United States of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 113th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 159 WASHINGTON, MONDAY, JULY 22, 2013 No. 105

Senate

The Senate was not in session today. Its next meeting will be held on Tuesday, July 23, 2013, at 10 a.m.

House of Representatives

MONDAY, JULY 22, 2013

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

DESIGNATION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

WASHINGTON, DC,
July 22, 2013.

I hereby appoint the Honorable STEVE WOMACK to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

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

MORNING-HOUR DEBATE

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

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

END-OF-LIFE CARE

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

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, I arrived at my office this morning to a Politico with the front page headline ''Blumenauer's Death Panel Bill Lives on.''

It's actually a terrific article by Joanne Kenen, but the terrible headline about nonexistent death panels symbolizes why, three Congresses later, we still have not helped families deal with the most difficult circumstances any of us will ever encounter.

This issue hit me with full force 10 years ago in the midst of the Terri Schiavo case, where we watched one family's tragedy turn into a national media circus and a political spectacle all because one 27-year-old woman didn't have a conversation with her loved ones to make her wishes known about what would she want if the unthinkable happened. And she was caught in the terrible circumstance of being in a vegetative state—brain dead—for 8 years with no likelihood of recovery.

It's not really unthinkable. It's just that many of us would rather not think about it. Too rarely do we have this conversation, yet virtually every one of us will be in these circumstances with ourselves or with a loved one unable to make their wishes known about health care because of permanent or temporary incapacity.

This is not just about end of life. It could be any decision: about whether or not to amputate a leg or to have an operation that carries with it significant risks. Who speaks for each of us when we're unable to speak for ourselves?

The public overwhelmingly thinks that people should have the information and that their insurance or Medicare should pay for that conversation with a medical professional. Unfortunately, today, Medicare will pay tens of thousands of dollars for a 93-year-old man with terminal cancer to have a hip replacement who will never walk again but will not pay for a conversation with that same person and their family to understand the circumstances they face and what their options are, to understand their choices and have those choices, whatever they might be, respected, known, and enforced.

This actually won't cost us anything. The evidence is that people who know more use their information to choose wisely—very often less intense medical interventions. Overall, it could actually save money.

Doctors are perhaps the best example. They certainly can afford medical care. They certainly know about it. Yet, because they know what works and what doesn't, they make their wishes known and strategically choose their health care. As a group, they actually end up using less medical care in their last year of life, but arguably have a higher quality of life. Everybody should have the same choice as a doctor.

I'm in the process of visiting with each and every Member of the House to see if we can do something that will give people the care they want that is overwhelmingly supported by the public and that won't cost the Federal Government any net cost.

I urge my colleagues to examine the bipartisan legislation H.R. 1173, the Personalize Your Care Act of 2013, that

Printed on recycled paper.

Dr. PHIL ROE and I have introduced to help families in their time of greatest need. I think it's worth a look. I think it's worth your support.

HONORING TEACHERS AND CONSTITUENTS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from New Mexico (Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM) for 5 minutes.

Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico. Mr. Speaker, it is important that we always remember why we're here and who we serve. And the best way to do that is by spending time with the people that we were elected to represent.

For the past few days, I've had the honor of showing some wonderful residents of New Mexico's First District around our Nation's capital, and this group includes my daughter Taylor Grisham and her new family: Ian, Kamen, Kwane and Kaden, the Stewarts.

These people are leaders in the community, they're model citizens, they're family members, and they're longtime friends. And today I would like to recognize two of these individuals for their service to New Mexico and to our Nation.

Lori Drury and Maureen Salmon, both of whom are here today, are exceptionally talented teachers and dedicated public servants. Teachers play an invaluable role in our society. Creating jobs, defending and expanding the middle class, growing the economy, and making sure everyone has a fair shot at the American Dream, teachers directly contribute to all of these noble missions. And they don't do it for the money and they don't do it for the glory. They do it because they care deeply about the students they teach.

So I rise today to thank Lori and Maureen, to thank my family, and to thank all the teachers and public servants in New Mexico and in America for the work they do each and every day to make this a finer and stronger America.

RECESS

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

Accordingly (at 12 o'clock and 7 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1400

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. PETRI) at 2 p.m.

PRAYER

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

We give You thanks, O God, for giving us another day.

We ask Your blessing upon this assembly and upon all to whom the authority of government is given.

Encourage the Members of this House, O God, to use their abilities and talents in ways that bring righteousness to this Nation and to all people. Ever remind them of the needs of the poor, the homeless or forgotten, and those who live without freedom or liberty. May they be instruments of justice for all Americans.

May Your spirit live with them, and with each of us, and may Your grace surround us and those we love that in all things we may be the people You would have us be in service to this great Nation.

May all that is done within the people's House this day be for Your greater honor and glory.

Amen.

THE JOURNAL

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

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

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

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

Mr. BURGESS 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.

JOBS AND THE ECONOMY

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

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, the White House announced this week that President Obama will be returning his focus to jobs and the economy; but he's not planning to do this by removing red tape from job creators, withdrawing his opposition to the Keystone XL pipeline, or by repealing ObamaCare.

He's planning to do this by giving speeches. Speeches don't turn the economic tide. Speeches devoid of policy proposals won't help the 4.3 million Americans who've been without a job for more than 6 months. Speeches also won't undo the damage ObamaCare is already doling out to small businesses and working families.

The particularly lethargic recovery our Nation is trudging through is the economic signature of the Obama Presidency. Rather than blocking American energy or defending ObamaCare, the President should try something new—working with House Republicans to advance our plan for economic growth and jobs.

The American people deserve a thriving economy and economic growth. House Republicans have a plan to get us there. The President should take note.

PRESERVING MEDICARE PATIENT ACCESS

(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, this week the Energy and Commerce Committee's Subcommittee on Health will begin a markup on legislation to fix a problem that Congress has been struggling with for over a decade, and that's fixing what's known as the ''doc fix,'' or the sustainable growth rate formula.

The proposed legislation is bipartisan. Both sides of the dais agree that this must be done, and it incorporates the feedback we've received from over 80 stakeholder groups. The legislation replaces the problematic formula with an improved system to increase the quality of care for Medicare patients while streamlining the costly and complicated process in a fiscally responsible way.

Most importantly, the legislation ensures that Medicare patients will continue to have access to medical service. By providing incentives for doctors to continue to treat Medicare patients, we're putting the health of our seniors first.

I'm proud to be part of this commonsense solution, and I look forward to speaking to this House more about this in the weeks to come as it works its way through committee.

FIFTH UNANSWERED BENGHAZI QUESTION

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

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Speaker, today I ask my fifth question about the terrorist attack in Benghazi that remains unanswered: Why was the CIA security team repeatedly ordered to stand down for more than 30 minutes after the attack began? Where did the order to stop the team from responding originate? Was it directed by the CIA or someone else in Washington? If the team had been allowed to respond immediately, could the lives of Ambassador Stevens and Sean Smith been saved?

Last year, news reports indicated that the CIA security team in Benghazi was repeatedly ordered to stand down or not respond to the attack at the consulate by agency chain of command. Trusted sources have confirmed this report, saying that the security team was ready to respond within minutes after receiving the initial call for help, but the CIA repeatedly blocked their departure for more than 30 minutes. The team ultimately disobeyed, but by then it was too late to save Stevens and Smith.

Will we ever, ever find the truth? We need a select committee.

HONORING JACK HOFFMAN

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

Mr. SMITH of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor my constituent, Jack Hoffman of Atkinson, Nebraska, and the Team Jack Foundation.

At only seven years old, Jack has inspired millions of people from around the world, while raising awareness and funding to fight pediatric brain cancer through the Team Jack Foundation.

Many of us remember when Jack, after surviving brain cancer, made his now-legendary touchdown run during the University of Nebraska's spring football game. The video of that play was voted the top play on ESPN.

Last week, Jack's touchdown was honored during ESPN's ESPY awards as Sports Moment of the Year for 2013. This award was well deserved. But more importantly, Jack has used his newfound fame to further the Team Jack Foundation, which is committed to helping find a cure for pediatric brain cancer.

I hope all of my colleagues will join me in honoring Jack not only for his award, but also for his continued efforts to fight cancer.

JOBS AND THE FREE ENTERPRISE SYSTEM

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

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, today is a very important day in the life of America as we recognize that Republicans are back in Washington to try and grow our economy and bring jobs back to the free enterprise system.

Mr. Speaker, for 12 years Republicans worked hard on doubling the size of GDP, and we did that from a GDP of $6.5 trillion to over $14 trillion. Over the last 5½ years, we have seen our President embark on an agenda that will reduce not just GDP, but jobs and job growth in America. We now stand at a GDP of just over 1 percent.

Mr. Speaker, this means that jobs, as we saw this last month when we saw the jobs report that came out, of some 700,000 jobs that have been created in America this year, of that number, about 600,000 are part-time jobs. America cannot make ends meet as workers, as families, as communities if we have a President who stands in the way of the free enterprise system and job growth.

Mr. Speaker, I urge House Republicans to continue their work on behalf of the American people for American jobs and to grow our economy.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess until approximately 4:30 p.m. today.

Accordingly (at 2 o'clock and 8 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1632

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. PETRI) at 4 o'clock and 32 minutes p.m.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

Record votes on postponed questions will be taken later.

