congressional District of Minnesota.

Victoria Okuneye, Brooklyn Park, Minnesota, 3rd Congressional District of Minnesota.

David Koffa, Hanover, New Hampshire, 2nd Congressional District of New Hampshire.

Quidest Sheriff, Blackwood, New Jersey, 1st Congressional District of New Jersey.

Nailah Cooper, Albuquerque, New Mexico, 1st Congressional District of New Mexico.

Tylene Billie, Crownpoint, New Mexico, 3rd Congressional District of New Mexico.

Lesley Eldridge, Gallup, New Mexico, 3rd Congressional District of New Mexico.

Ronald Sanchez, Queens, New York, 5th Congressional District of New York.

Xiang Mei Cao, Brooklyn, New York, 7th Congressional District of New York.

Emma Guzman, Brooklyn, New York, 11th Congressional District of New York.

Elliott Brea, New York, New York, 12th Congressional District of New York.

Rosario Jaime-Lara, New York, New York, 13th Congressional District of New York.

Gordon Wong, Geneseo, New York, 27th Congressional District of New York.

Joshua Pyant, Charlotte, North Carolina, 9th Congressional District of North Carolina.

Jessica Mack, Winston-Salem, North Carolina, 12th Congressional District of North Carolina.

Rashiadah Weaver, East Cleveland, Ohio, 11th Congressional District of Ohio.

Shelah McMillan, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, 2nd Congressional District of Pennsylvania.

Vivienne Meljen, Scranton, Pennsylvania, 17th Congressional District of Pennsylvania.

Emily Gao, Galveston, Texas, 14th Congressional District of Texas.

Brian Ibarra, El Paso, Texas, 16th Congressional District of Texas.

Paula Ogbevoen, Houston, Texas, 18th Congressional District of Texas.

Rio Reyna Pilar, San Antonio, Texas, 20th Congressional District of Texas.

Cassandra Ragin, San Antonio, Texas, 20th Congressional District of Texas.

Brenda Tristan, Laredo, Texas, 28th Congressional District of Texas.

Leslie Cepeda-Echeverria, Salt Lake City, Utah, 2nd Congressional District of Utah.

Michelle Lewis, Richmond, Virginia, 3rd Congressional District of Virginia.

Beverly Sanchez, Alexandria, Virginia, 8th Congressional District of Virginia.

Tiffany Tran, Vancouver, Washington, 3rd Congressional District of Washington.

Harpreet Singh-Gill, Milwaukee, Wisconsin, 4th Congressional District of Wisconsin.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. AL GREEN

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 17, 2013

Mr. AL GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, yesterday I was unavoidably detained and missed the following vote: H.R. 2576—To amend title 49, United States Code, to modify requirements relating to the availability of pipeline safety regulatory documents, and for other purposes. Had I been present, I would have voted "yes" on this bill.

TRIBUTE TO DR. CLINTON M. PATTEA

HON. KYRSTEN SINEMA

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 17, 2013

Ms. SINEMA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the life and passing of Dr. Clinton M. Pattea, a lifelong advocate for Native American sovereignty, president of the Fort McDowell Yavapai Nation, and former chairman of the Arizona Commission of Indian Affairs.

As a state legislator, I worked with Dr. Pattea on issues important to our local communities, where his passion for education and providing educational resources to the underserved was renowned. Dr. Pattea tirelessly sought to fund scholarships for native peoples across the state and in my district at Arizona State University, where I am an Adjunct Professor in the School of Social Work.

Elected to the Yavapai Tribal Council in 1960, Dr. Pattea thereafter led a decade-long campaign to stop construction of the Orme Dam, which would have flooded 17,000 acres of tribal lands. The victory is celebrated annually, as is Sovereignty Day, commemorating a peaceful standoff led by Dr. Pattea against federal agents seeking to seize Yavapai property. The non-violent protest led to the negotiation with Governor Fife Symington of a pact considered a national victory for Native self-determination.

Dr. Pattea will be missed by all who knew him, and will be remembered by his family, his Nation, the state of Arizona, and Native people everywhere. I ask that my colleagues join me in posthumously recognizing Dr. Pattea for his dedicated service to his community, as well as in grieving with his family and the Fort McDowell Yavapai Nation at the passing of their leader.

IN MEMORY OF ARTHUR GLATFELTER, JR.

HON. ROBERT E. ANDREWS

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 17, 2013

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the late Arthur Glatfelter, Jr. Mr. Glatfelter was a pillar of his community, a kind and generous man, and a leader who sought to make the world a better place. In addition to his work with philanthropies, Mr. Glatfelter was a loving husband, father, grandfather, and great grandfather.

Mr. Glatfelter fought for his country during World War II, serving in the United States Marine Corps in the Pacific. After the war he continued his life of service. Mr. Glatfelter was a leader in many philanthropic groups, and served on the boards of multiple organizations in his community. He was an original member of the board of directors as well as the founding director of the Congressional Fire Services Institute. Mr. Glatfelter remained an active member of the CFSI until stepping down in 2008. Other groups he worked with included the Cultural Alliance of York County, the National Fallen Firefighters Foundation, the York Habitat for Humanity, and the Farm and Natural Lands Trust of York County. Mr. Glatfelter was also the founder of the Glatfelter Insurance Group.

Mr. Speaker, Art Glatfelter was a shining example of community service and family values. He was not only a good friend of mine, but an outstanding friend of the emergency services and first responder communities all across America. He will be missed.

LEGISLATION TO AMEND THE INTERNAL REVENUE CODE OF 1986 TO PROVIDE FOR OFFSETTING CERTAIN PAST-DUE LOCAL TAX DEBTS AGAINST INCOME TAX OVERPAYMENTS

HON. JAMES P. MORAN

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 17, 2013

Mr. MORAN. Mr. Speaker, today I am proposing legislation to establish a program that would mirror the existing law for states. The legislation would allow certain types of delinquent local tax debt to be collected through the reduction of federal tax refunds. Providing local governments access to these needed and due funds is important both in principle and for budgetary purposes. In this challenging and uncertain economic environment, it is especially important to assist cities and counties to collect the taxes they are owed. The alternatives would be a reduction in vital services and jobs at a time when the government safety net for poor families and the unemployed has weakened significantly and increases in poverty in these hard economic times. Failure to collect what is due will impose significantly higher demands on local governments for police, housing and shelter, food, and other vital services. This bill offers a unique opportunity not just to provide hundreds of millions of dollars of desperately needed assistance at no cost to federal taxpayers but also to protect honest taxpayers from an increase in local property taxes. Under this legislation, the only cost is to the delinquent taxpayer, who would finally be made to pay his or her outstanding tax obligation.

This proposed program would have no additional cost to the federal government. Local governments would pay the federal government the fee of $25 for each offset refund. It would alleviate the administrative burden to Department of the Treasury by requiring the state taxing authority to act as the clearinghouse. Therefore, the client base for the Department of the Treasury would not increase.

This concept of an offset originated as a way to assist states with securing child support arrearages. It was expanded to allow states to submit other delinquent claims against an individual's federal tax return. This program has been very successful for the states. This bill would expand its successful idea and concept to local governments in all states. Doing so could potentially result in several billion dollars annually for local governments by effecting the collection of delinquent taxes. Under this legislation, the following order of priority for payment of an offset would be: (1) past-due federal income tax, (2) past-due state child support, (3) past-due federal government agency debt, (4) past-due state income tax, and (5) local government tax. The state taxing authority for each state would act as the clearinghouse for the local government tax debts, so this will not be an additional burden to Financial Management Services (which is a division of the United States Department of the Treasury and administers the Federal Offset Program). Doing so could potentially result in several billion dollars annually for local governments by improving the collection of delinquent taxes.

The bill would instruct the Secretary of the Treasury, upon receiving notice from any eligible state on behalf of a local government, that a named person owes such local government a past-due, legally enforceable tax obligation and provide, consequently, for the reduction of the federal tax refunds payable to such person by the amount of such debt. That amount would be remitted to the state for payment to the affected local government, provide for notification to the state of the taxpayer's name, taxpayer identification number, address, and the amount collected; and notification of the person due the refund that it has been reduced by an amount necessary to satisfy a past-due, legally enforceable tax obligation.

This bill offers a unique opportunity to provide hundreds of millions of dollars of desperately needed assistance at no cost to federal taxpayers. For Virginia localities, it is estimated that this bill will bring in between 65–70 million dollars in revenue during the first year in the program. From its participation in the Federal Offset Program, for FY 2008 the Commonwealth of Virginia received over $17 million dollars in offsets of federal income tax refunds and an additional $5 million in offsets of the tax stimulus checks. This legislation earned the official support of the National Association of Counties, the Government Finance Officers Association, the National League of Cities, the Treasurers' Association of Virginia, the United States Conference of Mayors, the Association of Public Treasurers of the United States and Canada, and the Conference of State Court Administrators.

This is a good-government bill. If the legislation is passed, it would allow federal, state and local government to work together. Good citizens, who pay their taxes, will appreciate that the federal government and the state government are assisting localities to help local government collect from the delinquents. Each citizen should share in paying his fair share of taxes.

H.R. 2667, THE AUTHORITY FOR MANDATE DELAY ACT AND H.R. 2668, THE FAIRNESS FOR AMERICAN FAMILIES ACT JULY 17, 2013

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 17, 2013

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.

TRIBUTE TO BLUE STAR MOTHERS OF AMERICA

HON. KYRSTEN SINEMA

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 17, 2013

Ms. SINEMA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to ask that my colleagues join me in recognizing the Blue Star Mothers of America, a national organization of military mothers devoted to supporting our nation's armed forces. Representatives LAMALFA, SWALWELL, and ROBY have joined me in introducing a resolution naming the month of August as "Blue Star Mothers of America Month."

I am proud to say that the East Valley Blue Star Mothers, a local chapter of the organization, meets in my district. They have dedicated themselves to supporting soldiers overseas, wounded warriors, families of fallen soldiers, as well as all veterans, homeless or thriving. They organize visits to VA hospitals, participate in Veteran's and Memorial Day events, and send care packages to homesick troops protecting our freedom abroad.

Founded in 1941, Blue Star Mothers of America boast 11,000 members brought together by their sons' and daughters' service. Chapters flourish in 42 states, and in all corners of my own state, Arizona. Blue Star Mothers are unsung heroes of the ongoing fight to preserve our country's safety and liberty.

The Blue Star Mothers are a truly patriotic organization and deserve our body's commendation. I ask that my colleagues join me in recognizing the Blue Star Mothers of America for their service to their communities, to our country, and to all of us individually.

THE ADMINISTRATION MUST NOT SIDELINE HORRIFIC HUMAN RIGHTS SITUATION IN NORTH KOREA

HON. FRANK R. WOLF

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 17, 2013

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Speaker, today the House Republican Conference and House Foreign Affairs Committee welcomed roughly 400 Korean American community leaders from across the country to Capitol Hill for the first-ever Korean American Meetup. Participants had the opportunity to meet with key congressional leaders to discuss legislative and policy priorities for the community.

Given my own interactions over the years with the vibrant Korean American community in my district, I think it is safe to say that the abysmal human rights situation in North Korea will feature prominently among these policy priorities.

Sadly, given the amount of time and focus that the Obama Administration has dedicated to shining a bright light on this dark corner of the globe you would never know that up to 200,000 people languish in a sophisticated and horrific prison camp system in North Korea reminiscent of the most brutal regimes throughout history.

On May 21 Christianity Today featured an interview with former Washington Post reporter Blaine Harden, author of "Escape from Camp 14." Harden's book features the story of Shin Dong-hyuk, the only known prisoner who was actually born in one of regime's notorious camps and escaped alive.

Mr. Shin's personal story is remarkable. He grew up knowing nothing of life outside the camp. He turned in his mother and brother—which led to their eventual execution—based on the promise of a meal of rice. In fact it was the pursuit of food that led him to attempt a harrowing escape.

Harden spoke of the camps as analogous to "Stalin's Gulag." He continued, "The camps were set up under Kim Il-sung, an acolyte of Stalin, as a mirror of the Soviet Gulag. What is different in the North Korean case is that they seem to be crueler and have lasted twice as long."

Indeed, the longevity of these camps is striking as is the fact that some South Korean POWs are still trapped in North Korea 60 years after the armistice. The Washington Post ran a story last weekend, which I submit for the RECORD, on this rarely discussed human rights tragedy.

We have known for some time about the true nature of the cruel and inhuman system of labor camps maintained by the regime. In fact satellite images confirmed their existence more than a decade ago. And yet somehow, almost inexplicably, these horrific camps have failed to inspire collective outrage on the part of the West, and have been sidelined to the point of irrelevance in successive U.S. administrations' dealings with North Korea, including the Obama Administration.

The U.S. Committee for Human Rights in North Korea published a report 10 years ago called The Hidden Gulag: Exposing North Korea's Prison Camps. It contained a full description of the camps, the worst of which are called kwan-li-so, which is translated as "political penal-labor colonies," and where, according to the Committee's report, scores of thousands of political prisoners—along with up to three generations of their family members—are banished without any judicial process and imprisoned, typically for lifetime sentences of slave labor.

The report also contained prisoners' testimonies and satellite photographs of the camps, whose very existence continues to be denied by the North Korean government, which is why the committee described the gulags as "hidden."

Defector testimony, like that of Mr. Shin, satellite images and in-depth reporting have left no doubt about the camps' existence and

the horrors of life there. What remains to be seen is how the U.S. will respond.