THREE KIDS MINE REMEDIATION AND RECLAMATION ACT

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 697) 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, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 697

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 ''Three Kids Mine Remediation and Reclamation Act''.

SEC. 2. DEFINITIONS.

In this Act:

(1) FEDERAL LAND.—The term ''Federal land'' means the approximately 948 acres of Bureau of Reclamation and Bureau of Land Management land within the Three Kids Mine Project Site, as depicted on the map.

(2) HAZARDOUS SUBSTANCE; POLLUTANT OR CONTAMINANT; REMEDY.—The terms ''hazardous substance'', ''pollutant or contaminant'', and ''remedy'' have the meanings given those terms in section 101 of the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act of 1980 (42 U.S.C. 9601).

(3) HENDERSON REDEVELOPMENT AGENCY.—The term ''Henderson Redevelopment Agency'' means the redevelopment agency of the City of Henderson, Nevada, established and authorized to transact business and exercise the powers of the agency in accordance with the Nevada Community Redevelopment Law (Nev. Rev. Stat. 279.382 to 279.685).

(4) MAP.—The term ''map'' means the map entitled ''Three Kids Mine Project Area'' and dated February 6, 2012.

(5) RESPONSIBLE PARTY.—The term ''Responsible Party'' means the private sector entity designated by the Henderson Redevelopment Agency, and approved by the State of Nevada, to complete the assessment, remediation, reclamation and redevelopment of the Three Kids Mine Project Site).

(6) SECRETARY.—The term ''Secretary'' means the Secretary of the Interior.

(7) STATE.—The term ''State'' means the State of Nevada.

(8) THREE KIDS MINE PROJECT SITE.—The term ''Three Kids Mine Project Site'' means the approximately 1,262 acres of land that is—

(A) comprised of—

(i) the Federal land; and

(ii) the approximately 314 acres of adjacent non-Federal land; and

(B) depicted as the ''Three Kids Mine Project Site'' on the map.

SEC. 3. LAND CONVEYANCE.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding sections 202 and 203 of the Federal Land Policy and Management Act of 1976 (43 U.S.C. 1712, 1713), not later than 90 days after the date on which the Secretary determines that the conditions described in subsection (b) have been met, and subject to valid existing rights and applicable law, the Secretary shall convey to the Henderson Redevelopment Agency all right, title, and interest of the United States in and to the Federal land.

(b) CONDITIONS.—

(1) APPRAISAL; FAIR MARKET VALUE.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—As consideration for the conveyance under subsection (a), the Henderson Redevelopment Agency shall pay the fair market value of the Federal land, if any, as determined under subparagraph (B) and as adjusted under subparagraph (F).

(B) APPRAISAL.—The Secretary shall determine the fair market value of the Federal land based on an appraisal—

(i) that is conducted in accordance with nationally recognized appraisal standards, including—

(I) the Uniform Appraisal Standards for Federal Land Acquisitions; and

(II) the Uniform Standards of Professional Appraisal Practice; and

(ii) that does not take into account any existing contamination associated with historical mining on the Federal land.

(C) REMEDIATION AND RECLAMATION COSTS.—

(i) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall prepare a reasonable estimate of the costs to assess, remediate, and reclaim the Three Kids Mine Project Site.

(ii) CONSIDERATIONS.—The estimate prepared under clause (i) shall be—

(I) based on the results of a comprehensive Phase II environmental site assessment of the Three Kids Mine Project Site prepared by the Henderson Redevelopment Agency or a Responsible Party that has been approved by the State; and

(II) prepared in accordance with the current version of the ASTM International Standard E–2137–06 (2011) entitled ''Standard Guide for Estimating Monetary Costs and Liabilities for Environmental Matters''.

(iii) ASSESSMENT REQUIREMENTS.—The Phase II environmental site assessment prepared under clause (ii)(I) shall, without limiting any additional requirements that may be required by the State, be conducted in accordance with the procedures of—

(I) the most recent version of ASTM International Standard E–1527–05 entitled ''Standard Practice for Environmental Site Assessments: Phase I Environmental Site Assessment Process''; and

(II) the most recent version of ASTM International Standard E–1903–11 entitled ''Standard Guide for Environmental Site Assessments: Phase II Environmental Site Assessment Process''.

(iv) REVIEW OF CERTAIN INFORMATION.—

(I) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall review and consider cost information proffered by the Henderson Redevelopment Agency, the Responsible Party, and the State in the preparation of the estimate under this subparagraph.

(II) FINAL DETERMINATION.—If there is a disagreement among the Secretary, Henderson Redevelopment Agency, and the State over the reasonable estimate of costs under this subparagraph, the parties shall jointly select 1 or more

experts to assist the Secretary in making the final estimate of the costs.

(D) DEADLINE.—Not later than 30 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall begin the appraisal and cost estimates under subparagraphs (B) and (C), respectively.

(E) APPRAISAL COSTS.—The Henderson Redevelopment Agency or the Responsible Party shall reimburse the Secretary for the costs incurred in performing the appraisal under subparagraph (B).

(F) ADJUSTMENT.—The Secretary shall administratively adjust the fair market value of the Federal land, as determined under subparagraph (B), based on the estimate of remediation, and reclamation costs, as determined under subparagraph (C).

(2) MINE REMEDIATION AND RECLAMATION AGREEMENT EXECUTED.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—The conveyance under subsection (a) shall be contingent on—

(i) the Secretary receiving from the State written notification that a mine remediation and reclamation agreement has been executed in accordance with subparagraph (B); and

(ii) the Secretary concurring, not later than 30 days after the date of receipt of the written notification under clause (i), that the requirements under subparagraph (B) have been met.

(B) REQUIREMENTS.—The mine remediation and reclamation agreement required under subparagraph (A) shall be an enforceable consent order or agreement between the State and the Responsible Party who will be obligated to perform under the consent order or agreement administered by the State that—

(i) obligates the Responsible Party to perform, after the conveyance of the Federal land under this Act, the remediation and reclamation work at the Three Kids Mine Project Site necessary to ensure all remedial actions necessary to protect human health and the environment with respect to any hazardous substances, pollutant, or contaminant will be taken, in accordance with all Federal, State, and local requirements; and

(ii) contains provisions determined to be necessary by the State and the Henderson Redevelopment Agency, including financial assurance provisions to ensure the completion of the remedy.

(3) NOTIFICATION FROM AGENCY.—As a condition of the conveyance under subsection (a), not later than 90 days after the date of execution of the mine remediation and reclamation agreement required under paragraph (2), the Secretary shall accept written notification from the Henderson Redevelopment Agency that the Henderson Redevelopment Agency is prepared to accept conveyance of the Federal land under subsection (a).

SEC. 4. WITHDRAWAL.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Subject to valid existing rights, for the 10-year period beginning on the earlier of the date of enactment of this Act or the date of the conveyance required by this Act, the Federal land is withdrawn from all forms of—

(1) entry, appropriation, operation, or disposal under the public land laws;

(2) location, entry, and patent under the mining laws; and

(3) disposition under the mineral leasing, mineral materials, and the geothermal leasing laws.

(b) EXISTING RECLAMATION WITHDRAWALS.—Subject to valid existing rights, any withdrawal under the public land laws that includes all or any portion of the Federal land for which the Bureau of Reclamation has determined that the Bureau of Reclamation has no further need under applicable law is relinquished and revoked solely to the extent necessary—

(1) to exclude from the withdrawal the property that is no longer needed; and

(2) to allow for the immediate conveyance of the Federal land as required under this Act.

(c) EXISTING RECLAMATION PROJECT AND PERMITTED FACILITIES.—Except as provided in subsection (a), nothing in this Act diminishes, hinders, or interferes with the exclusive and perpetual use by the existing rights holders for the operation, maintenance, and improvement of water conveyance infrastructure and facilities, including all necessary ingress and egress, situated on the Federal land that were constructed or permitted by the Bureau of Reclamation before the effective date of this Act.

SEC. 5. ACEC BOUNDARY ADJUSTMENT.

Notwithstanding section 203 of the Federal Land Policy and Management Act of 1976 (43 U.S.C. 1713), the boundary of the River Mountains Area of Critical Environmental Concern (NVN 76884) is adjusted to exclude any portion of the Three Kids Mine Project Site consistent with the map.

SEC. 6. RESPONSIBILITIES OF THE PARTIES.

(a) RESPONSIBILITY OF PARTIES TO MINE REMEDIATION AND RECLAMATION AGREEMENT.—On completion of the conveyance under section 3, the responsibility for complying with the mine remediation and reclamation agreement executed under section 3(b)(2) shall apply to the Responsible Party and the State of Nevada.

(b) SAVINGS PROVISION.—If the conveyance under this Act has occurred, but the terms of the agreement executed under section 3(b)(2) have not been met, nothing in this Act—

(1) affects the responsibility of the Secretary to take any additional response action necessary to protect public health and the environment from a release or the threat of a release of a hazardous substance, pollutant, or contaminant; or

(2) unless otherwise expressly provided, modifies, limits, or otherwise affects—

(A) the application of, or obligation to comply with, any law, including any environmental or public health law; or

(B) the authority of the United States to enforce compliance with the requirements of any law or the agreement executed under section 3(b)(2).

SEC. 7. SOUTHERN NEVADA PUBLIC LANDS MANAGEMENT ACT.

Southern Nevada Public Land Management Act of 1998 (31 U.S.C. 6901 note; Public Law 105–263) shall not apply to land conveyed under this Act.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Washington (Mr. HASTINGS) and the gentleman from California (Mr. HUFFMAN) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Washington.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous materials on the bill under consideration.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 697, the Three Kids Mine Remediation and Reclamation Act, was introduced by our colleague from Nevada (Mr. HECK) on Valentine's Day and was marked up on June 12 of this year.

The Three Kids Mine is located in Clark County, Nevada, adjacent to the city of Henderson. The mine was operated from 1916 to 1961. The United States, through the Defense Plant Corporation, owned 446 acres of the Three Kids Mine Project from 1942 to 1955. The mine site was used to produce federally owned manganese ore for national defense purposes and was leased by the U.S. until 2003 to stockpile manganese nodules.

The Three Kids Mine Project area is approximately 1,262 acres and includes 948 acres of Federal lands managed by the Bureau of Land Management and the Bureau of Reclamation, and 314 acres of private lands where the mill site and processing plant are located.

The site is contaminated with arsenic, lead, and other heavy metals and petroleum hydrocarbons. Cost estimates for cleanup and reclamation of the site range from $300 million to $1.2 billion.

The city of Henderson, the Henderson Redevelopment Agency, the Nevada Department of Environmental Protection, Lakemoor Development, and the Bureau of Land Management have negotiated a plan to clean up and redevelop the Three Kids Mine Project site that includes the purchase of 948 acres of Federal land. The purchase price would be adjusted to reflect the actual cleanup cost of the Federal and non-Federal lands where the Federal Government has environmental liability resulting from the mill, from the processing facilities, and the storage of Federal-owned manganese nodules.

All in all, Mr. Speaker, this is a win-win for everyone involved. The environmental problems are addressed, the abandoned mine site is reclaimed, and the land redeveloped for beneficial use—all at no cost to the American taxpayer.

If successful, this could provide a framework for other abandoned mine sites that are near or adjacent to small towns and larger urban areas.

So I urge my colleagues to support this legislation, which passed by voice vote in the last Congress, and I would hope it would do so again in this Congress.

I reserve the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. HUFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, we agree, the Three Kids Mine is an abandoned manganese mine and mill site located in Henderson, Nevada. This bill designates the combined 314 acres of private land and 948 acres of public land as the 1,262-acre Three Kids Mine Project Site and provides for the conveyance of the public lands to the Henderson Redevelopment Agency.

The bill requires that standard appraisal practices be used to determine the fair market value for the Federal lands to be conveyed. Once that determination has been made, the bill would require the Secretary of the Interior to determine the ''reasonable approximate estimation of the costs to assess, remediate, and reclaim the Three Kids Mine Project Site.'' That cost would then be deducted from the fair market

value of the public land that has conveyed. The Henderson Redevelopment Agency would pay the adjusted fair market value of the conveyed land, if any, and the Federal Government would be released from any and all liabilities or claims.

The BLM supports innovative proposals to address the cleanup of the Three Kids Mine, and we do not oppose this bill.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased to yield 4 minutes to the author of this legislation, who introduced it in the last Congress and in this Congress, the gentleman from Nevada (Mr. HECK).

Mr. HECK of Nevada. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 697, the Three Kids Mine Remediation and Reclamation Act, which is an innovative solution for restoring our environment, improving safety, and creating jobs.

H.R. 697 addresses the safety and environmental concerns of the Three Kids Mine, as was stated, an abandoned manganese mine and mill site consisting of approximately 1,262 acres of both Federal and private lands which lie within the Henderson city limits and is located across from a busy parkway and an increasing number of homes and businesses.

The site was owned and operated by various parties, including the United States Government, from approximately 1917 through 1961, and used as a storage area for Federal manganese ore reserves from the late 1950s through 2003.

Currently, the project site contains numerous large, unstable, sheer-cliff open pits as deep as 400 feet, huge volumes of mine overburden and tailings, mill facility remnants, and waste disposal areas. To give a sense of scale, the site contains mine overburden mounds that are approximately 10 stories high in some areas and abandoned waste ponds that are up to 60 feet deep and filled with more than 1 million cubic yards of gelatinous tailings containing high concentrations of arsenic, lead, and petroleum compounds.

H.R. 697 provides an innovative public-private partnership solution to finally clean up the abandoned Three Kids Mine site. In its simplest form, H.R. 697 directs the Secretary of the Interior to convey the Federal lands at the project site—approximately 948 acres—at fair market value, taking into account the costs of investigating and remediating the entire site, which also includes an additional 314 acres of now-private lands that were used historically in mine operations.

In return for conveying the land at fair market value, the Federal Government will also receive a release of liability for cleanup of both the Federal and private lands.

Under this legislation, before the Federal lands are conveyed, the State must enter into a binding consent agreement under which the cleanup of the entire project site will occur. This agreement must include financial assurances to ensure the completion of the remediation and reclamation of the site. The cleanup will be financed with private capital and Nevada tax increment financing at no cost to the Federal Government. Again, this project will be carried out at no cost to the Federal Government.

H.R. 697 is the result of more than 5 years of work among the city of Henderson Redevelopment Agency, the Department of the Interior, the State of Nevada, and private entities. This public-private partnership solution will finally lead to the cleanup and reclamation of the Three Kids Mine site, while at the same time providing for economic development and the creation of as many as 33,000 jobs. Furthermore, I believe this innovative solution could serve as a viable model for the cleanup and reclamation of other similar sites across the country.

This bill, which has the support of the entire Nevada delegation, is nearly identical to H.R. 2512, which passed the House of Representatives by voice vote during the 112th Congress, but unfortunately did not receive consideration in the Senate prior to the adjournment of the last Congress.

I want to thank the chairman and the ranking member of the House Natural Resources Committee for recognizing the importance of this legislation to Nevada and the West, and for their efforts in advancing it, in a bipartisan fashion, through the committee.

H.R. 697 is a win for the economy, a win for the environment, and a win for the Federal taxpayer. I encourage my colleagues to join me in supporting this legislation.

Mr. HUFFMAN. I yield such time as she may consume to the gentlelady from Nevada, Representative TITUS.

Ms. TITUS. I thank my friend from California for the time.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 697, the Three Kids Mine Remediation and Reclamation Act, and urge my colleagues to support the bill.

This bipartisan legislation, which has the support of the entire Nevada delegation, including Senators REID and HELLER, is critical to the cleanup and revitalization of long-dormant land near Henderson, Nevada.

H.R. 697 sets up a public-private partnership to address the remediation of the more than 1,200 acres of former manganese mining and industrial lands for redevelopment. These activities, as you have heard, date back nearly a century and were critical to our national defense during World War II. But over the last 50 years, the already nasty, polluted site has become increasingly dangerous. Accordingly, the cleanup of this land is a top priority for the Nevada State Department of Environmental Protection, the city of Henderson, and for the thousands of southern Nevada residents who live nearby.

I support this legislation to clean up the Three Kids Mine for both safety and environmental reasons and to create opportunities for redevelopment of the site for beneficial use and economic potential. So I would urge my colleagues to join me and the Nevada delegation in support of this bill.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. I would ask my friend from California, I have no more requests for time and I'm prepared to yield back if the gentleman is prepared to yield back.

Mr. HUFFMAN. I would tell the chairman I have no further speakers and am prepared to yield back if the chairman is prepared to close.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. I am prepared to close.

Mr. HUFFMAN. I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, as was mentioned, this is a win-win proposition—at no cost to the taxpayer—cleaning up this mine, and I urge its support. It passed, again, by voice vote in the last Congress, and I hope it does so again in this Congress.

I urge my colleagues to vote ''yes,'' and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HARRIS). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Washington (Mr. HASTINGS) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 697, as amended.

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

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

□ 1645

CALIFORNIA COASTAL NATIONAL MONUMENT EXPANSION ACT OF 2013

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 1411) to include the Point Arena-Stornetta Public Lands in the California Coastal National Monument as a part of the National Landscape Conservation System, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 1411

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE; DEFINITIONS.

(a) SHORT TITLE.—This Act may be cited as the ''California Coastal National Monument Expansion Act of 2013''.

(b) DEFINITIONS.—In this Act:

(1) MAP.—The term ''map'' means the map created by the Bureau of Land Management, entitled ''California Coastal National Monument Addition'' and dated September 15, 2012.

(2) MONUMENT.—The term ''Monument'' means the California Coastal National Monument established by Presidential Proclamation 7264.

(3) POINT ARENA-STORNETTA PUBLIC LANDS.—The term ''Point Arena-Stornetta Public Lands'' means the Federal land comprising approximately 1,255 acres in

Mendocino County, California, as generally depicted on the map.

(4) PRESIDENTIAL PROCLAMATION 7264.—The term ''Presidential Proclamation 7264'' means Presidential Proclamation Number 7264, dated January 11, 2000 (65 Fed. Reg. 2821).

(5) SECRETARY.—The term ''Secretary'' means the Secretary of the Interior.

SEC. 2. PURPOSE.