What has this administration done about this abomination?

What has this administration done about a regime that sustains and perpetuates this evil?

In March, after sustained pressure from human rights organizations, the United Nations Human Rights Council agreed to set up a commission of inquiry to examine systematic ''crimes against humanity'' in North Korea. The commission is slated to begin its work this month and could represent a sliver of hope for the long suffering people of North Korea.

However, it is striking that just one month after the decision to pursue a commission of inquiry, President Obama met with UN General Secretary Ban Ki-moon, and despite the fact that North Korea featured prominently on the agenda, their lengthy public remarks after meeting did not include a single mention of the human rights atrocities in North Korea instead focusing exclusively on the nuclear issue and diffusing tensions on the Korean Peninsula.

Because North Korea possesses nuclear weapons and regularly threatens to use them as well as share nuclear weapons technology with other rogue states like Iran, the international community, the U.S. included, has tended to ignore or seriously downplay the horrendous human rights abuses in North Korea in the interest of trying to negotiate an end to its nuclear program.

But next to nothing has been achieved by these negotiations over the years. In fact, recent months have been marked by a series of provocations by the North Korean government. Meanwhile, America—the world's leading democracy which has historically championed fundamental freedoms—has been shamefully silent about grave human rights abuses and atrocities.

On a host of levels this approach is deeply flawed and I do not believe it will yield the desired results on either the nuclear front or the human rights front. The possession of nuclear weapons is simply too important to the North Korean regime, if only to deflect attention from its cruel and oppressive system of camps and the famine that it has brought upon its people at an estimated cost of anywhere from one to three million lives. Any future talks with the North Koreans, be it the six-party process, which stalled in 2008, or some other forum, must include human rights on the agenda. For years, nuclear talks alone have produced next to nothing.

A new North Korea framework is long overdue. Ignoring or downplaying the human rights situation for one more day is unconscionable.

Ronald Reagan negotiated with the Soviet Union to reduce nuclear weapons throughout the 1980s, but that did not stop him from speaking about human rights, calling upon the Soviets to tear down the Berlin Wall, and predicting that communism would end up on the ash heap of history. His outspoken support for human rights had an effect, accelerating the demise of communism and, in the process, making it easier to resolve nuclear and security issues, since the main cause of Soviet aggressiveness was the communist system it was intended to defend and extend. Further it reminded those living behind the Iron Curtain that America was a friend, not an enemy, despite Soviet propaganda to the contrary.

We should be doing the same thing with North Korea today.

My friend Carl Gershman, president of the National Endowment for Democracy, has pointed out that the North Korean totalitarian system is undergoing an inexorable process of erosion, marked by a sharply reduced ability to impose a complete information blockade on its population.

He notes that what makes the North Korean system especially vulnerable is the existence just across the southern border of a free, successful and affluent South Korean society. For decades now the regime in Pyongyang has told its population that the people of South Korea live in hell while they live in a communist paradise. He's concluded that as the population learns that the truth is exactly the opposite, they will become increasingly restive, resentful, and rebellious.

With these fissures in the information blockade comes an opportunity.

In the words of the tireless North Korean human rights activist and champion Suzanne Scholte, ''There is so much that we can do to help the North Korean people. First, because they can hear us: our government must make our human rights concerns the most important policy regarding North Korea, so that North Koreans know the truth; that we are not the yankee imperialist wolves trying to destroy them, but the United States and other countries have spent billions of dollars trying to feed them and save them from starvation.''

Additionally, the Obama Administration ought to be pursuing a policy which places a high priority on working with other countries in the region to champion the rights of North Korean refugees. China is among the biggest obstacles. Its current policy of repatriating North Korean refugees violates China's international treaty obligations. A grim fate awaits those who are returned to North Korea.

According to Human Rights Watch, ''Beijing categorically labels North Koreans in China 'illegal' economic migrants and routinely repatriates them, despite its obligation to offer protection to refugees under customary international law and the Refugee Convention of 1951 and its 1967 protocol, to which China is a state party. Former North Korean security officials who have defected told Human Rights Watch that North Koreans handed back by China face interrogation, torture, and referral to political prisoner or forced labor camps. In a high profile case, China forced back at least 30 North Koreans in February and March 2012, defying a formal request from South Korean President Lee Myung-Bak to desist from doing so, and despite protests in front of the Chinese Embassy in Seoul.''

When was the last time this issue was raised with the Chinese government?

Did it even garner a cursory mention during the recent U.S.-China Economic and Strategic Dialogue?

Is there any sense that China will have to pay a price for disregarding its international obligations?

The human rights travesty in North Korea is perhaps most acute when we consider the vulnerable children of that nation. There are those living under the regime and those referred to as ''stateless orphans,'' having been born out of relationships between North Korean women defectors, many of whom are trafficked once they escape to China, and Chinese men. According to a September 2012 Radio Free Asia story, ''Aid workers estimate that there are some 2,000 'defector orphans' in China . . .''

Last September, the House passed the North Korean Child Welfare Act of 2012, which I cosponsored. It was signed into law by the president in January. The legislation directs the State Department to ''advocate for the best interests'' of North Korean children and to when possible, facilitate immediate protection for those living outside North Korea through family reunification or, ''if appropriate and eligible in individual cases, domestic or international adoption.''

This legislation enjoyed broad bipartisan support in the Congress. What steps has the State Department taken to fulfill its obligation in this regard?

Ultimately, this administration needs to look forward. It needs vision, creativity and boldness.

The North Korean regime will not be there forever to oppress its people.

Writing in the Wall Street Journal on the eve of South Korean President Park Geun-hye's first summit with US President Barack Obama, Nicholas Eberstadt suggested that, ''A robust international human-rights campaign in support of the world's most hideously abused subject population would restrict the regime's international freedom of maneuver, just as the anti-apartheid campaign did against South Africa in the 1980s. A serious public-communications effort—propaganda, if you like—aimed at encouraging any glimmers of decline in the cohesion of Pyongyang's elite could also constrain the leadership.''

Such imagination has been utterly lacking in the Obama administration.

Fortunately, we take some solace in knowing that just like the regimes in Nazi Germany and the Soviet Union that preceded it, this evil empire, too, will fall.

In the meantime we must champion the rights of the people who wither under its oppression.

I'll close with the words of columnist and author, Anne Applebaum in the hope that they inspire the administration's approach to North Korea moving forward. She writes in the introduction of The Hidden Gulag, ''This is not to say that words can make a dictatorship collapse overnight. But words can certainly make a dictatorship collapse over time, as experience during the last two decades has shown. Totalitarian regimes are built on lies and can be damaged, even destroyed, when those lies are exposed.''

[From the Washington Post, July 13, 2013]

SOME SOUTH KOREAN POWS STILL TRAPPED IN THE NORTH, 60 YEARS AFTER ARMISTICE

(By Chico Harlan)

SEOUL.—Sixty years ago this month, a 21–year-old South Korean soldier named Lee Jae-won wrote a letter to his mother. He was somewhere in the middle of the peninsula, he wrote, and bullets were coming down like ''raindrops.'' He said he was scared.

The next letter to arrive came days later from the South Korean military. It described a firefight in Paju, near the modern-day border between the North and South, and said Lee had been killed there in battle. His body had not been recovered.

''We never doubted his death,'' said Lee's younger brother, Lee Jae-seong. ''It was the chaos of war, and you couldn't expect to recover a body.''

But Lee was not dead. Rather, he had been captured by Chinese Communists and handed to the North Koreans, who detained him as a lifetime prisoner, part of a secretive program that continues 60 years after the end of the

Korean War, according to South Korean officials and escapees from the North.

Tens of thousands of South Korean POWs were held captive in the North under the program, penned in remote areas and kept incommunicado in one of the most scarring legacies of the three-year war. South Korean officials say that about 500 of those POWs—now in their 80s and 90s—might still be alive, still waiting to return home. In part because they're so old, South Korea says it's a government priority, though a difficult one, to get them out.

Almost nothing was known about the lives of these prisoners until 20 years ago, when a few elderly soldiers escaped, sneaking from the northern tip of North Korea into China and making their way back to South Korea. A few dozen more followed, and they described years of forced labor in coal mines. They said they were encouraged to marry North Korean wives, a means of assimilation. But under the North's family-run police state, they were designated as members of the ''hostile'' social class—denied education and Workers' Party membership, and sent to gulags for even minor slip-ups, such as talking favorably about the quality of South Korean rice.

When the war ended with a July 27, 1953, armistice agreement that divided the peninsula along the 38th parallel, about 80,000 South Korean soldiers were unaccounted for. A few, like Lee Jae-won, were presumed dead. Most were thought to be POWs. The two Koreas, as part of the armistice, agreed to swap those prisoners, but the North returned only 8,300.

The others became part of an intractable Cold War standoff, and the few POWs who have escaped say both Koreas are to blame. The South pressed the North about the POWs for several years after the war, but the issue faded from public consciousness—until the first successful escape of a POW, in 1994. The North, meanwhile, has said that anybody living in the country is there voluntarily.

South Korea took up the POW issue with greater force six years ago, as it became clear that a lengthy charm offensive—known as the Sunshine Policy—wasn't leading the North to change its economic or humanitarian policies. During a 2000 summit with Kim Jong Il, South Korean President Kim Dae-jung didn't even bring up the issue. But by 2007, the South was talking about the POWs in defense talks. And by 2008, under conservative President Lee Myung-bak, South Korea offered aid to win the prisoners' release.

But with relations between the two governments badly frayed, the countries haven't discussed the issue since military-to-military talks in February 2011.

''Time is chasing us,'' said Lee Sang-chul, a one-star general at the South Korean Ministry of National Defense who is in charge of the POW issue.

But without North Korea's cooperation, Lee said, the South has little recourse to retrieve its soldiers. Lee said that, realistically, the POWs have only one way to return home: They have to escape.

HOPES THAT WITHERED

So far, about 80 have.

They gather for annual dinners in the South, and some meet for regular card games. They've been given overdue medals and overdue apologies. They've testified about the POWs they know who are still in the North. They've shaken hands with the president. They've received major compensation payments—about $10,000 per month, over five years.

The returnees have encountered all varieties of surprise, both bitter and grand, as a half-dozen of them described in recent interviews. One escapee, Lee Won-sam, was married just before the war and reunited with his wife 55 years later. But many left families in the North only to find alienation in the South. The POWs, like others in the North, were told for decades that the South was impoverished and decrepit—and their arrival in the South revealed the extent of that deception while also dropping them into incomprehensible prosperity. A handful lost money in frauds, South Korean officials say.

''I thought South Korea had lots of beggars under the bridge and everybody lived in shacks,'' said Lee Gyu-il, 80, who escaped in 2008.

Many escapees say that after the war, they were initially hopeful that the South would secure their return. That hope withered in 1956, when the North assembled the prisoners and told them about Cabinet Order 143, which turned them into North Korean citizens—albeit those of the lowest rank. They were told to be thankful that they had been welcomed into a virtuous society.

''Sadly, there was no real change in our daily lives,'' Yoo Young-bok, who escaped in 2000, wrote in his memoir, which has been translated into English. ''We went right on toiling'' in the mines.

'HE LIVED A FALSE LIFE'

Those who have escaped acknowledge their luck. It wasn't easy for them to flee. Some had to travel for days through the North and then dart across a river forming the border with China—at an age when some had trouble running. Brokers helped guide them but also charged them more than the going rate for defectors, knowing that the escapees would receive large payments after settling in the South.

They know a few who are still stranded in the North. Most of the former prisoners have died from mining accidents, disease, execution, famine and old age.

In Lee Jae-won's case, it was liver cancer. It was 1994, and he was 63. After being captured by the Chinese and handed to the North, he had worked for four decades in a mine at the northernmost point of the peninsula, near the Russian border. He'd married a woman with one eye—a fellow member of the hostile class—and had four children, all of whom were ridiculed by teachers and classmates for their family background.

But only as Lee's health deteriorated in his final months did he tell his children, for the first time, the details of his earlier life. He gave one son, Lee Ju-won, the names of family members in the South, as well as an address: the home in which he was raised.

''So after I buried him, I decided to go there,'' Lee Ju-won said.

It took him 15 years to defect. Two days after Lee Ju-won was given his South Korean citizenship, he traveled to his family's home town, Boeun. His relatives still owned the original property, though the home had been demolished and rebuilt.

During that visit, Lee Ju-won learned that his family had celebrated his father's birthday every year and always set aside a rice ball for him at the New Year's feast. He also discovered his father's letter from Paju, written weeks before the armistice, which a relative had saved.

Lee Ju-won learned that his father, before the war, had been rebellious and talkative—characteristics he stifled in the North, though he passed them on to his son.

''It turns out my dad was a lot like me, though he didn't show it,'' Lee Ju-won said. ''He was admired in North Korea, because he worked hard and didn't do anything wrong. But he lived a false life. He knew one slip of the tongue could harm our whole family. So he never talked about South Korea.''

Yoonjung Seo contributed to this report.

HONORING UNITED STATES MARINE CORPS COLONEL ADRIAN W. BURKE

HON. JEFF DENHAM

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 17, 2013

Mr. DENHAM. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor United States Marine Corps' Colonel Adrian W. Burke, who retired today after many years of decorated service.

Col. Burke is a native of Deer Park, Texas. He earned his commission in the United States Marine Corps as a Distinguished Naval Graduate from Texas A&M University where he earned a Bachelor of Business Administration degree majoring in Marketing in 1984.