The purpose of this Act is to protect, conserve, and enhance for the benefit and enjoyment of present and future generations the unique and nationally important historical, natural, cultural, scientific, educational, scenic, economic and recreational values of the Point Arena-Stornetta Public Lands, while allowing certain recreational, research and traditional ecomomic activities or uses, such as grazing, to continue.

SEC. 3. EXPANSION OF CALIFORNIA COASTAL NATIONAL MONUMENT.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The boundary of the Monument established by Presidential Proclamation 7264 is expanded to include the Federal land shown on the map.

(b) MAP AND LEGAL DESCRIPTION.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—As soon as practicable after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall file with the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources of the Senate and the Committee on Natural Resources of the House of Representatives a map and boundary description of land added to the Monument by this Act.

(2) FORCE AND EFFECT.—The map and boundary description filed under paragraph (1) shall have the same force and effect as if included in this Act, except that the Secretary may correct any minor errors in the map and boundary descriptions.

(3) AVAILABILITY OF MAP AND BOUNDARY DESCRIPTION.—The map and boundary description filed under paragraph (1) shall be on file and available for public inspection in appropriate offices of the Bureau of Land Management.

SEC. 4. ADMINISTRATION.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall manage the land added to the Monument by this Act—

(1) as a part of the Monument; and

(2) in accordance with Presidential Proclamation 7264, except that—

(A) traditional economic activities and existing uses, such as grazing and the maintenance of existing structures that are used for grazing, shall not be restricted; and

(B) lands and interests in land within the proposed land addition not owned by the United States shall not be part of the monument and the future acquisition of those lands and interests in lands by the United States may occur only through donation or exchange with the written consent of the landowner.

(b) MANAGEMENT PLAN.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 2 years after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall finalize an amendment to the Monument management plan for the long-term protection and management of the land added to the Monument by this Act.

(2) REQUIREMENTS.—The plan amendment shall—

(A) be developed with an opportunity for full public participation; and

(B) describe the appropriate uses and management of the land consistent with this Act.

(c) MOTORIZED AND MECHANIZED TRANSPORT.—Except as needed for emergency or authorized administrative purposes, the use of motorized and mechanized vehicles in the Monument shall be permitted only on roads and trails designated for that use.

(d) INCORPORATION OF LAND AND INTERESTS.—

(1) AUTHORITY.—The Secretary may acquire non-Federal land or interests in land within or adjacent to the land added to the Monument by this Act only through exchange, or donation with the written consent of the landowner, and such non-Federal land shall not be included within the boundaries of the Monument absent written consent of the landowner.

(2) MANAGEMENT.—Any land or interests in land within or adjacent to the land added to the Monument by this Act acquired by the United States after the date of enactment of this Act shall be added to and administered as part of the Monument.

(3) ACCESS TO PRIVATE PROPERTY.—The addition of lands under this Act to the Monument may not result in a lack of or restricted access by motorized vehicle to any non-Federal lands within the Monument.

(e) OVERFLIGHTS.—Nothing in this Act—

(1) restricts or precludes overflights, including low-level overflights or military, commercial, and general aviation overflights that can be seen or heard within the land added to the Monument by this Act;

(2) restricts or precludes the designation or creation of new units of special use airspace or the establishment of military flight training routes over the land added to the Monument by this Act; or

(3) modifies regulations governing low-level overflights above the adjacent Gulf of the Farallones National Marine Sanctuary.

(f) LAW ENFORCEMENT.—Nothing in this Act effects the law enforcement authorities of the Department of Homeland Security.

(g) NATIVE AMERICAN USES.—Nothing in this Act enlarges, diminishes, or modifies the rights of any Indian tribe or Indian religious community.

(h) BUFFER ZONES.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The expansion of the Monument is not intended to lead to the establishment of protective perimeters or buffer zones around the land included in the Monument by this Act.

(2) ACTIVITIES OUTSIDE THE MONUMENT.—The fact that activities outside the Monument can be seen or heard within the land added to the Monument by this Act shall not, of itself, preclude those activities or uses up to the boundary of the Monument.

(i) GRAZING.—Nothing in this Act affects the grazing of livestock and the maintenance of existing structures that are used for grazing within the Point Arena-Stornetta Public Lands or the Monument.

(j) NATIONAL LANDSCAPE CONSERVATION SYSTEM.—The Secretary shall manage the Monument as part of the National Landscape Conservation System.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Washington (Mr. HASTINGS) and the gentleman from California (Mr. HUFFMAN) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Washington.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on the bill under consideration.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

H.R. 1411 would add 1,255 acres of the Point Arena-Stornetta Public Lands to the California Coastal National Monument, which was created by Presidential Proclamation 7264 in January of 2000.

The Stornetta family, the namesake of this area being annexed into the monument, grazes cattle in this area, so it is imperative that grazing continues and is compatible with the long-term protection and management of the monument. Public land grazers in Arizona, Montana, and Utah have already been targeted by a few antigrazing zealots who want to litigate to extinction the legitimate and long-standing practice of grazing in national monuments.

During committee consideration of H.R. 1411, an amendment was adopted to ensure that traditional economic activities and uses, such as grazing, will be allowed to continue once the Point Arena-Stornetta Public Lands are added to the California Coastal National Monument. It also limited future land acquisitions to only those done by donations or exchange, thereby preventing any unnecessary taxpayer expense. Private property rights were also protected by ensuring motorized vehicle access to any non-Federal lands within the monument and requiring written consent from the landowners before their property can be included in the monument.

The bill includes provisions preventing restrictions on military or commercial low-level overflights and training activities, and also on Department of Homeland Security law enforcement activities, other routine provisions protecting activities outside of the designation, and prohibiting the creation of buffer zones.

I think these conditions are the right conditions when you take land for other uses, and I support this legislation.

I reserve the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. HUFFMAN. I am honored to rise in support of my first piece of legislation as a Member of Congress: H.R. 1411. This bill will add Mendocino's Point Arena-Stornetta Public Lands to the California Coastal National Monument.

Those of my colleagues who have visited the Mendocino coast appreciate the true unspoiled beauty of this region, and understand why it's so important to protect it for future generations.

This bill will preserve a complex and fragile ecosystem on the Mendocino coast, approximately 130 miles north of San Francisco. It will serve as the first land-based addition to the California Coastal National Monument. It will also add 10 miles of connectivity to the California Coastal Trail.

The Point Arena-Stornetta Public Lands encompass 1,255 acres of pristine coastal wetlands, including habitat for

several endangered species. The bill will also protect the Garcia River estuary and 2 miles of the Garcia River itself. This river is critical habitat for coho salmon and steelhead. In addition, we will maintain the existing ranching, recreation, and research uses of this land, preserving much of it as a sustainable working landscape.

But safeguarding this national treasure isn't just good for the environment; it is also good for the economy. Environmental tourism is critical to the economy of the north coast of California, and expanding the Coastal National Monument will bring new visitors and new economic activity.

Tourism is already the number one source of jobs on the Mendocino coast. We get close to 2 million annual visitors in the region, and that supports more than 5,000 jobs and generates more than $110 million in economic activity annually. The Point Arena-Stornetta Public Lands are a perfect gateway for visitors to experience the California Coastal National Monument. That is one of the reasons why the effort to protect this amazing stretch of the Mendocino coast has such broad public support from State and local elected officials to the Manchester-Point Arena Band of Pomo Indians, conservation groups across the country, and business and civic leaders in the community. In addition, hundreds of individuals in this rural area have expressed their support by way of petition.

My friend and predecessor in representing the north coast in Congress, Congressman MIKE THOMPSON, initiated the effort to protect this area in the last Congress, and I am very pleased that he is joining me as a cosponsor of this bill.

I am also very appreciative of the support of the chairman of the Natural Resources Committee, Chairman DOC HASTINGS, and also of the newest Member of our Senate and our former ranking Democrat, ED MARKEY.

In addition, I want to thank Chairman BISHOP and Ranking Member GRIJALVA of the Public Lands Subcommittee for not only hearing the bill, but for inviting my constituent, Scott Schneider, who is president and CEO of Visit Mendocino, to come and testify in support of this legislation.

This bill was reported by the Natural Resources Committee by unanimous consent, and I am grateful that we have come so far to preserve this iconic landscape.

I look forward to continuing to work with the committee, with Senators BOXER and FEINSTEIN, and with my colleagues to ensure that we fully and permanently protect this magnificent coastline.

I urge my colleagues to vote ''yes'' on H.R. 1411, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. I have no more requests for time.

I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HUFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield as much time as he may consume to the gentleman from the Northern Mariana Islands (Mr. SABLAN).

Mr. SABLAN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me time.

From his days in the California State House and now here in Congress, Congressman JARED HUFFMAN has been a leader in protecting our valuable natural resources. H.R. 1411 is a fine example of this commitment and office leadership. Congressman HUFFMAN's bill incorporates the area known as the Point Arena-Stornetta Public Lands into the California Coastal National Monument.

The bill gives permanent protection to 1,255 acres of wetlands along the Mendocino County coast. The area provides habitat for endangered species, including the Point Arena mountain beaver and the Behren's silverspot butterfly. The Garcia River running through it shelters steelhead and silver and king salmon.

While I have the floor, I also want to commend Congressman HUFFMAN for his efforts to protect sharks. In the California Legislature, Congressman HUFFMAN wrote the law banning wasteful trade in shark fins. Here in Congress, he led the effort to protest when the Commerce Department proposed regulations preempting State laws against shark finning.

The Northern Mariana Islands, which I represent, has enacted a similar law. So along with other Members who respect State authority, I cosigned Congressman HUFFMAN's letter asking NOAA to withdraw its proposed regulation.

Again, I commend Mr. HUFFMAN for his dedication to protecting our natural resources, and I ask all my colleagues to support H.R. 1411.

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

Mr. HUFFMAN. I thank the gentleman from the Northern Mariana Islands.

Mr. Speaker, I would yield as much time as he may consume to my colleague, the gentleman from Monterey, California (Mr. FARR).

Mr. FARR. I thank Mr. HUFFMAN for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I want to congratulate the committee and Chairman DOC HASTINGS on bringing this bill to the floor.

I was instrumental in creating the Coastal National Monument along the California coastline. It had to be done by executive order because we couldn't get the bills out of committee. I just really appreciate the fact that the committee is concentrating on this, because a lot of these things that people kind of argue against they don't realize what the positive unintended consequences are.

What this bill does is it really talks about management of land. As the chairman pointed out, the substance of the bill allows the private enterprise, the agriculture to continue, and to have it in a way that is going to be cost-effective management. This is a win-win for the private sector and for the public sector.

In many cases, the Bureau of Land Management is a very effective land manager. It essentially, in the West, has a lot of the land that actually was never picked up by Forest Service. When you think of Forest Service, you think of timbering or mining and those kinds of things, or land that qualified for the National Park System as kind of the leftover lands of the westward expansion. They have a lot of land management responsibility and know-how.

The California coastline is the number one attraction and the number one engine. It is the whole engine of California. Most of the cities and stuff are all along the coast. So any time you add to ability to expand access—we sometimes forget in Congress that the number one activity of interest in this country is watchable wildlife. More people watch wildlife, whether it is in the movies or channels or buy gear to go out, than watch all the national sports. It is huge business and it is jobs. In the rural area, this is key to job development.

Since we've created the Coastal National Monument, we have had little towns and counties in the rural area that have been identifying the rocks, all of which have historical names from families or shipwrecks. Now it gives some attraction to it, some historical attraction, which people love to learn about. It has been a great educational tool to teach us about this 1,100-mile coastline in California sort of inch by inch.

This addition is going to be able to build more opportunity for job creation, as people want to hire people to give them access, want to buy pictures, want to buy books, want to buy art that's made from it.

So I really commend the committee on realizing that these things are responsible job development jobs, not just government ownership of land. When you say, well, it is taking it off the private tax rolls, remember, this is a private interest that wanted to sell it to a public system. Those lands will pay taxes in lieu of property taxes, PIL taxes. It will continue the economy of the area. But for the local area—this is pretty rural California, really rural—this will just be a huge economic boon tool.

I compliment Mr. HUFFMAN. This is the first bill he has brought to the floor. I hope he brings more. He is a very able Member of Congress. He proved a great member of the California State Legislature.

Mr. HASTINGS, thank you for providing the leadership to get these bills to the floor so that we can have an opportunity to vote on them.

I urge an ''aye'' vote.

Mr. HUFFMAN. I thank the gentleman and yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, this is a good piece of legislation. I urge my colleagues to adopt it, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Washington (Mr. HASTINGS) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 1411, as amended.

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

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

OPERATION OF VEHICLES ON CERTAIN WISCONSIN HIGHWAYS

Mr. PETRI. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 2353) to amend title 23, United States Code, with respect to the operation of vehicles on certain Wisconsin highways, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 2353

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

SECTION 1. OPERATION OF VEHICLES ON CERTAIN WISCONSIN HIGHWAYS.

Section 127 of title 23, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(j) OPERATION OF VEHICLES ON CERTAIN WISCONSIN HIGHWAYS.—If any segment of the United States Route 41 corridor, as described in section 1105(c)(57) of the Intermodal Surface Transportation Efficiency Act of 1991, is designated as a route on the Interstate System, a vehicle that could operate legally on that segment before the date of such designation may continue to operate on that segment, without regard to any requirement under subsection (a).''.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Does the gentleman intend that the motion apply to the bill, as amended?

Mr. PETRI. Yes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The bill, as amended, is pending.

Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. PETRI) and the gentleman from West Virginia (Mr. RAHALL) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Wisconsin.

GENERAL LEAVE

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

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

There was no objection.

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

U.S. Highway 41 between Milwaukee and Green Bay is slated to become part of the U.S. interstate system early next year. H.R. 2353 would simply allow trucks that exceed Federal weight limits but are currently authorized to operate on this road to continue to operate after the interstate designation.

□ 1700

This primarily involves agricultural crops during harvest season, milk, timber, scrap metal, and garbage. No new trucks in excess of Federal weight limits would be allowed on the new I–41. This would just maintain the status quo and not disrupt the current flow of commerce.

This is not unprecedented, as other roads which have become part of the interstate system have received this grandfather, including I–39 in Wisconsin, with no ill effect. In fact, the Wisconsin State Patrol, which is responsible for truck safety enforcement, has issued a statement in support of this bill, and is noting the safety benefits of not forcing these trucks off the safer interstate and onto State and local roads which are not designated to carry such traffic.

The bill before us is also supported by Republican and Democratic members of the Wisconsin House delegation, our two U.S. Senators, the Wisconsin Department of Transportation, and many State and local officials and organizations. I ask my House colleagues to approve this bill, which is so important to my State.

I reserve the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair wishes to again clarify with the gentleman whether the bill is with or without an amendment.

Mr. PETRI. It is without an amendment.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair would announce that the pending motion is that the House suspend the rules and pass the Union Calendar version of the bill, which is without amendment.

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

Congress has previously grandfathered truck weights on roads that obtained interstate designation, including Interstate 99 in Pennsylvania, Interstate 39 in Wisconsin and Interstate 68 in Maryland. I point that out to note that what is being proposed in the pending legislation is not without precedent or justification.

While I support this legislation, consideration by the House of this bill should not be construed as an indicator of movement on the broader debate of whether to increase truck weights generally. This is a limited extension of current standards on one road in one State, and I am evaluating it as such. I support this bill, and I urge its adoption.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. PETRI. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to my colleague from Wisconsin (Mr. RIBBLE).

Mr. RIBBLE. Thank you, Chairman PETRI.

I also want to thank the ranking member, Mr. RAHALL, for working with us. We advanced this bill through committee, and it passed our committee by voice vote.

Mr. Speaker, the bill is very simple. Chairman PETRI mentioned it maintains the status quo on a single highway in Wisconsin that is being changed from a U.S. highway to a U.S. interstate. Highway 41, from Green Bay, Wisconsin, to Milwaukee, is slated to become an interstate next year. To do that without any disruption to safety, it's important that we grandfather the current weight limits that are currently on the road, and this bill does exactly that.

It ensures that any trucks that drive on the road today will be able to drive on the road after the conversion. Without this bill, shippers would simply have two options, and neither would be good for safety. One option would be to move these trucks onto side roads, which, in Wisconsin, are often rural or through small towns that are not suited for truck traffic. The other option would be to put more trucks on the highway in order to comply with the lower weight limits. Neither option is good for safety, and neither option is good for Wisconsin.

As Chairman PETRI mentioned, it is supported by the Wisconsin State Patrol; it is supported by the Governor of Wisconsin; it is supported by the Wisconsin State Assembly, including the majority and ranking members; it is supported by the Wisconsin State Senate; and it is supported by the Wisconsin DOT.

As the ranking member mentioned, this is not a precedent-setting piece of legislation. In fact, it has happened in other parts of the country. I am in support of this legislation, and I urge my colleagues to support it.

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

Mr. PETRI. Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support the legislation before us, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. PETRI) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 2353.

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

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AUTHORIZING USE OF CAPITOL GROUNDS FOR DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA SPECIAL OLYMPICS LAW ENFORCEMENT TORCH RUN

Mr. RIBBLE. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 44) authorizing the use of the Capitol Grounds for the District of Columbia Special Olympics Law Enforcement Torch Run.

The Clerk read the title of the concurrent resolution.

The text of the concurrent resolution is as follows:

H. CON. RES. 44

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring),

SECTION 1. AUTHORIZATION OF USE OF THE CAPITOL GROUNDS FOR DC SPECIAL OLYMPICS LAW ENFORCEMENT TORCH RUN.

On September 27, 2013, or on such other date as the Speaker of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate may jointly designate, the 28th Annual District of Columbia Special Olympics Law Enforcement Torch Run (in this resolution referred to as the ''event'') may be run through the Capitol Grounds to carry the Special Olympics torch to honor local Special Olympics athletes.

SEC. 2. RESPONSIBILITY OF CAPITOL POLICE BOARD.

The Capitol Police Board shall take such actions as may be necessary to carry out the event.

SEC. 3. CONDITIONS RELATING TO PHYSICAL PREPARATIONS.

The Architect of the Capitol may prescribe conditions for physical preparations for the event.

SEC. 4. ENFORCEMENT OF RESTRICTIONS.