Col. Burke has served as a Logistics Officer and a North Africa, Middle East and Central Asia Regional Specialist. He has commanded at the platoon, company, battalion and regimental levels, leading troops into combat during nine campaigns. Furthermore, he commanded a reinforced logistics company that supported Regimental Combat Team One during Operation Desert Shield and Task Force Papa Bear during the invasion of Kuwait in Operation Desert Storm. He commanded a reinforced logistics battalion during the initial invasion of Iraq in support of the 1st Marine Division. Col. Burke returned with his battalion for a second OIF deployment to support Regimental Combat Team 7 during the expansion of combat operations into the western Al Aribar province of Iraq.

Col. Burke holds three Master's degrees. In 1992, he earned a Master of Business Administration degree with an emphasis in International Business from National University, San Diego, CA, where he was a Leadership Scholarship recipient. In 1999, he earned a Master of Arts degree in National Security and Strategic Studies from the Naval War College, Newport, RI; he was recognized with three research and writing commendations. In 2006, he earned a Master of Science degree in National Resource Strategy with a concentration in Supply Chain Management from the Industrial College of the Armed Forces, Washington, DC; he was recognized as a Distinguished Academic Graduate and received a research and writing award for logistics excellence.

Col. Burke is a CTL, Certified in Transportation and Logistics by the American Society of Transportation and Logistics. He is a certified graduate of the Georgia Tech Professional Program in Supply Chain and Logistics. He is a graduate of the Marine Corps' School of Advanced Warfighting, a masters-level program that refines decision-making skills in complex environments. Col. Burke is also an Honor Graduate of the Marine Corps' Amphibious Warfare School.

The United States Marine Corps' Colonel Adrian W. Burke assumed command of the San Joaquin region Defense Logistics Agency Defense Distribution Center in July, 2010. His previous assignment was acting as the Director of Logistics for U.S. Forces Afghanistan for Operation Enduring Freedom.

Col. Burke's personal decorations include: the Defense Superior Service Medal, the Legion of Merit, two Bronze Star Medals, three Meritorious Service Medals, two Navy Commendation Medals, two Navy Achievement

Medals, and three Combat Action Ribbons. His unit decorations include: the Presidential Unit Citation, four Joint Meritorious Unit Awards and two Naval Unit Citations.

Col. Burke is married to his wife of almost sixteen years, the former Miss Traci Ann Patterson of San Diego, Calif. They have four children; Jimmy, Susie, Kadie, and Ellie.

Mr. Speaker, please join me in honoring Colonel Adrian W. Burke for his honorable service to our great Country.

TRIBUTE TO WOONG KYUNG KIM

HON. MIKE COFFMAN

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 17, 2013

Mr. COFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Grandmaster Woong Kyung Kim of Aurora, Colorado. A Korean by birth, Mr. Kim, known affectionately as Bobby, became a household name in the world of martial arts as a teacher and a film star in the 1970s. Grandmaster Kim also occupied a peculiar but indispensable role in auxiliary to our armed forces from 1964 to 1979.

Born in Seoul, South Korea in 1942, Grandmaster Kim began his service to the U.S. military while in college as a Taekwondo instructor for the Army's Second Infantry Division, stationed at the Demilitarized Zone (DMZ). Mr. Kim taught the American troops in Korea while finishing his studies and shortly after he graduated in 1969, he came to the United States and began teaching the ways of Taekwondo to cadets at the U.S. Air Force Academy in Colorado Springs. Mr. Kim ended his tenure with the Air Force Academy in 1979 but continues to share his knowledge of the Korean martial arts with pupils in Colorado to this day.

Shortly after becoming an American citizen, Bobby Kim began an illustrious film career in 1975 and has been credited in 19 movies. Mr. Kim became a presence in the action and martial arts genre in both America and Korea over his career. Grandmaster Kim shared the screen with many great action stars during his career and even starred as the titular character in the 1989 Korean martial arts film ''Ernie and Master Kim''.

Grandmaster Bobby Kim served as a role model and a community leader throughout his life. His unique service to our country is a testament to the American dream and we should all be proud to call him our countryman. Mr. Speaker, it is an honor to recognize Grandmaster Bobby Kim for a lifetime of achievement with our military and on the big screen.

RECOGNIZING CONNOR SHUPE

HON. JASON T. SMITH

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 17, 2013

Mr. SMITH of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in recognition of Connor Shupe, a member of Boy Scout Troop 99 in Houston, Missouri, who received his Eagle Scout Award on July 7, 2013. It is the highest award in scouting and the importance of this achievement cannot be overstated.

In order for Connor to become an Eagle Scout, he earned twenty-two different merit badges in a wide variety of subjects as well as serving in various leadership positions in his troop. For his Eagle project, Connor set up a food drive and cleaned and painted the Texas County Food Pantry. He organized multiple volunteers in different shifts and roles to get this major accomplishment completed. Connor recently graduated from Plato High School and plans on attending Brigham Young University Idaho after he serves a mission for his church.

Not every Boy Scout achieves the rank of Eagle Scout. The merit that comes with it deserves to be recognized and celebrated, especially in the hopes of inspiring other young men to become hard-working, American citizens and volunteers in their communities.

IN HONOR OF RAJNATH SINGH, PRESIDENT OF INDIA'S BHARATIYA JANATA PARTY

HON. ENI F.H. FALEOMAVAEGA

OF AMERICAN SAMOA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 17, 2013

Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to welcome Rajnath Singh to Washington, D.C. Mr. Singh is the current president of the Bharatiya Janata Party (BJP), the main opposition party in India.

At age 24, Rajnath Singh was appointed District President of the Jana Sangh. In 1977, he was elected a Member of the Legislative Assembly from the Mirzapur constituency. In 1984, he became state president of the youth wing.

In 1986, he was appointed national general secretary of the youth wing. In 1988, he rose to the position of National President in the BJP youth and was also elected into the Uttar Pradesh legislative council.

In 1991, Mr. Singh became Education Minister in the first BJP government in the state of Uttar Pradesh. In April 1994, he was elected into the Rajya Sabha and he became involved with the Advisory committee on Industry, Consultative Committee for the Ministry of Agriculture, Business Advisory Committee, House Committee and the Committee on Human Resource Development. Mr. Singh was twice elected as National President of BJP and his political accomplishments also include his service as Chief Minister of Uttar Pradesh, his home state.

Mr. Singh oversaw BJP victories in the states of Uttarakhand and Punjab, as well as municipal elections in Delhi, Chandigarh and across Maharashtra. In 2007, assembly elections in Gujarat added a new dimension to the string of successful electoral victories by the BJP.

In 2008, the BJP formed its first ever Government in south India when it rose to power in Karnataka. In 2008, BJP also registered victories in Madhya Pradesh and Chhattisgarh. The most successful phase in the BJP's history was when it managed to win 5 Assembly elections in a row in Uttranchal, Punjab, Gujarat, Madhya Pradesh and Chhattisgarh.

I am honored to welcome Mr. Singh to our nation's Capital. I thank him for his service to India and for his work in strengthening U.S.-India relations. I also commend the BJP party for naming Chief Minister Narendra Modi as BJP's campaign committee chief.

As former Chairman and current Ranking Member of the House Foreign Affairs Subcommittee on Asia and the Pacific, I have and will continue to fully support Chief Minister Modi in his work to lift millions out of poverty by making development a mass movement. Making development a mass movement cuts across the barriers of caste, community, region, religion, race, gender, and status, and guarantees that the benefits of development reach all of us.

This extraordinary idea put forward by Chief Minister Modi has the potential to make the world a better place to live and, consequently, it is time for the U.S. to reverse its course and dialogue now with Chief Minister Modi, who may very well be India's next Prime Minister.

Once more, I welcome the President of the BJP party to Washington, D.C., and I thank Mr. Sanjay Puri, founder and CEO of the Alliance for U.S.-India Business (AUSIB), for bringing us together.

A HIGH POINT FURNITURE COMPANY WINS NATIONAL HONORS

HON. HOWARD COBLE

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 17, 2013

Mr. COBLE. Mr. Speaker, there is a company in the Sixth District of North Carolina that recently received a distinguished national award for its commitment to American workers and producing fine hand-crafted furniture in the United States. Edward Ferrell/Lewis Mittman (EF/LM) is the recipient of the ''2013 Best: Made in America Award.'' I would like to congratulate all involved in this company's patriotic efforts.

Edward Ferrell/Lewis Mittman is a home furnishings and accessories company located in High Point, North Carolina. Steve Mittman moved EF/LM to North Carolina in 1992 from New York City where it was founded by his father in 1953. Today, EF/LM continues to operate in its modern High Point factory designed to nurture and support the great craftspeople of North Carolina.

EF/LM employs approximately 85 people in a variety of roles. The company is a ''sell to the trade only'' company that manufactures products in all categories of upholstered furniture and case goods. These products are showcased by about 15 managers and sales persons who run individual showrooms as their own businesses. The dedicated individuals at EF/LM work to incorporate surrounding local communities into the development of designs, and often volunteer their time and expertise for local non-profit causes. In addition to providing jobs in the Sixth District, EF/LM makes an effort to utilize local suppliers and other businesses for materials and tasks to further help American consumers and businesses.

Recently, EF/LM handcrafted a ''bipartisan'' sofa and hosted an event in which the sofa was staged in the Rayburn House Office Building Foyer. Respective sides of red and blue fabric were sewn together with white fabric to symbolize an invitation for Republicans and Democrats to sit, talk and listen about the importance of creating and sustaining jobs on American soil.

I would like to offer special congratulations to Owner Steve Mittman, President and CEO Crans Baldwin, Vice President of Operations Gregg Arrington, CFO and Controller Steve Wilt, Vice President of Design Phillip Jeffries, Director of Supply Chain Mark Peterson, and Showroom Managers Annie O'Connell and Joanna Mon.

Edward Ferrell/Lewis Mittman is a loyal, reputable and truly American company that has contributed to High Point's reputation as the Furniture Capital of the World. I am proud to congratulate EF/LM on its ''2013 Best: Made in America Award.''

CONGRATULATING METROPOLITAN AFRICAN METHODIST EPISCOPAL (AME) CHURCH ON ITS 175TH ANNIVERSARY

HON. ELEANOR HOLMES NORTON

OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 17, 2013

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to ask the House of Representatives to join me in congratulating Metropolitan African Methodist Episcopal (AME) Church, also known as ''The National Cathedral of African Methodism,'' on its 175th anniversary, and for its contributions to the District of Columbia.

Founded in 1838, Metropolitan AME Church has a long history of notable activities and events. The church was a safe haven to runaway persons who were enslaved, and pioneered the Bethel Literary Society, which enriched the civic, cultural and intellectual lives of African American citizens. Through the years, Metropolitan AME Church has hosted a number of prominent speakers, such as Frederick Douglass, Paul Laurence Dunbar, Mary McLeod Bethune, Eleanor Roosevelt, Joel Elias Spingarn, E. E. Just, Alain Locke, Mordecai Johnson, Hubert H. Humphrey, Jesse Jackson, and Bishop Desmond Tutu, among others. The church was also the site of memorial services for Frederick Douglass, A. Philip Randolph and Rosa Parks. This historic landmark was also the location of both President Bill Clinton and Vice President Albert Gore's inauguration prayer services. In recent years, President Barack Obama and the First Family have worshipped at Metropolitan AME Church.

Members of the congregation are committed to charity. Together, they rose over $56,000 in money and goods for the survivors of Hurricane Katrina and Rita. Metropolitan AME Church also supports social justice initiatives that aim to improve the lives of all citizens of the District of Columbia and surrounding jurisdictions. The church has worked with ex-offenders, who are reentering society and most recently, the church has focused on initiatives to ''Stop the Pipeline to Prison'' and ''Ending Gun Violence.''

Metropolitan AME Church is committed to preserving the architectural and cultural heritage that distinguishes the District of Columbia. The church received the designation as an historical site and has renovated the church ($4.5 Million) to maintain its edifice as a part of AME history. Just recently, the church was awarded a $90,000 grant from the Partners in Preservation to restore the stained-glass windows surrounding the recently restored episcopacy windows on the church's primary facade.

Mr. Speaker, I ask the House of Representatives to join me in celebrating the 175th anniversary of Metropolitan AME.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. DUNCAN HUNTER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 17, 2013

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Speaker, the purpose of my statement is to inform the House that my absence last week, from July 8 to July 12, and on Tuesday of this week, July 16, was due to a necessary surgical procedure called anterior cervical disc fusion, performed by an outstanding team of professionals. With recovery underway, I'm eager to get back to work alongside the rest of my colleagues.

SECOND MAJOR UNANSWERED QUESTION ABOUT THE TERRORIST ATTACK IN BENGHAZI

HON. FRANK R. WOLF

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 17, 2013

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Speaker, yesterday I came to the floor to announce that in the remaining legislative days before the August recess, I will be speaking out daily to remind the American people about the key questions that remain to be answered. I will also be sending a series of letters to a number of agencies responsible for the failures leading up to, during and in the aftermath of the Benghazi attacks.

Yesterday, I raised the question of why no survivors, whether State Department, CIA or private security contractor employees—have been asked to testify publicly before Congress. Today, I am raising questions about whether there were intelligence failures in the vetting of the Libyan militias hired to provide security for the consulate, which agency official was responsible for vetting these militias and which insider source provided the terrorists with details about the U.S. compound in advance of the attack.