The Capitol Police Board shall provide for enforcement of the restrictions contained in section 5104(c) of title 40, United States Code, concerning sales, advertisements, displays, and solicitations on the Capitol Grounds, as well as other restrictions applicable to the Capitol Grounds, in connection with the event.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. RIBBLE) and the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia (Ms. NORTON) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Wisconsin.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. RIBBLE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on House Concurrent Resolution 44.

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

There was no objection.

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

H. Con. Res. 44 would authorize the use of the Capitol Grounds for the District of Columbia's Special Olympics Law Enforcement Torch Run that will be held on September 27, 2013.

I would first like to thank Ranking Member NORTON, of the Subcommittee on Economic Development, Public Buildings and Emergency Management, for introducing this resolution, as well as to thank Chairman BARLETTA of the subcommittee for cosponsoring it.

As in years past, the torch run will be launched from the West Terrace of the U.S. Capitol and will continue through the Capitol Grounds as part of the journey to the annual D.C. Special Olympics Summer Games.

The Special Olympics is an international organization dedicated to enriching the lives of children and adults with disabilities through athletics and competition. The Law Enforcement Torch Run began in 1981 when the police chief of Wichita, Kansas, saw an urgent need to raise funds for and to increase awareness of the Special Olympics. The Torch Run was then quickly adopted by the International Association of Chiefs of Police. Today, the Torch Run is the largest grassroots effort that raises funds and awareness for the Special Olympics program. The event in D.C. is one of many law enforcement torch runs throughout the country and across 40 nations.

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

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

I rise in support of House Concurrent Resolution 44, which authorizes the use of the Capitol Grounds for the 28th Annual Law Enforcement Torch Run, which benefits the District of Columbia Special Olympics.

The torch relay event has traditionally been associated with the summer D.C. Special Olympics, which took place this past May. Each year, approximately 2,500 Special Olympians compete in over a dozen events here in the Nation's Capital, and more than 1 million children and adults with special needs participate in Special Olympic programs worldwide. The Law Enforcement Torch Run has become a truly popular event on Capitol Hill and is an integral part of the fundraising efforts for the D.C. Special Olympics. Nearly 1,500 Law Enforcement Torch Run participants are expected to assemble at the West Terrace of the U.S. Capitol Building on September 27, 2013, for a 2.3-mile run to Fort McNair, which culminates in a picnic and a celebration for all participants.

The Special Olympics of D.C. provides year-round sports and fitness training, health screenings and athletic competition to all children and adults with intellectual disabilities, and it touches thousands of families in D.C. and the region. Participants are involved in basketball, bowling, golf, soccer, tennis, track and field, volleyball, and many other sports programs that address various levels of ability. Best of all, the different programs offered to Special Olympics athletes are always free of charge and are partially supported by the event that we would authorize today.

I am truly pleased to support such a meritorious organization and to support the passage of this resolution, and I ask my colleagues to do the same.

I thank the gentleman for his cooperation in bringing this bill.

As I have no further requests for time, Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. RIBBLE. This is a terrific event. It's one that every Member of Congress should support, and I encourage the adoption of it.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. RIBBLE) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the concurrent resolution, H. Con. Res. 44.

The question was taken.

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

WMD INTELLIGENCE AND INFORMATION SHARING ACT OF 2013

Mr. MEEHAN. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 1542) to amend the Homeland Security Act of 2002 to establish weapons of mass destruction intelligence and information sharing functions of the Office of Intelligence and Analysis of the Department of Homeland Security and to require dissemination of information analyzed by the Department to entities with responsibilities relating to homeland security, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 1542

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 ''WMD Intelligence and Information Sharing Act of 2013''.

SEC. 2. WEAPONS OF MASS DESTRUCTION INTELLIGENCE AND INFORMATION SHARING.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Subtitle A of title II of the Homeland Security Act of 2002 (6 U.S.C. 121 et seq.) is amended by adding at the end the following:

''SEC. 210G. WEAPONS OF MASS DESTRUCTION INTELLIGENCE AND INFORMATION SHARING.

''(a) IN GENERAL.—The Office of Intelligence and Analysis of the Department of Homeland Security shall—

''(1) support homeland security-focused intelligence analysis of terrorist actors, their claims, and their plans to conduct attacks involving chemical, biological, radiological, and nuclear materials against the Nation;

''(2) support homeland security-focused intelligence analysis of global infectious disease, public health, food, agricultural, and veterinary issues;

''(3) support homeland security-focused risk analysis and risk assessments of the homeland security hazards described in paragraphs (1) and (2) by providing relevant quantitative and nonquantitative threat information;

''(4) leverage existing and emerging homeland security intelligence capabilities and structures to enhance prevention, protection, response, and recovery efforts with respect to a chemical, biological, radiological, or nuclear attack;

''(5) share information and provide tailored analytical support on these threats to State, local, and tribal authorities as well as other national biosecurity and biodefense stakeholders; and

''(6) perform other responsibilities, as assigned by the Secretary.

''(b) COORDINATION.—Where appropriate, the Office of Intelligence and Analysis shall coordinate with other relevant Department components, others in the Intelligence Community, including the National Counter Proliferation Center, and other Federal, State, local, and tribal authorities, including officials from high-threat areas, and enable such entities to provide recommendations on optimal information sharing mechanisms, including expeditious sharing of classified information, and on how they can provide information to the Department.

''(c) REPORT.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than one year after the date of the enactment of this section and annually thereafter, the Secretary shall report to the appropriate congressional committees on—

''(A) the intelligence and information sharing activities under subsection (a) and of all relevant entities within the Department to counter the threat from weapons of mass destruction; and

''(B) the Department's activities in accordance with relevant intelligence strategies.

''(2) ASSESSMENT OF IMPLEMENTATION.—The report shall include—

''(A) a description of methods established to assess progress of the Office of Intelligence and Analysis in implementing this section; and

''(B) such assessment.

''(d) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

''(1) The term 'appropriate congressional committees' means the Committee on Homeland Security of the House of Representatives and any committee of the House of Representatives or the Senate having legislative jurisdiction under the rules of the House of Representatives or Senate, respectively, over the matter concerned.

''(2) The term 'Intelligence Community' has the meaning given that term in section 3(4) of the National Security Act of 1947 (50 U.S.C. 401a(4)).

''(3) The term 'national biosecurity and biodefense stakeholders' means officials from the Federal, State, local, and tribal authorities and individuals from the private sector who are involved in efforts to prevent, protect against, respond to, and recover from a biological attack or other phenomena that may have serious health consequences for the United States, including wide-scale fatalities or infectious disease outbreaks.''.

(b) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of contents in section 1(b) of such Act is amended by adding at the end of the items relating to such subtitle the following:

''Sec. 210G. Weapons of mass destruction intelligence and information sharing.''.

SEC. 3. DISSEMINATION OF INFORMATION ANALYZED BY THE DEPARTMENT TO STATE, LOCAL, TRIBAL, AND PRIVATE ENTITIES WITH RESPONSIBILITIES RELATING TO HOMELAND SECURITY.

Section 201(d)(8) of the Homeland Security Act of 2002 (6 U.S.C. 121(d)(8)) is amended by striking ''and to agencies of State'' and all that follows and inserting ''to State, local, tribal, and private entities with such responsibilities, and, as appropriate, to the public, in order to assist in preventing, deterring, or responding to acts of terrorism against the United States.''.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. MEEHAN) and the gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. THOMPSON) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. MEEHAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and include any extraneous material on the bill under consideration.

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

There was no objection.

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

I want to thank Homeland Security Committee Chairman MICHAEL MCCAUL and former Chairman PETER KING, as well as Ranking Member HIGGINS and Congresswoman JACKIE SPEIER, for joining me in introducing this bipartisan legislation.

I urge the support for H.R. 1542, the Weapons of Mass Destruction Intelligence and Information Sharing Act of 2013.

The legislation provides important guidance for disseminating WMD—that's weapons of mass destruction—intelligence information at the Department of Homeland Security. Weapons of mass destruction are considered for the purposes of this act to be chemical, biological, radiological, and nuclear weapons.

Mr. Speaker, in 2010, the Congress established the Commission on the Prevention of Weapons of Mass Destruction Proliferation and Terrorism. The Commission was chaired by former Senators Bob Graham and Jim Talent. A principal but, as of yet, unfilled recommendation from the Graham-Talent Commission was to assure that critical collaboration take place—collaboration among Homeland Security intelligence assets and other Federal, State and local partners—in protecting the homeland. It's time for Congress to do its part right now to ensure that the Nation is meeting its WMD detection and prevention responsibilities in a meaningful way.

Mr. Speaker, when I stood before this body on this bill last year, I had recently returned from the Middle East, and one of the takeaways from the trip was the number of chemical weapons stockpiled in Syria.

□ 1715

I raised the concern that during this extraordinary time of insecurity in the region, these weapons could wind up in the hands of al Qaeda or other terrorists. Since that time, we've tragically learned that Bashar al-Assad has indeed used chemical weapons on his own people, and we have the fear and concern of the threat of those who have expressed a desire in Iran to use weapons of mass destruction to assure that Israel does not exist.

Chemical weapons have completely changed the way our military prepares for operations. Just last week, the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff Martin Dempsey told the Senate Armed Services Committee that the military is preparing for the possibility of encountering chemical weapons in Syria. The risk of these weapons getting into the hands of terrorists continues to grow, and our military continues to become more vigilant. These risks and the current nature of the threat makes this legislation all the more relevant.