These are serious questions that deserve clear answers. After nearly a year of committee investigations, I believe the House should be able to provide this information to the American people. Additionally, to the best of my knowledge, no official has been held accountable for any intelligence failures with regard to vetting the loyalty of the Libyan militias.

I raise these questions today in the context of the piece recently published by Vanity Fair, which is an excerpt from one of the books being written by the Benghazi survivors who have yet to appear before Congress. The book, Under Fire: The Untold Story of the Attack in Benghazi, provides a blow-by-blow account as seen from the eyes of the Diplomatic Security Service agents on the ground that night. The take away: this was a well-planned attack by terrorists who knew what they were doing and who clearly had help from the local militias contracted to provide ''security.''

How else, as the piece points out, would the attackers seem ''to know there were new, uninstalled generators behind the February 17 Martyrs Brigade command post, nestled between the building and the overhand of foliage from the western wall, as well as a dozen jerry cans full of gasoline to power them.'' This gas was used to set the fires in the compound.

There are additional concerns about the security guards outside the consulate who left in a car moments before the assault on the consulate began. According to the Vanity Fair piece:

> The feeling of security was enhanced at 2102 hours when an SSC (Supreme Security Council—a coalition of individual and divergently minded Libyan militias) patrol vehicle arrived. The tan Toyota Hilux pickup, with an extended cargo hold, decorated in the colors and emblem of the SSC, pulled off to the side of the road in front of Charlie–1. The driver shut off the engine. He wasn't alone—the darkened silhouette of another man was seen to his right. The pickup sported twin Soviet-produced 23–mm. anti-aircraft guns—the twin-barreled cannons were lethal against Mach 2.0 fighter aircraft and devastating beyond belief against buildings, vehicles, and humans. The two men inside didn't come out to engage in the usual small talk or to bum some cigarettes from the guards or even to rob them. The Libyan guards, after all, were not armed.
>
> ''Suddenly the SSC militiaman behind the steering wheel fired up his engine and headed west, the vehicle crunching the gravel with the weight of its tires.
>
> ''Later, following the attack, according to the (unclassified) Accountability Review Board report, an SSC official said that ''he ordered the removal of the car 'to prevent civilian casualties.' This hints that the SSC knew an attack was imminent; that it did not warn the security assets in the Special Mission Compound implies that it and elements of the new Libyan government were complicit in the events that transpired.''

Why, indeed, did the SSC guards not notify the consulate that an attack was imminent? And why were they allowed to leave as the terrorists gathered outside the compound? Again, these questions are essential to learning exactly who was responsible for the attack on the consulate.

According to an article by Eli Lake published in The Daily Beast earlier this year, the CIA was ''responsible in part for one major failure the night of the Benghazi attack: his officers were responsible for vetting the February 17 Martyr's Brigade, the militia that was supposed to be the first responder on the night of the attack, but melted away when the diplomatic mission was attacked.''

The article continued, ''Another U.S. intelligence official . . . said the failure for the CIA at Benghazi was the mistaken assumption that the Zintan tribe in Benghazi—that provided many of the fighters for the February 17 Martyr's Brigade—would have the same loyalties as the Zintan tribe in Tripoli, which had protected several senior U.S. officials including Hillary Clinton in her visit last year to Libya. 'The CIA failed at mapping the human terrain,'' this official said. ''They did not understand the politics in Benghazi and we paid the price.''

These are important issues for the Congress to address and we have an obligation to ensure that reforms are made to prevent similar failures in the future. However, to the best of my knowledge, neither the State Department nor the CIA have disclosed who was responsible for vetting the militias, whether there was an intelligence failure or what reforms may have been implemented in the way of the militia's betrayal last September.

To summarize, I ask my colleagues if the Congress can answer these questions and, if not, why?

Was there an intelligence failure in vetting the true loyalty of the Libyan security guards for the U.S. consulate? Which agency was responsible for vetting the militias?

Who provided the terrorists with details of the consulate property? Was it the security guards or someone in the Libyan government who was notified about the ambassador's visit?

Why did the guards in the car outside the consulate not warn the U.S. staff of the gathering terrorists as they drove away a minute before the assault began? Were they complicit in the plot?

When the Congress departs for the August recess in two and a half weeks, will the American people know why, after a year of investigations, who provided the terrorists with insider information about the consulate property and the ambassador's location?

Again, this is why I believe a House Select Committee is the best way forward to ensure that these and other unanswered questions are resolved. To date, 160 House Republicans—nearly three quarters of the entire Republican Conference—have cosponsored H. Res. 36 to create a Select Committee on Benghazi to ensure the American people learn the truth.

OUR UNCONSCIONABLE NATIONAL DEBT

HON. MIKE COFFMAN

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 17, 2013

Mr. COFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, on January 20, 2009, the day President Obama took office, the national debt was $10,626,877,048,913.08.

Today, it is $16,738,177,765,933.41. We've added $6,111,300,717,020.33 to our debt in 4 and a half years. This is $6 trillion in debt our nation, our economy, and our children could have avoided with a balanced budget amendment.

RECOGNIZING UNITED METHODIST OUTREACH MINISTRIES

HON. KYRSTEN SINEMA

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 17, 2013

Ms. SINEMA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to ask that my colleagues join me in recognizing United Methodist Outreach Ministries, an organization devoted to the service and shelter of homeless families in Arizona. Since 1964, they have provided the state of Arizona with the highest quality of service, providing families and individuals with temporary and permanent housing, medical care, child care, and education to rebuild lives traumatized by desperate circumstances.

In addition, I would like to commend the Department of Veterans Affairs for their work in facilitating UMOM's outstanding service. The VA, since 2011, has awarded grants to 319 deserving organizations in all 50 states, Puerto Rico, the Virgin Islands, and the District of Columbia as part of their Supportive Services for Veteran Families (SSVF) program. In July, 2013, for use in the upcoming year, they awarded $300 million that will help approximately 120,000 homeless and at-risk Veterans and their families. UMOM has been awarded an SSVF grant in all three years the program has been active.

One of UMOM's Veterans housing facilities is in my district, and I am thrilled that such an organization is raising the level of care provided to my constituents—the veterans who have given so much to our country. I would like to encourage UMOM and other such organizations to continue serving the most in-need and deserving of Arizona residents with such admirable dedication.

UMOM is a wonderful representative of the non-profit organizations across the country serving our Veterans with the efficient help of the Department of Veterans Affairs. I ask that my colleagues join me in recognizing United Methodist Outreach Ministries for beginning to pay the debt we owe our most honored Veterans.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. BLAINE LUETKEMEYER

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 17, 2013

Mr. LUETKEMEYER. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 354 I was not present due to a flight cancellation and subsequent late arrival.

Had I been present, I would have voted "aye."

Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 355 I was not present due to a flight cancellation and subsequent late arrival.

Had I been present, I would have voted "aye."

Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 356 I was not present due to a flight cancellation and subsequent late arrival.

Had I been present, I would have voted "aye."

IN HONOR OF CHINATOWN, LOS ANGELES IN RECOGNITION OF ITS 75TH ANNIVERSARY

HON. XAVIER BECERRA

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 17, 2013

Mr. BECERRA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the 75th anniversary of a place of history and a cornerstone of Los Angeles culture: Chinatown.

Chinatown today is a dynamic neighborhood where the old and new come together harmoniously to create a unique destination point for Angelinos and newcomers alike. It spans 24-city blocks with a bustling commercial district and active residents. When walking down North Broadway, you can see the well-preserved historic architecture and cultural celebrations alongside innovative commercial developments that protect the integrity of the Chinese American community's history in Los Angeles.

Understanding how Los Angeles' Chinatown found a home opens a fascinating window into the quest for dignity and opportunity for Chinese Americans. That journey did not start with the creation of Chinatown in its current location. In fact, it began in 1852 when the first Chinese settled around El Pueblo Plaza. By the 1870s, it had grown to 200 people, mostly male, who made their living as laborers working in laundry, gardening and ranching.

It was during this time of growth that the Chinese community experienced one of the most serious incidents of racial violence in Los Angeles' history, the Massacre of 1871. This horrific event occurred when a mob of over 500 white men entered Chinatown to attack, rob and murder Chinese residents of the city. Despite such severe discrimination, the people of Chinatown persevered and found a way to prosper. Chinatown grew to over 3,000 people, boasting a Chinese Opera theatre, three temples, a newspaper, even a telephone exchange. As the town thrived, residents formed family organizations and church missions.

Even as the Chinese community continued to make significant contributions to Los Angeles and the nation, sadly there was an increase in anti-Chinese sentiment. State laws prohibited the Chinese from owning property and the federal Chinese Exclusion Act barred others in the future from emigrating to the United States. America made life difficult for its people of Chinese heritage.

And it added to the adversity that Old Chinatown in Los Angeles confronted. Starting in 1913, Chinatown faced a continuous threat of relocation as the City of Los Angeles decided that the best location to build Union Station, it's sparkling new railroad station, would be Old Chinatown. After decades of living with the threat of eviction, the Chinese community was forced to relocate in 1931. The residents of Old Chinatown, who had built their lives in this neighborhood, were displaced with no compensation or relocation plans to rebuild their homes and businesses. They were scattered throughout the city.

Hard times were no stranger to the residents of Chinatown. And so, on April 22, 1937, Peter Soohoo brought together a group of 28 prominent Chinese Angelenos for an organizational meeting. They drafted a proposal for a new neighborhood that would combine elements of Chinese design with modern American architecture. This architectural vision would reflect the Chinese American identity that this community had worked so hard to establish.

According to the plan, a private association would wholly manage the project including the financing of it. Thus, the Los Angeles Chinatown Project Association was born. On June 25, 1938, eighteen businesses opened their doors to the public in the New Chinatown, one of the first malls in America and the nation's first modern American "Chinatown."

The Chinese American community continued its impressive growth in Los Angeles. The sons and daughters of these pioneers helped build Chinatown from three buildings on North Broadway into a dynamic commercial district and residential area frequented by both tourists and locals. It is one of Los Angeles' cultural treasures that we must nurture and celebrate.

I commend the hardworking citizens of New Chinatown, some of whom are descendants of its original families, for their dedication to advancing the area, while protecting its history and cultural significance. Their contributions are invaluable and must be applauded.

Mr. Speaker, it is with deep pride that I ask my colleagues to join me in celebrating the ''Diamond Anniversary'' of one of Los Angeles'' great neighborhoods, New Chinatown. We are a better America today because of the visionaries and pioneers who fought to survive the tough times and because of the generations that followed who continue to make our City and our country the home of the American Dream.

TRIBUTE TO THE DAVID LLOYD MITCHELL FAMILY C/O MS. CHARLOTTE MITCHELL, CHAIRMAN FAMILY REUNION 2013

HON. DANNY K. DAVIS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 17, 2013

Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, family Reunions are very important events and activities in the lives of all people, especially for African Americans in this country who have gone through the experiences of being snatched from their homelands, taken from their tribes, brought to another country, survived hostile environments, experienced discrimination and still stand tall, achieves greatly and is an integral part of American life.

Your family, the decedents of Mr. David Lloyd Mitchell have much for which to be proud. Since his arrival in this country you all have continued to move forward and I commend you for the great research and recordkeeping that someone has done. To trace one's family back to the Reconstruction Period in this country is a feat in and of itself. There has obviously been a great emphasis placed on education as evidenced by the presence of more than thirty attorneys, medical doctors and Ph.D.'s, more than 200 Master Degrees, 500 plus Bachelors and I are sure that there is a great assortment of other achievements and accomplishments made by members of your family.

I congratulate the family of Mr. David Lloyd Mitchell, commend you for your outstanding accomplishments and wish you well as you continue to reach new heights each and every day.

Welcome to Chicago and enjoy your family reunion on July 26–28th.

TRIBUTE TO RETIRED SERGEANT MAJOR HOWARD BAKEMAN

HON. JO BONNER

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 17, 2013

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Speaker, I rise to praise a true American hero, retired Army Sergeant Major Howard Bakeman, who passed away on June 1, 2013, at the age 95.

A veteran of World War II, Mr. Bakeman survived the attack on Pearl Harbor while serving as a staff sergeant at Schofield Barracks in Hawaii. Remarkably, two of his brothers were also stationed at Pearl Harbor during the Japanese attack and all three survived. After the war, he remained in the Army through peace-time and was again called to action in 1950 to serve his country in the Korean conflict.

In 1959, he was promoted to Sergeant Major, serving nine more years before fulfilling his obligation to Uncle Sam.

After completing his active duty tour, Mr. Bakeman moved to Mobile in 1968 where he worked for two years as an Army ROTC instructor at Citronelle High School. During his time in Citronelle, he was recognized for having the largest number of Army cadets to enlist from any of the schools in Mobile County.

Mr. Bakeman's dedication to duty was typical of many who served during what is often described as ''the greatest generation.'' He loved what he did and looked at his time served as an adventure. In an interview early last year with Mobile's Fox 10 television, he observed, ''I didn't have to pay for anything. It's not every employer that pays you to go to these exotic countries.''

Mr. Bakeman also offered some advice on life and patriotism. ''Be respectful. Remember where you came from. Remember where you are living. Respect authority and respect the flag. Now if they can't do that, they better pack and haul it. There's absolutely no excuse.''

Mr. Bakeman hailed from a family of dedicated servicemen—along with his father and two brothers—the Bakeman men served a combined total of 123 years in the armed forces. What's more, even well into his 90's, Mr. Bakeman was a familiar presence at local events honoring our veterans. He always wore his uniform proudly.

On behalf of the people of Alabama, I wish to extend heartfelt condolences to his niece, Elizabeth Lynch, and his entire family and many friends. We will forever be indebted to his heroism and his service to our nation.

MELVIN DOW

HON. TED POE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 17, 2013

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I would like to recognize the fine career and outstanding community involvement of a great Houstonian, a devoted public servant and my friend, Melvin Dow. Melvin is retiring after 62 years of service to our community. It is an honor for me to recognize Melvin, not only for his numerous professional accomplishments and many contributions to our community, but also for his service to our country.

After graduating from Rice University, Melvin earned his law degree from Harvard Law School where he graduated magna cum laude and served as editor of the Harvard Law Review. Melvin began his career and service with the United States Army, where he was commissioned as a First Lieutenant, in the Army General Counsel's Office in the Pentagon. Following his service in the Army, Melvin moved back to Houston to begin his legal career in Harris County.

Melvin's extensive knowledge of the justice system and his incredible work ethic quickly gained him respect from his colleagues in the law profession. Over his career, Melvin was routinely recognized for his expertise and contributions to the legal community. He was included in the Best Lawyers in America for 28 consecutive years and was listed as a ''Super Lawyer'' by Texas Monthly Magazine for multiple years. In addition, Melvin serves as a member of the Harvard Law School's Board of Overseers' Visiting Committee.

In addition to his notable recognition for his work within the legal community, Melvin has also earned acknowledgements for his work within the Jewish-American community. Melvin is currently a member of the Board of Directors of the American Israel Public Affairs Committee (AIPAC) and Melitz, and Melvin serves on the Advisory Boards of the University of Texas Hillel Foundation, the Rice University Jewish Studies Program, and Congregation Beth Yeshurun of Houston. Melvin previously served as National President of AIPAC, trustee of the Jewish Publication Society, President of Congregation Beth Yeshurun, Vice President of the Jewish Federation of Houston and on the Board of Trustees of St. John's School. The list of this model citizen's accomplishments is impressive and well-deserved. Melvin's service to his city, state and nation as well as his faith will have an enduring positive impact.

A dedicated family man, Melvin has been married to his wife, Frieda, for 55 years. Together, they are the proud parents of five sons and grandparents to nine granddaughters and three grandsons.

I have had the opportunity to travel with Melvin and Frieda to Israel and observe firsthand their dedication to Israel's Absolute Right to Exist and to be a free democratic Republic.

On behalf of the Second Congressional District of Texas, I commend this remarkable Texan for his exemplary service and dedication to Harris County and to the State of Texas. Thank you, Melvin, for a lifetime of remarkable achievements within the legal community and for your steadfast commitment in helping to better your community.

And that's just the way it is.

TRIBUTE TO WILLIAM FRANCIS HARTNETT, JR.

HON. TODD ROKITA

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 17, 2013

Mr. ROKITA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and salute a remarkable individual, William Francis Hartnett, Jr., who passed away on July 15, 2013. I wish to express my heartfelt gratitude and appreciation for his leadership and service to our county.

Mr. Hartnett attended St. Michael's College, Middlebury College, and Cornell University. He was also a graduate of Fordham University School of Law. After earning his J.D., he practiced law in both New York City and Port Washington, New York.

Mr. Hartnett had a servant's heart. For four years he served our nation as an officer in the United States Navy and continued to serve Americans as a Special Agent for the Federal Bureau of Investigation. Mr. Hartnett also served his community as Assistant to the Vice Chairman of the New York Housing Authority, Counsel to the Board of the New York City Board of Higher Education, and as East Meadow School Board President. Mr. Hartnett served on numerous boards, including St. Francis Hospital, Northwestern Memorial Hospital, the Chicago Public Library, Chicago Catholic Charities, and many more. Mr. Hartnett also served on the Board of La Lumiere School in La Porte, Indiana.

Mr. Hartnett was the Founder of both William F. Hartnett and Associates and Hartnett-Shaw Development Corporation. He developed many commercial, residential and industrial real estate projects across the country, including Lake Point Tower in Chicago, United Nations Plaza in New York, Williams Center in Tulsa, Oklahoma, and Century City in Los Angeles.

Mr. Hartnett was a family man who is survived by Lorranye, his loving wife of sixty-three years, four children, seventeen grandchildren, and six great-grandchildren. William Francis Hartnett, Jr. was a man truly committed to his family, his community, his 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. Thank you and rest in peace, Mr. Hartnett.

TRIBUTE TO WINTHROP M. HALLET, III, PRESIDENT OF THE MOBILE AREA CHAMBER OF COMMERCE

HON. JO BONNER

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 17, 2013

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Speaker, I rise to honor Winthrop M. Hallett, III, as he leaves his post as President of the Mobile Area Chamber of Commerce on July 31, 2013. For decades Win has been a strong advocate for our community and his positive influence will be felt for many years to come as our economy continues to expand and prosper.

A native of Mobile, Win attended Vanderbilt University and graduated with a bachelor's in economics. Soon after graduation, he was faced with leading his family's building materials business after the sudden death of his father. He rose to the occasion and continued to serve as owner and operator for 20 years. In 1991, following the good advice of a close friend, he opened a new chapter in his life by going to work for the Mobile Area Chamber of Commerce.

Known for putting others above himself, Win quickly took to the role of building a better Mobile. He focused on polishing Mobile's image as an ideal place to do business and raise a family. Due in no small part to his steadfast efforts, Mobile received the coveted All-America City award in 1995. His tenure was marked by one success after another, bringing in new commerce and industry and helping to transform Mobile into a true business destination.

In particular, I would like to point out that Win was instrumental in helping to recruit major transformational businesses to our region, including Mobile Aerospace, Austal, ThyssenKrupp and Airbus. It was an honor to work with him on these and many other economic development efforts to benefit South Alabama.

Continuing to use his keen business mind for the good of others, Win also served with the United States Chamber of Commerce as chairman of the Chamber Committee of 100. He was also a member of the Board of Directors and Board Nominating Committee and Chairman of the Accrediting Board and the Bylaws Committee. He also served as Chairman of the Metropolitan Cities Council and is a member of the ACCE's Board of Directors. Win has also held leadership positions in various organizations around Mobile, such as the Rotary Club of Mobile, the Mobile YMCA, the Alabama Wildlife Federation, and Leadership Mobile.

Win's love for Mobile can be seen in his involvement in numerous local organizations. He is the Vice President of the Coastal Land Trust and the Vice Chairman of the Alabama District Export Council. He is a member of the Mobile Bay National Estuary Program Executive Committee and the Aerospace Alliance. And he achieved the honor of graduating from Leadership Alabama and the Center for Creative Leadership.

Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the people of Mobile and my colleagues in the Alabama Delegation, I would like to extend my personal appreciation, gratitude and highest regards to Mr. Winthrop M. Hallett, III, for his untiring, selfless service to Mobile and South Alabama. I wish him and his entire family the very best in their future endeavors.

SENATE COMMITTEE MEETINGS

Title IV of Senate Resolution 4, agreed to by the Senate of February 4, 1977, calls for establishment of a system for a computerized schedule of all meetings and hearings of Senate committees, subcommittees, joint committees, and committees of conference. This title requires all such committees to notify the Office of the Senate Daily Digest—designated by the Rules Committee—of the time, place and purpose of the meetings, when scheduled and any cancellations or changes in the meetings as they occur.

As an additional procedure along with the computerization of this information, the Office of the Senate Daily Digest will prepare this information for printing in the Extensions of Remarks section of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on Monday and Wednesday of each week.

Meetings scheduled for Thursday, July 18, 2013 may be found in the Daily Digest of today's record.

MEETINGS SCHEDULED

JULY 22

3 p.m.

Committee on Environment and Public Works

To hold an oversight hearing to examine Army Corps of Engineers water management in the Apalachicola-Chattahoochee-Flint (ACF) and the Alabama-Coosa-Tallapoosa (ACT) river systems.

SD–406

JULY 23

9 a.m.

Committee on Foreign Relations

To hold hearings to examine the nominations of Joseph Y. Yun, of Oregon, to be Ambassador to Malaysia, Daniel A. Clune, of Maryland, to be Ambassador to the Lao People's Democratic Republic, and Morrell John Berry, of Maryland, to be Ambassador to Australia, all of the Department of State.

SD–419

10 a.m.

Committee on Appropriations

Subcommittee on Financial Services and General Government

Business meeting to markup proposed legislation making appropriations for fiscal year 2014 for Financial Services and General Government.

SD–138

Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs

Subcommittee on Financial Institutions and Consumer Protection

To hold hearings to examine financial holding companies, focusing on if banks should control power plants, warehouses, and oil refineries.

SD–538

Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation

Subcommittee on Oceans, Atmosphere, Fisheries, and Coast Guard

To hold hearings to examine New England and mid-Atlantic perspectives on ''Magnuson-Stevens Act'' reauthorization.

SR–253

Committee on Environment and Public Works

To hold hearings to examine the nominations of Kenneth J. Kopocis, of Virginia, to be an Assistant Administrator for the Office of Water, James J. Jones, of the District of Columbia, to be Assistant Administrator for Toxic Substances, and Avi Garbow, of Virginia, to be General Counsel, all of the Environmental Protection Agency.

SD–406

Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions

To hold hearings to examine National Labor Relations Board nominees.

SD–430

Committee on the Judiciary

Subcommittee on Antitrust, Competition Policy and Consumer Rights

To hold hearings to examine pay-for-delay deals, focusing on competition and consumers.

SD–226

10:30 a.m.

Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry

To hold hearings to examine the nominations of Krysta L. Harden, of Georgia, to be Deputy Secretary, and Robert Bonnie, of Virginia, to be Under Secretary for Natural Resources and Environment, both of the Department of Agriculture.

SR–328A

Committee on Appropriations

Subcommittee on State, Foreign Operations, and Related Programs

Business meeting to markup proposed legislation making appropriations for fiscal year 2014 for the Department of State, Foreign Operations, and Related Programs.

SD–138

Committee on the Budget

To hold hearings to examine the impact of sequestration on national security and the economy.

SD–608

Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs

To hold hearings to examine the 90/10 rule, focusing on improving educational outcomes for our military and veterans.

SD–342

2:15 p.m.

Committee on Foreign Relations

Business meeting to consider S. Res. 156, expressing the sense of the Senate on the 10-year anniversary of NATO Allied Command Transformation, embassy security legislation, and the nominations of Victoria Nuland, of Virginia, to be Assistant Secretary for European and Eurasian Affairs, Douglas Edward Lute, of Indiana, to be United States Permanent Representative on the Council of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, with the rank and status of Ambassador, and Daniel Brooks Baer, of Colorado, to be U.S. Representative to the Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe, with the rank of Ambassador, all of the Department of State.

S–116

2:30 p.m.

Committee on Energy and Natural Resources

To resume hearings to examine S. 1273, to establish a partnership between States that produce energy onshore and offshore for our country with the Federal Government.

SD–366

Select Committee on Intelligence

To hold closed hearings to examine certain intelligence matters.

SH–219

3 p.m.

Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs

Subcommittee on Securities, Insurance, and Investment

To hold hearings to examine creating a housing finance system built to last, focusing on ensuring access for community institutions.

SD–538

Committee on the Judiciary

Subcommittee on Bankruptcy and the Courts

To hold hearings to examine how sequestration is effecting the courts.

SD–226

JULY 24

9:50 a.m.

Committee on Rules and Administration

Business meeting to consider S. 375, to require Senate candidates to file designations, statements, and reports in electronic form, and the nomination of Davita Vance-Cooks, of Virginia, to be Public Printer, Government Printing Office.

SR–301

10 a.m.

Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs

To hold hearings to examine the ''Federal Housing Administration (FHA) Solvency Act of 2013''.

SD–538

Committee on Environment and Public Works

To hold an oversight hearing to examine implementation of Moving Ahead for Progress in the 21st Century's (MAP–21) ''Transportation Infrastructure Finance and Innovation Act'' (TIFIA) program enhancements.

SD–406

Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions

Business meeting to consider the nominations of Kent Yoshiho Hirozawa, of New York, and Nancy Jean Schiffer, of Maryland, both to be a Member of the National Labor Relations Board, and any pending nominations.

SD–430

Committee on the Judiciary

To hold hearings to examine the nominations of Cornelia T. L. Pillard, to be United States Circuit Judge for the District of Columbia Circuit, Landya B. McCafferty, to be United States District Judge for the District of New Hampshire, Brian Morris, and Susan P. Watters, both to be a United States District Judge for the District of Montana, and Jeffrey Alker Meyer, to be United States District Judge for the District of Connecticut.

SD–226

Committee on Rules and Administration

To hold hearings to examine the nominations of Ann Miller Ravel, of California, and Lee E. Goodman, of Virginia, both to be a Member of the Federal Election Commission.

SR–301

Joint Economic Committee

To hold hearings to examine America's crumbling infrastructure, and how to fix it.

TBA

10:30 a.m.

Committee on Finance

To hold hearings to examine health information technology, focusing on using it to improve care.