We must be doing more to assure that local and State law enforcement are privy to intelligence that could stop an attack. In fact, the potential for homegrown radicalization has increased, and therefore the need for law enforcement and Federal authorities to work together has increased all the more. I think we're all aware of the tragic circumstances of the attack in Boston that occurred all too recently. Although the FBI closed its case on Tamerlan Tsarnaev, a Treasury Enforcement Communications System, or TECS, alert was placed on him. It should have immediately pinged Homeland Security and Customs and Border Patrol. Therefore, when Tamerlan traveled to Russia in 2012 and subsequently returned to the U.S. only to set up a jihadist YouTube account, a red flag should have been raised, and Federal, State, and local officials should have been notified.

One of the purposes of this bill is to enhance the communication and collaboration between our Federal intelligence assets, particularly those of Homeland Security, and our Federal, State, and local partners.

Chemical, biological, radiological, and nuclear materials can be quite difficult to detect and to prevent. However, the danger they pose is unimaginable. My legislation is with recommendation from the Commission, and it will ensure sustained Department of Homeland Security commitment to facilitate the partnership across the intelligence community and the first responder community.

I urge support for this bill, and reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 1542, the WMD Intelligence and Information Sharing Act of 2013.

This bill would strengthen information-sharing at all levels of government regarding chemical, biological, radiological, and nuclear terrorist threats.

Since the attacks of September 11, 2011, concerns about an attack on U.S. soil with a weapon of mass destruction or dirty bomb has come into sharp focus. The Director of National Intelligence has stated that the intelligence community remains concerned about the prospect that a terrorist organization or non-state actor could exploit a weapon of mass destruction and, with little or no warning, inflict significant damage to our Nation's citizens and economy.

The potentially devastating nature of WMD attacks has come into greater focus in recent months. In particular,

there's evidence that chemical weapons were used in the Syrian civil war. Worries persist that in the chaos of this war, dangerous chemical agents could fall into the hands of terrorists or other rogue operators. The prospect that biological and nuclear weapons could fall into the wrong hands is also very concerning.

Recognizing that effective information-sharing is essential to preventing a WMD attack, H.R. 1542 requires the Department of Homeland Security to support homeland security-focused analysis of terrorist actors and their plans to conduct attacks involving chemical, biological, and nuclear materials against the Nation.

This bill requires DHS to coordinate with other components and the intelligence community and other Federal, State, local, and tribal authorities to provide recommendations on information-sharing mechanisms.

Robust partnership between DHS and local law enforcement is critical to enhancing situational awareness with respect to terrorism prevention, including prevention of a WMD attack.

I'm pleased to support this bipartisan bill and would like to acknowledge that the language under consideration today originated in comprehensive WMD legislation authored by my former committee colleague, Representative BILL PASCRELL of New Jersey.

While I support this measure, I would hope that this Congress could move forward on more comprehensive WMD prevention legislation in the very near future.

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

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

I thank the gentleman from Mississippi for his comments, and I also want to recognize, as he does, the great work that was done by Congressman PASCRELL on this issue, as well, here in this House. And when I had the good fortune to begin to do work on the House Homeland Security Committee, it was Congressman PASCRELL who was among those who brought this issue to our attention and the failure or the lack of the ability to see the issues that the Commission put forward be put into place. So I want to thank him for his good work on this issue, as well.

Mr. Speaker, I have no further speakers at this point. So if the gentleman from Mississippi has no further speakers, I'm certainly prepared to close, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, as I have no further speakers and I am prepared to close, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Speaker, I urge passage of H.R. 1542 today. Enactment of this measure will strengthen the partnership between the Department of Homeland Security and our Nation's first preventers against one of the most vexing homeland security threats, weapons of mass destruction.

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

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

I thank the gentleman from Mississippi, and I want to thank my colleagues for their support of H.R. 1542. This is a vitally important piece of legislation, as has been identified in the earlier comments of the gentleman from Mississippi, and I echo them myself, particularly this concern, as we engage in a world in which the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction, particularly those which are chemical weapons, which we do not know whether they may have fallen into the hands of not only Syria, but Libya, as well, creates a heightened sense of need and awareness on the part of those in our intelligence committees to do all to assure there is collaboration on intelligence that they derive in these areas with the partners on the Federal, State, and local levels.

So I urge Members to support this legislation, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. MEEHAN) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 1542.

The question was taken.

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

RECESS

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

Accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 24 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1831

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. HOLDING) at 6 o'clock and 31 minutes p.m.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

Votes will be taken in the following order:

H.R. 1542, by the yeas and nays;

H. Con. Res. 44, by the yeas and nays.

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

WMD INTELLIGENCE AND INFORMATION SHARING ACT OF 2013

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 1542) to amend the Homeland Security Act of 2002 to establish weapons of mass destruction intelligence and information sharing functions of the Office of Intelligence and Analysis of the Department of Homeland Security and to require dissemination of information analyzed by the Department to entities with responsibilities relating to homeland security, and for other purposes, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 388, nays 3, not voting 42, as follows:

[Roll No. 375]

YEAS—388

Aderholt	Collins (NY)	Gibson
Amash	Conaway	Gingrey (GA)
Amodei	Connolly	Gohmert
Andrews	Conyers	Goodlatte
Bachmann	Cook	Gosar
Bachus	Cooper	Gowdy
Barletta	Costa	Granger
Barr	Cotton	Graves (GA)
Barrow (GA)	Courtney	Graves (MO)
Barton	Cramer	Grayson
Bass	Crawford	Green, Al
Beatty	Crenshaw	Green, Gene
Becerra	Crowley	Griffin (AR)
Benishek	Cuellar	Griffith (VA)
Bentivolio	Cummings	Guthrie
Bera (CA)	Daines	Hahn
Bilirakis	Davis, Danny	Hall
Bishop (GA)	Davis, Rodney	Hanabusa
Bishop (NY)	Delaney	Harper
Bishop (UT)	DeLauro	Harris
Black	DelBene	Hartzler
Blackburn	Denham	Hastings (FL)
Blumenauer	Dent	Hastings (WA)
Bonamici	DeSantis	Heck (NV)
Bonner	DesJarlais	Heck (WA)
Boustany	Deutch	Hensarling
Brady (PA)	Diaz-Balart	Himes
Brady (TX)	Dingell	Hinojosa
Bridenstine	Doggett	Holding
Brooks (AL)	Doyle	Honda
Brooks (IN)	Duckworth	Hoyer
Broun (GA)	Duffy	Hudson
Brown (FL)	Duncan (SC)	Huelskamp
Brownley (CA)	Duncan (TN)	Huffman
Buchanan	Edwards	Huizenga (MI)
Burgess	Ellison	Hultgren
Bustos	Enyart	Hurt
Butterfield	Eshoo	Israel
Calvert	Esty	Issa
Camp	Farenthold	Jackson Lee
Cantor	Farr	Jeffries
Capito	Fattah	Jenkins
Capuano	Fincher	Johnson (GA)
Carney	Fitzpatrick	Johnson (OH)
Carson (IN)	Fleischmann	Johnson, E. B.
Cartwright	Fleming	Johnson, Sam
Cassidy	Flores	Jordan
Castor (FL)	Forbes	Joyce
Castro (TX)	Fortenberry	Kaptur
Chabot	Foster	Keating
Chaffetz	Foxx	Kelly (IL)
Chu	Frankel (FL)	Kelly (PA)
Cicilline	Franks (AZ)	Kennedy
Clarke	Frelinghuysen	Kildee
Clay	Fudge	Kilmer
Cleaver	Gabbard	Kind
Clyburn	Gallego	King (IA)
Coble	Garcia	King (NY)
Coffman	Gardner	Kinzinger (IL)
Cohen	Garrett	Kirkpatrick
Cole	Gerlach	Kline
Collins (GA)	Gibbs	Labrador

LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Langevin
Lankford
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latham
Latta
Levin
Lewis
LoBiondo
Loebsack
Long
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Lummis
Lynch
Maffei
Maloney, Carolyn
Maloney, Sean
Marino
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul
McClintock
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McHenry
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
McNerney
Meadows
Meehan
Meeks
Messer
Mica
Michaud
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, George
Moore
Moran
Mullin
Mulvaney
Murphy (FL)
Murphy (PA)
Napolitano
Neal
Negrete McLeod
Neugebauer
Noem
Nolan
Nugent
Nunes
Nunnelee
O'Rourke
Olson
Owens
Palazzo
Pascrell
Paulsen
Payne
Pearce
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Perry
Peters (CA)
Peters (MI)
Peterson
Petri
Pingree (ME)
Pittenger
Pitts
Pocan
Poe (TX)
Polis
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Price (NC)
Quigley
Radel
Rahall
Rangel
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rice (SC)
Richmond
Rigell
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rokita
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Runyan
Ruppersberger
Ryan (OH)
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sanford
Sarbanes
Scalise
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Schock
Schrader
Schwartz
Schweikert
Scott (VA)
Scott, Austin
Scott, David
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sessions
Sewell (AL)
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Sinema
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Southerland
Stewart
Stivers
Stockman
Stutzman
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Terry
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Titus
Tonko
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walorski
Walz
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watt
Waxman
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Welch
Wenstrup
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (FL)
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Woodall
Yarmuth
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (FL)
Young (IN)

NAYS—3

Jones
Lofgren
Massie

NOT VOTING—42

Alexander
Barber
Braley (IA)
Bucshon
Campbell
Capps
Cárdenas
Carter
Culberson
Davis (CA)
DeFazio
DeGette
Ellmers
Engel
Garamendi
Grijalva
Grimm
Gutiérrez
Hanna
Herrera Beutler
Higgins
Holt
Horsford
Hunter
Kingston
Kuster
Lee (CA)
Lipinski
Marchant
McCarthy (NY)
Meng
Miller, Gary
Nadler
Pallone
Pastor (AZ)
Reed
Rohrabacher
Royce
Rush
Speier
Tierney
Tsongas

□ 1856

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

Mr. SMITH of Texas changed his vote from ''nay'' to ''yea.''