SD–215

2 p.m.
Committee on Environment and Public Works
Subcommittee on Superfund, Toxics and Environmental Health
To hold hearings to examine cleaning up and restoring communities for economic revitalization.
SD–406

Committee on Foreign Relations
Subcommittee on East Asian and Pacific Affairs
To hold hearings to examine rebalance to Asia III, focusing on protecting the environment and ensuring food and water security in East Asia and the Pacific.
SD–419

Committee on the Judiciary
Subcommittee on the Constitution, Civil Rights and Human Rights
To hold hearings to examine closing Guantanamo, focusing on the national security, fiscal, and human rights implications.
SD–226

Special Committee on Aging
To hold hearings to examine payday loans.
SD–562

2:30 p.m.
Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation
To hold hearings to examine cruise industry oversight, focusing on the need for a stronger focus on consumer protection.
SR–253

Committee on Small Business and Entrepreneurship
To hold hearings to examine implementation of the ''Affordable Care Act'', focusing on understanding small business concerns.
SR–428

JULY 25

9:30 a.m.
Committee on Armed Services
To hold hearings to examine the nominations of Stephen Woolman Preston, of the District of Columbia, to be General Counsel, Jon T. Rymer, of Tennessee, to be Inspector General, Susan J. Rabern, of Kansas, to be Assistant Secretary of the Navy for Financial Management and Comptroller, and Dennis V. McGinn, of Maryland, to be Assistant Secretary of the Navy for Energy, Installations, and Environment, all of the Department of Defense.
SH–216

Committee on Energy and Natural Resources
To hold hearings to examine supplemental funding options to support the National Park Service's efforts to address deferred maintenance and operational needs.
SD–366

2:30 p.m.
Committee on Energy and Natural Resources
Subcommittee on Water and Power
To hold hearings to examine the issues associated with aging water resource infrastructure in the United States.
SD–366

Select Committee on Intelligence
To hold closed hearings to examine certain intelligence matters.
SH–219

JULY 30

10 a.m.
Committee on Energy and Natural Resources
Subcommittee on Public Lands, Forests, and Mining
To hold hearings to examine S. 37, to sustain the economic development and recreational use of National Forest System land and other public land in the State of Montana, to add certain land to the National Wilderness Preservation System, to release certain wilderness study areas, to designate new areas for recreation, S. 343, to provide for the conveyance of certain Federal land in Clark County, Nevada, for the environmental remediation and reclamation of the Three Kids Mine Project Site, S. 364, to establish the Rocky Mountain Front Conservation Management Area, to designate certain Federal land as wilderness, and to improve the management of noxious weeds in the Lewis and Clark National Forest, S. 404, to preserve the Green Mountain Lookout in the Glacier Peak Wilderness of the Mount Baker-Snoqualmie National Forest, S. 753, to provide for national security benefits for White Sands Missile Range and Fort Bliss, S. 1169, to withdraw and reserve certain public land in the State of Montana for the Limestone Hills Training Area, S. 1294, to designate as wilderness certain public land in the Cherokee National Forest in the State of Tennessee, S. 1300, to amend the Healthy Forests Restoration Act of 2003 to provide for the conduct of stewardship end result contracting projects, S. 1301, to provide for the restoration of forest landscapes, protection of old growth forests, and management of national forests in the eastside forests of the State of Oregon, S. 1309, to withdraw and reserve certain public land under the jurisdiction of the Secretary of the Interior for military uses, H.R. 507, to provide for the conveyance of certain land inholdings owned by the United States to the Pascua Yaqui Tribe of Arizona, H.R. 862, to authorize the conveyance of two small parcels of land within the boundaries of the Coconino National Forest containing private improvements that were developed based upon the reliance of the landowners in an erroneous survey conducted in May 1960, and H.R. 876, to authorize the continued use of certain water diversions located on National Forest System land in the Frank Church-River of No Return Wilderness and the Selway-Bitterroot Wilderness in the State of Idaho.
SD–366

2:30 p.m.
Committee on Energy and Natural Resources
To hold hearings to examine S. 1240, to establish a new organization to manage nuclear waste, provide a consensual process for siting nuclear waste facilities, ensure adequate funding for managing nuclear waste.
SD–366

AUGUST 1

9:30 a.m.
Committee on Energy and Natural Resources
To hold hearings to examine the November 6, 2012 referendum on the political status of Puerto Rico and the Administration's response.
SD–366

SEPTEMBER 11

10:30 a.m.
Committee on Appropriations
Subcommittee on Financial Services and General Government
To hold hearings to examine proposed budget estimates and justification for fiscal year 2014 for the Federal Communications Commission.
SD–138

Daily Digest

Senate

Chamber Action

Routine Proceedings, pages S5717–S5758

Measures Introduced: Seven bills and one resolution were introduced, as follows: S. 1311–1317, and S. Res. 197. **Page S5755**

Measures Passed:

Charles W. Morgan: Committee on the Judiciary was discharged from further consideration of S. Res. 183, commemorating the relaunching of the 172-year-old Charles W. Morgan by Mystic Seaport: The Museum of America and the Sea, and the resolution was then agreed to. **Pages S5757–58**

Measures Considered:

Keep Student Loans Affordable Act: Senate began consideration of the motion to proceed to consideration of S. 1238, to amend the Higher Education Act of 1965 to extend the current reduced interest rate for undergraduate Federal Direct Stafford Loans for 1 year, to modify required distribution rules for pension plans. **Pages S5717–18**

Message from the President: Senate received the following message from the President of the United States:

Transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to the continuation of the national emergency with respect to the former Liberian regime of Charles Taylor that was established in Executive Order 13348 on July 22, 2004; which was referred to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs. (PM–16) **Page S5753**

Perez Nomination—Agreement: Senate resumed consideration of the nomination of Thomas Edward Perez, of Maryland, to be Secretary of Labor. **Pages S5737–49**

During consideration of this nomination today, Senate also took the following action:

By 60 yeas to 40 nays (Vote No. 177), three-fifths of those Senators duly chosen and sworn, having voted in the affirmative, Senate agreed to the motion to close further debate on the nomination. **Pages S5736–37**

A unanimous-consent agreement was reached providing for further consideration of the nomination, post-cloture, at approximately 10:30 a.m., on Thursday, July 18, 2013, and that all time during adjournment, morning business, legislative session and recess count post-cloture on the nomination. **Page S5758**

Nomination Confirmed: Senate confirmed the following nomination:

By 82 yeas to 17 nays (Vote No. EX. 176), Fred P. Hochberg, of New York, to be President of the Export-Import Bank of the United States. **Pages S5718–36**

During consideration of this nomination today, Senate also took the following action:

By 82 yeas to 18 nays (Vote No. 175), three-fifths of those Senators duly chosen and sworn, having voted in the affirmative, Senate agreed to the motion to close further debate on the nomination. **Page S5718**

Messages from the House: **Page S5754**

Measures Referred: **Page S5754**

Measures Read the First Time: **Pages S5754, S5758**

Executive Communications: **Pages S5754–55**

Additional Cosponsors: **Pages S5755–56**

Statements on Introduced Bills/Resolutions: **Pages S5756–57**

Authorities for Committees to Meet: **Page S5757**

Privileges of the Floor: **Page S5757**

Record Votes: Three record votes were taken today. (Total—177) **Pages S5718, S5736–37**

Adjournment: Senate convened at 9:30 a.m. and adjourned at 7:25 p.m., until 9:30 a.m. on Thursday, July 18, 2013. (For Senate's program, see the remarks of the Acting Majority Leader in today's Record on page S5758.)

Committee Meetings

(Committees not listed did not meet)

COMMODITY FUTURES TRADING COMMISSION REAUTHORIZATION

Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry: Committee concluded a hearing to examine reauthorization of the Commodity Futures Trading Commission, after receiving testimony from Kenneth E. Bentsen, Jr., Securities Industry and Financial Markets Association, Dennis M. Kelleher, Better Markets, Inc., and Walter L. Lukken, Futures Industry Association, all of Washington, D.C.; Terrence A. Duffy, CME Group Inc., Adam Cooper, Citadel LLC, on behalf of Managed Funds Association, and Daniel J. Roth, National Futures Association, all of Chicago, Illinois; Gene Guilford, Commodity Market Oversight Coalition, Cromwell, Connecticut; John Heck, The Scoular Company, Omaha, Nebraska, on behalf of the National Grain and Feed Association; Donald Russak, New York Power Authority, White Plains, New York, on behalf of the American Public Power Association; and Jim Colby, Honeywell International Inc., Morristown, New Jersey.

BUSINESS MEETING

Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry: Committee announced the following subcommittee assignments:

Subcommittee on Commodities, Markets, Trade and Risk Management: Senators Donnelly (Chair), Baucus, Heitkamp, Harkin, Brown, Gillibrand, Chambliss, Roberts, Boozman, Hoeven, and Johanns.

Subcommittee on Jobs, Rural Economic Growth and Energy Innovation: Senators Heitkamp (Chair), Brown, Klobuchar, Bennet, Donnelly, Casey, Johanns, Hoeven, Grassley, Thune, and Boozman.

Subcommittee on Conservation, Forestry and Natural Resources: Senators Bennet (Chair), Harkin, Klobuchar, Leahy, Baucus, Heitkamp, Boozman, McConnell, Chambliss, Thune, and Roberts.

Subcommittee on Nutrition, Specialty Crops, Food and Agricultural Research: Senators Casey (Chair), Leahy, Harkin, Brown, Gillibrand, Bennet, Hoeven, McConnell, Chambliss, Grassley, and Thune.

Subcommittee on Livestock, Dairy, Poultry, Marketing and Agriculture Security: Senators Gillibrand (Chair), Leahy, Baucus, Klobuchar, Donnelly, Casey, Roberts, McConnell, Boozman, Johanns, and Grassley.

Senators Stabenow and Cochran are ex officio members of each subcommittee.

APPROPRIATIONS: MISSILE DEFENSE AGENCY

Committee on Appropriations: Subcommittee on Department of Defense concluded a hearing to examine proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 2014 for the Missile Defense Agency, after receiving testimony from Vice Admiral James Syring, Director, Missile Defense Agency, Department of Defense.

MAJOR THREATS FACING NAVY FORCES

Committee on Armed Services: Subcommittee on SeaPower received a closed briefing on the major threats facing Navy forces and the Navy's current and projected capabilities to meet those threats from Vice Admiral Joseph P. Aucoin, USN, Deputy Chief of Naval Operations for Warfare Systems (N9), and Arthur H. Barber III, Deputy Director, Assessment Division (N81B), Joshua J. Corless, Senior Intelligence Advisor, and Jason A. Reynolds, Director, Special Programs (N89), all of the Office of the Chief of Naval Operations, all of the Department of Defense.

NUCLEAR EMPLOYMENT STRATEGY

Committee on Armed Services: Subcommittee on Strategic Forces concluded a closed hearing to examine revisions to the nuclear employment strategy, after receiving testimony from Madelyn R. Creedon, Assistant Secretary for Global Strategic Affairs, and General C. Robert Kehler, USAF, Commander, United States Strategic Command, both of the Department of Defense.

CONSUMER DEBT INDUSTRY

Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs: Subcommittee on Financial Institutions and Consumer Protection concluded a hearing to examine the consumer debt industry, after receiving testimony from Corey Stone, Assistant Director, Office of Deposits, Cash, Collections, and Reporting Markets, Consumer Financial Protection Bureau; and James Reilly Dolan, Acting Associate Director, Division of Financial Practices, Federal Trade Commission.

EXPANSION OF INTERNET GAMBLING

Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation: Subcommittee on Consumer Protection, Product Safety, and Insurance concluded a hearing to examine the expansion of internet gambling, focusing on assessing consumer protection concerns, after receiving testimony from Chuck Canterbury, Fraternal Order of Police, and Matt Smith, Catholic Advocate, both of Washington, D.C.; Tom Grissen, Daon, Reston, Virginia; and Jack A. Blum, Annapolis, Maryland.

E-RATE 2.0

Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation: Committee concluded a hearing to examine E-Rate 2.0, focusing on connecting every child to technology, after receiving testimony from Linda H. Lord, Maine State Librarian, Augusta, on behalf of the American Library Association; Sheryl Abshire, Calcasieu Parish Public Schools, Lake Charles, Louisiana; Patrick Finn, Cisco Systems, Inc., Herndon, Virginia; and James G. Coulter, LEAD Commission, San Francisco, California.

HEALTH INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY

Committee on Finance: Committee concluded a hearing to examine health information technology, focusing on quality health care, after receiving testimony from Farzad Mostashari, National Coordinator, Office of the National Coordinator for Health Information Technology, and Patrick Conway, CMS Chief Medical Officer and Director, Center for Clinical Standards and Quality, both of the Department of Health and Human Services.

NOMINATION

Committee on Foreign Relations: Committee concluded a hearing to examine the nomination of Samantha Power, of Massachusetts, to be the Representative to the United Nations, with the rank and status of Ambassador and the Representative in the Security Council of the United Nations, and to be Representative to the Sessions of the General Assembly of the United Nations during her tenure of service as Representative to the United Nations, after the nominee, who was introduced by Senators Chambliss and Isakson, testified and answered questions in her own behalf.

NOMINATION

Committee on Foreign Relations: Committee concluded a hearing to examine the nomination of Catherine M. Russell, of the District of Columbia, to be Ambassador at Large for Global Women's Issues, Department of State, after the nominee, who was introduced by Senator Leahy, testified and answered questions in her own behalf.

DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY AT 10 YEARS

Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs: Committee concluded a hearing to examine the Department of Homeland Security at 10 years, focusing on harnessing science and technology to protect national security and enhance government efficiency, including strengthening oversight and coordination of research and development efforts, after receiving testimony from Tara O'Toole, Under Secretary of Homeland Security for Science and Technology; and David C. Maurer, Director, Homeland Security and Justice, Government Accountability Office.

VOTING RIGHTS ACT

Committee on the Judiciary: Committee concluded a hearing to examine working together to restore the protections of the "Voting Rights Act", focusing on Selma and *Shelby County*, after receiving testimony from Representatives Lewis and Sensenbrenner; Luz Urbaez Weinberg, City of Aventura Commissioner, Aventura, Florida; Michael A. Carvin, Jones Day, Washington, D.C.; and Justin Levitt, Loyola Law School, Los Angeles, California.

SMALL BUSINESS TAX REFORM

Committee on Small Business and Entrepreneurship: Committee concluded a hearing to examine small business tax reform, focusing on making the tax code work for entrepreneurs and startups, after receiving testimony from William Randolph, Director, Business and International Taxation, Office of Tax Policy, Department of the Treasury; Michael J. Eckert, Angel Capital Association, New Orleans, Louisiana; J. Michael Keeling, The ESOP Association, Chris Edwards, CATO Institute, Kristie Arslan, National Association for the Self-Employed, Ann Sullivan, Women Impacting Public Policy, and Scott Hodge, Tax Foundation, all of Washington, D.C.; Annette Nellen, San Jose State University, San Jose, California; Sanford Zinman, National Conference of CPA Practitioners, White Plains, New York; Kenneth B. Canty, Freeland Construction Company, Inc., Charleston, South Carolina; and Greg Nelson, Brown Rental, Boise, Idaho, on behalf of the American Rental Association.

House of Representatives

Chamber Action

Public Bills and Resolutions Introduced: 16 public bills, H.R. 2703–2718; and 1 resolution, H. Res. 304 were introduced. **Pages H4597–98**

Additional Cosponsors: **Pages H4598–99**

Report Filed: A report was filed today as follows:

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 (H. Rept. 113–158). **Page H4597**

Speaker: Read a letter from the Speaker wherein he appointed Representative Massie to act as Speaker pro tempore for today. **Page H4525**

Recess: The House recessed at 10:40 a.m. and reconvened at 12 noon. **Page H4529**

Chaplain: The prayer was offered by the guest chaplain, Reverend Robert Wagenseil, Calvary Episcopal Church, Indian Rocks Beach, Florida. **Page H4529**

Journal: The House agreed to the Speaker's approval of the Journal by voice vote. **Page H4577**

Recess: The House recessed at 1:36 p.m. and reconvened at 2:16 p.m. **Page H4543**

Recess: The House recessed at 2:52 p.m. and reconvened at 2:55 p.m. **Page H4545**

Official Photograph of the House in Session: The official photograph of the House in session was taken pursuant to the provisions of H. Res. 270. **Page H4545**

Motion to Adjourn: Rejected the Polis motion to adjourn by a recorded vote of 10 ayes to 409 noes, Roll No. 359. **Pages H4545–46**

Authority for Mandate Delay Act: The House passed H.R. 2667, to delay the application of the employer health insurance mandate, by a yea-and-nay vote of 264 yeas to 161 nays, Roll No. 361. **Pages H4546–57, H4573–75**

Rejected the Andrews motion to recommit the bill to the Committee on Ways and Means with instructions to report the same back to the House forthwith with an amendment, by a yea-and-nay vote of 188 yeas to 230 nays, Roll No. 360. **Pages H4573–74**

H. Res. 300, the rule providing for consideration of the bills (H.R. 2668) and (H.R. 2667) was agreed to by a yea-and-nay vote of 232 yeas to 183 nays, Roll No. 358, after the previous question was ordered by a yea-and-nay vote of 230 yeas to 192 nays, Roll No. 357. **Pages H4534–43, H4543–45**

Fairness for American Families Act: The House passed H.R. 2668, to delay the application of the individual health insurance mandate, by a yea-and-nay vote of 251 yeas to 174 nays, Roll No. 363. **Pages H4557–73, H4575–77**

Rejected the Andrews motion to recommit the bill to the Committee on Ways and Means with instructions to report the same back to the House forthwith with an amendment, by a yea-and-nay vote of 193 ayes to 230 noes, Roll No. 362. **Pages H4575–76**

H. Res. 300, the rule providing for consideration of the bills (H.R. 2668) and (H.R. 2667) was agreed to by a yea-and-nay vote of 232 yeas to 183 nays, Roll No. 358, after the previous question was ordered by a yea-and-nay vote of 230 yeas to 192 nays, Roll No. 357. **Pages H4534–43, H4543–45**

Pursuant to section 3 of the rule, 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. Upon the addition of the text of H.R. 2667 to the engrossment of H.R. 2668, H.R. 2667 shall be laid on the table. **Page H4577**

World War I Centennial Commission—Appointment: Read a letter from Representative Pelosi, Democratic Leader, in which she appointed Mr. Robert Dalessandro of Alexandria, VA to the World War I Centennial Commission. **Page H4577**

Presidential Message: Read a message from the President wherein he notified Congress 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—referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs and ordered to be printed (H. Doc. 113–47). **Page H4577**

Quorum Calls—Votes: Six yea-and-nay votes and one recorded vote developed during the proceedings of today and appear on pages H4544, H4544–45, H4545–46, H4574, H4574–75, H4576, H4576–77. There were no quorum calls.

Adjournment: The House met at 10 a.m. and adjourned at 10 p.m.

Committee Meetings

MISCELLANEOUS MEASURES

Committee on Appropriations: Full Committee held a markup on the Commerce, Justice, Science, and Related Agencies Appropriations Bill for FY 2014; and Financial Services and General Government Appropriations Bill for FY 2014. The Committee ordered reported, without amendment, the Commerce, Justice, Science, and Related Agencies Appropriations Bill for FY 2014. The Committee ordered reported, as amended, the Financial Services and General Government Appropriations Bill for FY 2014.

SECURITY SITUATION IN THE SYRIAN ARAB REPUBLIC—IMPLICATIONS FOR U.S. NATIONAL SECURITY AND U.S. POLICY OPTIONS

Committee on Armed Services: Full Committee held a hearing entitled ''The Security Situation in the Syrian Arab Republic—Implications for U.S. National Security and U.S. Policy Options''. Testimony was heard from public witnesses.

MISCELLANEOUS MEASURES

Committee on Energy and Commerce: Full Committee concluded markup on H.R. 1582, the ''Energy Consumers Relief Act 2013''; H.R. 1900, the ''Natural Gas Pipeline Permitting Reform Act''; H.R. 83, a bill to require the Secretary of the Interior to develop an action plan to address the energy needs of the insular areas of the United States and the Freely Associated States; H.R. 2094, the ''School Access to Emergency Epinephrine Act''; H.R. 698, the ''HIV Organ Policy Equity Act''; and H.R. 2052, the ''Global Investment in American Jobs Act of 2013''. The following bills were ordered reported as amended: H.R. 1582; H.R. 1900; and H.R. 2052. The following bills were ordered reported without amendment: H.R. 83; H.R. 2094; and H.R. 698.

MONETARY POLICY AND THE STATE OF THE ECONOMY

Committee on Financial Services: Full Committee held a hearing entitled ''Monetary Policy and the State of the Economy''. Testimony was heard from Ben Bernanke, Chairman, Board of Governors, Federal Reserve System.

STAKEHOLDER PERSPECTIVES ON TSA ACQUISITION REFORM

Committee on Homeland Security: Subcommittee on Transportation Security held a hearing entitled ''Stakeholder Perspectives on TSA Acquisition Reform''. Testimony was heard from public witnesses.

EVALUATING PRIVACY, SECURITY, AND FRAUD CONCERNS WITH OBAMACARE'S INFORMATION SHARING APPARATUS

Committee on Homeland Security: Subcommittee on Cybersecurity, Infrastructure Protection, and Security Technologies; and the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform's Subcommittee on Energy Policy, Health Care and Entitlements held a hearing entitled ''Evaluating Privacy, Security, and Fraud Concerns with ObamaCare's Information Sharing Apparatus''. Testimony was heard from Alan R. Duncan, Assistant Inspector General for Security and Information Technology Services, Treasury Inspector General for Tax Administration; Terence V. Milholland, Chief Technology Officer, Internal Revenue Service; Danny Werfel, Principal Deputy Commissioner, Internal Revenue Service; Marilyn B. Tavenner, Administrator, Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services, Department of Health and Human Services; Henry Chao, Deputy Chief Information Officer, Deputy Director of the Office of Information Services, Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services, Department of Health and Human Services; and John Dicken, Director, Health Care, Government Accountability Office.

COLLECTIONS STEWARDSHIP AT THE SMITHSONIAN

Committee on House Administration: Full Committee held a hearing entitled ''Collections Stewardship at the Smithsonian''. Testimony was heard from G. Wayne Clough, Secretary, Smithsonian Institution; Scott Miller, Deputy Undersecretary for Collections and Interdisciplinary Support, Smithsonian Institution; and Scott Dahl, Inspector General, Smithsonian Institution.

OVERSIGHT OF THE ADMINISTRATION'S USE OF FISA AUTHORITIES

Committee on the Judiciary: Full Committee held a hearing entitled ''Oversight of the Administration's use of FISA Authorities''. Testimony was heard from James Cole, Department of Justice; John C. Inglis, National Security Agency; Robert S. Litt, Office of Director of National Intelligence, Stephanie Douglas, Federal Bureau of Investigation, National Security Branch; and a public witness.

MISCELLANEOUS MEASURE

Committee on the Judiciary: Subcommittee on Constitution and Civil Justice held a markup on H.R. 2655, the ''Lawsuit Abuse Reduction Act of 2013''. The bill was forwarded, without amendment.

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR OPERATIONS, MANAGEMENT, AND RULEMAKINGS

Committee on Natural Resources: Full Committee held a hearing entitled ''The Department of the Interior Operations, Management, and Rulemakings''. Testimony was heard from Sally Jewell, Secretary, Department of the Interior.

NATIONAL BLUEWAYS ORDER

Committee on Natural Resources: Subcommittee on Water and Power held a hearing entitled ''A Washington, DC-based Bureaucratic Invention with Potential Water Conservation and Property Rights Impacts: The National Blueways Order''. Testimony was heard from Rebecca Wodder, Senior Advisor to the Secretary, Department of the Interior; Robert Griffin, Judge, Independence County, Arkansas; and public witnesses.

WHY SHOULD AMERICANS HAVE TO COMPLY WITH THE LAWS OF FOREIGN NATIONS?

Committee on Natural Resources: Subcommittee on Fisheries, Wildlife, Oceans and Insular Affairs held a hearing entitled ''Why should Americans have to comply with the laws of foreign nations?''. Testimony was heard from Kristina Alexander, Legislative Attorney, American Law Division, Congressional Research Service; and public witnesses.

BORDER SECURITY OVERSIGHT, PART III: EXAMINING ASYLUM REQUESTS

Committee on Oversight and Government Reform: Subcommittee on National Security held a hearing entitled ''Border Security Oversight, Part III: Examining Asylum Requests''. Testimony was heard from Joseph E. Langlois, Associate Director, Refugee, Asylum, and International Operations, Citizenship and Immigration Services.

A PATH FORWARD ON POSTAL REFORM

Committee on Oversight and Government Reform: Full Committee held a hearing entitled ''A Path Forward on Postal Reform''. Testimony was heard from Representative Smith (NE); Patrick Donahoe, Postmaster General and CEO, United States Postal Service; and public witnesses.

STUDENT SUCCESS ACT

Committee on Rules: Full Committee held a hearing on H.R. 5, the ''Student Success Act''. The Committee granted, by record vote of 8–4, a structured rule for H.R. 5. The rule provides one hour of general debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Education and the Workforce. The rule waives all points of order against consideration of the bill. The rule makes in order as original text for the purpose of amendment an amendment in the nature of a substitute consisting of the text of Rules Committee Print 113–18 and provides that it shall be considered as read. The rule waives all points of order against the amendment in the nature of a substitute. The rule makes in order only those further amendments printed in the Rules Committee report. Each such amendment may be offered only in the order printed in the report, may be offered only by a Member designated in the report, shall be considered as read, shall be debatable for the time specified in the report equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, may be withdrawn by its proponent at any time before action thereon, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question. The rule waives all points of order against the amendments printed in the report. The rule provides one motion to recommit with or without instructions. Testimony was heard from Chairman Kline (MN), and Representatives George Miller (CA), Salmon, Thompson (PA), Brooks (IN), Polis, Young (AK), Garrett, Scalise, Fitzpatrick, Duncan (SC), Gibson, Mullin, Jackson Lee, Cárdenas, Hanabusa, and Esty.

INTERNAL REVENUE SERVICE AND SMALL BUSINESSES: ENSURING FAIR TREATMENT

Committee on Small Business: Full Committee held a hearing entitled ''The Internal Revenue Service and Small Businesses: Ensuring Fair Treatment''. Testimony was heard from Daniel I. Werfel, Principal Deputy Commissioner, Internal Revenue Service.

CAUSES OF DELAYS TO THE FAA'S NEXTGEN PROGRAM

Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure: Subcommittee on Aviation held a hearing entitled ''Causes of Delays to the FAA's NextGen Program''. Testimony was heard from Michael P. Huerta, Administrator, Federal Aviation Administration; and Calvin L. Scovel III, Inspector General, Department of Transportation.

LEGISLATIVE MEASURES

Committee on Veterans' Affairs: Full Committee held a hearing on the following: H.R. 813, the ''Putting Veterans Funding First Act of 2013''; H.R. 806, to amend title 38, United States Code, to make permanent the requirement for annual reports on Comptroller General reviews of the accuracy of Department of Veterans Affairs medical budget submissions, and for other purposes; and a draft discussion 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. Testimony was heard from Robert D. Snyder, Acting Assistant Secretary for the Office of Policy and Planning, Department of Veterans Affairs; and public witnesses.

MISCELLANEOUS MEASURES

Committee on Veterans' Affairs: Subcommittee on Disability Assistance and Memorial Affairs held a markup on H.R. 2086, the ''Pay As You Rate Act''; H.R. 2189, to establish a commission or task force to evaluate the backlog of disability claims of the Department of Veterans Affairs; and H.R. 2423, the ''Disabled Veterans' Access to Medical Exams Improvement Act''. The following bills were forwarded, as amended: H.R. 2086; H.R. 2189; and H.R. 2423.

DELAY OF THE EMPLOYER MANDATE PENALTIES AND REPORTING REQUIREMENTS

Committee on Ways and Means: Subcommittee on Health held a hearing on the Obama Administration's recent decision to delay the information reporting requirements and penalties associated with the employer mandate in the Affordable Care Act until 2015. Testimony was heard from J. Mark Iwry, Senior Advisor to the Secretary and Deputy Assistant Secretary for Retirement and Health Policy, Department of the Treasury.

WHAT REALLY WORKS: EVALUATING CURRENT EFFORTS TO HELP FAMILIES SUPPORT THEIR CHILDREN AND ESCAPE POVERTY

Committee on Ways and Means: Subcommittee on Human Resources held a hearing entitled ''What Really Works: Evaluating Current Efforts to Help Families Support their Children and Escape Poverty''. Testimony was heard from Kristen Cox, Executive Director, Utah Governor's Office of Management and Budget; and public witnesses.

ONGOING INTELLIGENCE ACTIVITIES

House Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence: Full Committee held a hearing entitled ''Ongoing Intelligence Activities''. This was a closed hearing.

Joint Meetings

AUTHORITARIANISM IN AZERBAIJAN

Commission on Security and Cooperation in Europe: On Tuesday, July 16, 2013, Commission received a briefing on growing authoritarianism in Azerbaijan, focusing on current events in Azerbaijan and the prospect for a free and fair election, after receiving testimony from Thomas Melia, Deputy Assistant Secretary of State for Democracy, Human Rights and Labor; Elin Suleymanov, Ambassador of the Republic of Azerbaijan to the United States, and Miriam Lanskoy, National Endowment for Democracy, both of Washington, D.C.; and Erkin Gadirli, Republican Alternative, Samad Seyidov, National Assembly of Azerbaijan, and Eldar Namavoz, National Council of Democratic Forces of Azerbaijan, all of Baku, Azerbaijan.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS FOR THURSDAY, JULY 18, 2013

(Committee meetings are open unless otherwise indicated)

Senate

Committee on Appropriations: business meeting to markup proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 2014 for Commerce, Justice, Science, and Related Agencies and the Department of Homeland Security, 10 a.m., SD–106.

Committee on Armed Services: to hold hearings to examine the nominations of General Martin E. Dempsey, USA for reappointment to the grade of general and reappointment as Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, and Admiral James A. Winnefeld, Jr., USN for reappointment to the grade of admiral and reappointment as Vice Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, both of the Department of Defense, 9:30 a.m., SH–216.

Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs: business meeting to consider the nominations of Melvin L. Watt, of North Carolina, to be Director of the Federal Housing Finance Agency, Jason Furman, of New York, to be Member and Chairman of the Council of Economic Advisers, Kara Marlene Stein, of Maryland, Michael Sean Piwowar, of Virginia, and Mary Jo White, of New York, all to be Members of the Securities and Exchange Commission, and Richard T. Metsger, of Oregon, to be a Member of the National Credit Union Administration Board; to be immediately followed by a hearing to examine the Semiannual Monetary Policy Report to Congress, 10:30 a.m., SD–538.

Committee on Energy and Natural Resources: to hold hearings to examine the current state of clean energy finance in the United States and opportunities to facilitate greater investment in domestic clean energy technology development and deployment, 9:30 a.m., SD–366.

Committee on Environment and Public Works: to hold hearings to examine climate change, 10 a.m., SD–406.

Committee on Finance: to hold hearings to examine the nomination of F. Scott Kieff, of Illinois, to be a Member of the United States International Trade Commission, 2:30 p.m., SD–215.

Committee on the Judiciary: business meeting to consider the nominations of Todd M. Hughes, of the District of Columbia, to be United States Circuit Judge for the Federal Circuit, Colin Stirling Bruce, to be United States

District Judge for the Central District of Illinois, Sara Lee Ellis, and Andrea R. Wood, each to be a United States District Judge for the Northern District of Illinois, Madeline Hughes Haikala, to be United States District Judge for the Northern District of Alabama, and James B. Comey, Jr., of Connecticut, to be Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, Department of Justice, 9:30 a.m., SD–226.

Select Committee on Intelligence: to hold closed hearings to examine certain intelligence matters, 2 p.m., SH–219.

House

Committee on Appropriations, Full Committee, markup on the Legislative Branch Appropriations Bill for FY 2014, 11 a.m., 2359 Rayburn.

Committee on Energy and Commerce, Subcommittee on Commerce, Manufacturing, and Trade, hearing entitled ''Reporting Data Breaches: Is Federal Legislation Needed to Protect Consumers?'', 11 a.m., 2123 Rayburn.

Subcommittee on Oversight and Investigations, hearing entitled ''Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act: Implementation in the Wake of Administrative Delay'', 1:30 p.m., 2123 Rayburn.

Committee on Financial Services, Full Committee, hearing entitled ''A Legislative Proposal to Protect American Taxpayers and Homeowners by Creating a Sustainable Housing Finance System'', 1 p.m., 2128 Rayburn.

Committee on Foreign Affairs, Subcommittee on Terrorism, Nonproliferation, and Trade, hearing entitled ''Global al-Qaeda: Affiliates, Objectives, and Future Challenges'', 2 p.m., 2172 Rayburn.

Subcommittee on Africa, Global Health, Global Human Rights, and International Organizations, hearing entitled ''Is There an African Resource Curse?'', 2 p.m., 2167 Rayburn.

Committee on Homeland Security, Subcommittee on Cybersecurity, Infrastructure Protection, and Security Technologies, hearing entitled ''Oversight of Executive Order 13636 and Development of the Cybersecurity Framework'', 10 a.m., 311 Cannon.

Committee on the Judiciary, Subcommittee on the Constitution and Civil Justice, hearing entitled ''The Voting Rights Act after the Supreme Court's Decision in Shelby County'', 11 a.m., 2141 Rayburn.

Subcommittee on Regulatory Reform, Commercial and Antitrust Law, markup on H.R. 2122, the ''Regulatory Accountability Act of 2013''; and H.R. 2641, the ''Responsibly and Professionally Invigorating Development Act of 2013'', 2 p.m., 2141 Rayburn.

Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, Full Committee, hearing entitled ''The IRS's Systematic Delay and Scrutiny of Tea Party Applications'', 11 a.m., 2154 Rayburn.

Subcommittee on Economic Growth, Job Creation and Regulatory Affairs, hearing entitled ''Regulatory Burdens: The Impact of Dodd-Frank on Community Banking'', 8:30 a.m., 2154 Rayburn.

Subcommittee on Energy Policy, Health Care and Entitlements, hearing entitled ''Examining the Obama Administration's Social Cost of Carbon Estimates'', 2:30 p.m., 2247 Rayburn.

Committee on Science, Space, and Technology, Full Committee, markup on H.R. 2687, the ''National Aeronautics and Space Administration Authorization Act of 2013'', 11:15 a.m., 2318 Rayburn.

Committee on Small Business, Subcommittee on Agriculture, Energy and Trade, hearing entitled ''The President's Climate Action Plan: What Is the Impact on Small Businesses?'', 10 a.m., 2360 Rayburn.

Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, Full Committee, markup on H.R. 185, to designate the United States courthouse located at 101 East Pecan Street in Sherman, Texas, as the ''Paul Brown United States Courthouse''; H.R. 579, to designate the United States courthouse located at 501 East Court Street in Jackson, Mississippi, as the ''R. Jess Brown United States Courthouse''; H.R. 2251, to designate the United States courthouse located at 118 South Mill Street, in Fergus Falls, Minnesota, as the ''Edward J. Devitt United States''; H.R. 1961, to amend title 46, United States Code, to extend the exemption from the fire-retardant materials construction requirement for vessels operating within the Boundary Line; H.R. 2352, to amend title 23, United States Code, with respect to the operation of vehicles on certain Wisconsin highways, and for other purposes; and other matters cleared for consideration, 11:30 a.m., 2167 Rayburn.

Committee on Veterans' Affairs, Subcommittee on Economic Opportunity, markup on H.R. 2210, the ''Marine Gunnery Sergeant John David Fry Scholarship Improvements Act of 2013''; H.R. 2327, the ''Veterans Economic Opportunity Administration Act of 2013''; H.R. 331, to direct the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to permit the centralized reporting of veteran enrollment by certain groups, districts, and consortiums of educational institutions; H.R. 1357, to amend the VOW to Hire Heroes Act of 2011 to improve the Veterans Retraining Assistance Program by providing assistance under such program for certain training programs that are considered less than full-time; H.R. 1842, the ''Military Family Home Protection Act''; H.R. 2011, the Veterans' Advisory Committee on Education Improvement Act of 2013; H.R. 2150, the''Homeless Veterans' Reintegration Programs Reauthorization Act of 2013''; and H.R. 2481, the ''Veterans G.I. Bill Enrollment Clarification Act of 2013'', 11 a.m., 334 Cannon.

Committee on Ways and Means, Full Committee, hearing on President Obama's trade policy agenda with U.S. Trade Representative Michael Froman, 9 a.m., 1100 Longworth.

House Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence, Full Committee, hearing on Member Access Requests, 10 a.m., HVC–304. This is a closed hearing.

Full Committee, hearing entitled ''Ongoing Intelligence Activities'', 10:45 a.m., HVC–304. This is a closed hearing.

Next Meeting of the SENATE

9:30 a.m., Thursday, July 18

Senate Chamber

Program for Thursday: The Majority Leader will be recognized. At approximately 10:30 a.m., Senate will continue consideration of the nomination of Thomas Edward Perez, of Maryland, to be Secretary of Labor, post-cloture.

Following disposition of the nomination of Thomas Edward Perez, Senate will vote on the motion to invoke cloture on the nomination of Regina McCarthy, of Massachusetts, to be Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency.

Next Meeting of the HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

10 a.m., Thursday July 18

House Chamber

Program for Thursday: Begin consideration of H.R. 5—Student Success Act (Subject to a Rule).

Extensions of Remarks, as inserted in this issue

HOUSE

Alexander, Rodney, La.,E1071
Andrews, Robert E., N.J., E1073
Becerra, Xavier, Calif., E1079
Bonner, Jo, Ala., E1080, E1081
Carter, John R., Tex., E1072
Coble, Howard, N.C., E1077
Coffman, Mike, Colo., E1077, E1079
Davis, Danny K., Ill., E1080
Denham, Jeff, Calif., E1076
Dingell, John D., Mich., E1074
Faleomavaega, Eni F.H., American Samoa, E1077
Green, Al, Tex., E1073
Hunter, Duncan, Calif., E1078
Kind, Ron, Wisc., E1071
Kinzinger, Adam, Ill., E1071
Luetkemeyer, Blaine, Mo., E1079
Moran, James P., Va., E1072, E1073
Norton, Eleanor Holmes, D.C., E1078
Paulsen, Erik, Minn., E1072
Poe, Ted, Tex., E1080
Rokita, Todd, Ind., E1080
Sinema, Kyrsten, Ariz., E1073, E1074, E1079
Smith, Jason T., Mo., E1077
Wolf, Frank R., Va., E1074, E1078

Congressional Record

The *Congressional Record* (USPS 087–390). The Periodicals postage is paid at Washington, D.C. The public proceedings of each House of Congress, as reported by the Official Reporters thereof, are printed pursuant to directions of the Joint Committee on Printing as authorized by appropriate provisions of Title 44, United States Code, and published for each day that one or both Houses are in session, excepting very infrequent instances when two or more unusually small consecutive issues are printed one time. ¶Public access to the *Congressional Record* is available online through the U.S. Government Printing Office, at *www.fdsys.gov*, free of charge to the user. The information is updated online each day the *Congressional Record* is published. For more information, contact the GPO Customer Contact Center, U.S. Government Printing Office. Phone 202–512–1800, or 866–512–1800 (toll-free). E-Mail, *contactcenter@gpo.gov*. ¶To place an order for any of these products, visit the U.S. Government Online Bookstore at: bookstore.gpo.gov. Mail orders to: Superintendent of Documents, P.O. Box 979050, St. Louis, MO 63197–9000, or phone orders to 866–512–1800 (toll-free), 202–512–1800 (D.C. area), or fax to 202–512–2104. Remit check or money order, made payable to the Superintendent of Documents, or use VISA, MasterCard, Discover, American Express, or GPO Deposit Account. ¶Following each session of Congress, the daily *Congressional Record* is revised, printed, permanently bound and sold by the Superintendent of Documents in individual parts or by sets. ¶With the exception of copyrighted articles, there are no restrictions on the republication of material from the *Congressional Record*.

POSTMASTER: Send address changes to the Superintendent of Documents, *Congressional Record*, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C. 20402, along with the entire mailing label from the last issue received.