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

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AUTHORIZING USE OF CAPITOL GROUNDS FOR DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA SPECIAL OLYMPICS LAW ENFORCEMENT TORCH RUN

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and agree to the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 44) authorizing the use of the Capitol Grounds for the District of Columbia Special Olympics Law Enforcement Torch Run, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the concurrent resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. RIBBLE) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the concurrent resolution.

This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 388, nays 0, not voting 45, as follows:

[Roll No. 376]

YEAS—388

Aderholt
Amash
Amodei
Andrews
Bachmann
Bachus
Barletta
Barr
Barrow (GA)
Barton
Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Benishek
Bentivolio
Bera (CA)
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Black
Blackburn
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Bonner
Boustany
Brady (PA)
Brady (TX)
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Broun (GA)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Buchanan
Burgess
Bustos
Butterfield
Calvert
Camp
Cantor
Capito
Capuano
Cárdenas
Carney
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Cassidy
Castor (FL)
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
Cummings
Daines
Davis, Danny
Davis, Rodney
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Deutch
Diaz-Balart
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle
Duckworth
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Edwards
Ellison
Enyart
Eshoo
Esty
Farenthold
Farr
Fattah
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
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)
Guthrie
Hahn
Hall
Hanabusa
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Heck (NV)
Heck (WA)
Hensarling
Himes
Hinojosa
Holding
Honda
Hoyer
Hudson
Huelskamp
Huffman
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hurt
Israel
Issa
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Jenkins
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Jordan
Joyce
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kelly (PA)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kinzinger (IL)
Kirkpatrick
Kline
Labrador
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Langevin
Lankford
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latham
Latta
Levin
Lewis
LoBiondo
Loebsack
Lofgren
Long
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Lummis
Lynch
Maffei
Maloney, Carolyn
Maloney, Sean
Marino
Massie
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul
McClintock
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McHenry
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
McNerney
Meadows
Meehan
Meeks
Messer
Mica
Michaud
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, George
Moore
Moran
Mullin
Mulvaney
Murphy (FL)
Murphy (PA)
Napolitano
Neal
Negrete McLeod
Neugebauer
Noem
Nolan
Nunes
Nunnelee
O'Rourke
Olson
Owens
Palazzo
Pascrell
Paulsen
Payne
Pearce
Perlmutter
Perry
Peters (CA)
Peters (MI)
Peterson
Petri
Pingree (ME)
Pittenger
Pitts
Pocan
Poe (TX)
Polis
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Price (NC)
Quigley
Radel
Rahall
Rangel
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rice (SC)
Richmond
Rigell
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rokita
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Runyan
Ruppersberger
Ryan (OH)
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sanford
Sarbanes
Scalise
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Schock
Schrader
Schwartz
Schweikert
Scott (VA)
Scott, Austin
Scott, David
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sessions
Sewell (AL)
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Sinema
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Southerland
Stewart
Stivers
Stockman
Stutzman
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Terry
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Titus
Tonko
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walorski
Walz
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watt
Waxman
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Welch
Wenstrup
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (FL)
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Woodall
Yarmuth
Yoder
Yoho
Young (FL)
Young (IN)

NOT VOTING—45

Alexander
Barber
Bishop (UT)
Braley (IA)
Bucshon
Campbell
Capps
Carter
Culberson
Davis (CA)
DeFazio
DeGette
Ellmers
Engel
Fleming
Grijalva
Grimm
Gutiérrez
Hanna
Herrera Beutler
Higgins
Holt
Horsford
Hunter
Kingston
Kuster
Lee (CA)
Lipinski
Marchant
McCarthy (NY)
Meng
Miller, Gary
Nadler
Nugent
Pallone
Pastor (AZ)
Pelosi
Reed
Rohrabacher
Royce
Rush
Speier
Tierney
Tsongas
Young (AK)

□ 1903

So (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the concurrent resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. ROYCE. Mr. Speaker, due to a runway accident at LaGuardia Airport in New York, I was unavoidably detained.

On rollcall No. 375 had I been present, I would have voted "aye."

On rollcall No. 376 had I been present, I would have voted "aye."

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. BRALEY of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I regret missing floor votes on Monday, July 22, 2013. Had I registered my vote, I would have voted: "yea" on rollcall 375, on Motion to Suspend the Rules and Pass, as amended, H.R. 1542—WMD Intelligence and Information Sharing Act of 2013; "yea" on rollcall 376, on Motion to Suspend the Rules and Pass, as amended, H. Con. Res. 44—Authorizing the use of the Capitol Ground for the District of Columbia Special Olympics Law Enforcement Torch Run.

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

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

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

There was no objection.

NO LABELS AND PROBLEM SOLVERS

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

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, last week a group of more than 80 Members of the House and Senate unveiled a package of legislative reforms to make government more efficient, effective, and less wasteful.

The bipartisan group is called ''No Labels''—encompassing Members of Congress who have committed to meet on a regular basis to find common ground among political parties on a range of policy issues.

I reach across the aisle on every single piece of legislation I introduce. It's the only way to actually get something done in this town. But this group is looking to create a larger dialogue among Members of Congress from different parties with different philosophies. It's a constructive group that is looking to advance solutions on a nonpartisan basis.

The package of nine bills they introduced last week might not solve all the Nation's problems, but they do demonstrate how common ground can be achieved, how Democrats and Republicans can work together as problem-solvers.

The more Members that we can bring together to work across the aisle on a consistent basis helps us to build trust and ultimately a legislative branch that functions a whole lot better.

SOCIAL SECURITY AND CHAINED CPI

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

Mr. SWALWELL of California. Mr. Speaker, I have spoken to my constituents who are concerned about the viability of Social Security. They want big ideas and long-term solutions. Instead, there are solutions right now and proposals to switch to a chained CPI formula to calculate cost-of-living adjustments for Social Security beneficiaries to save money. This would reduce benefits and only extend Social Security solvency for 2 years.

I do not support the use of chained CPI. It reduces the amount of Social Security checks, but not the rising cost of health care, water bills, or other fixed costs that seniors continue to face.

The importance of Social Security is evident in the lives of millions of beneficiaries, including my own father and grandmother. It's an earned benefit that these hardworking Americans have paid into their entire lives. That's why I have signed on to House Concurrent Resolution 34 to express my clear opposition to this misguided reduction in benefits.

But I don't stand here just to knock down ideas. Instead of reducing benefits through chained CPI, I believe we should raise the cap on payroll contributions. Currently, Social Security taxes are only collected on the first $113,000 of earnings. By raising the cap, we can extend Social Security solvency without cutting benefits.

I urge my colleagues to join me in opposing chained CPI.

KEEP COAL AS AN ENERGY RESOURCE

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

Mrs. CAPITO. Mr. Speaker, this week the House will consider two pieces of legislation that are vitally important to protect the jobs of thousands of West Virginians.

I rise as a proud cosponsor of the Coal Residuals Reuse and Management Act and the Energy Consumers Relief Act.

The Coal Residuals Reuse and Management Act will stop the EPA from implementing new coal ash regulations by empowering the States to create a permit program that meets their individual needs, while still providing environmental safeguards.

EPA's proposed regulation on coal ash would cost thousands of jobs and would increase electric bills for families and small businesses. It would also hinder the reuse of coal residuals, guaranteeing that more coal ash would end up in landfills instead of reused as concrete or cement.

The House will also consider the Energy Consumers Relief Act. This legislation requires that anytime EPA proposes a regulation that would cost more than $1 billion, that it is to be reviewed by other agencies, including the Department of Energy.

If the Secretary of Energy determines that a rule would have adverse effects on the economy, such as unemployment, wages, consumer prices, business and manufacturing activity, then the results must be made available to the public.

Thousands of workers have been laid off. We've got to get back to creating jobs in this country, and these two bills will do that.

SAFE CLIMATE CAUCUS

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

Mr. TONKO. Mr. Speaker, although the House continues to ignore climate change, others are busy assessing the problems and options to address the new situations that this Nation and our world will face in a warmer world. The United States Global Change Research Program's draft assessment suggests that we have work to do if we are to maintain a reliable, modern transportation system.

The committee's draft states that sea level rise, storm surge, extreme weather events, heat waves, and other manifestations of climate change are reducing the reliability and the capacity of our transportation system in many ways. The good news is the negative impacts can be reduced to rerouting, mode change, and other adaptive actions if we invest in our transportation network.

The States should not have to do this exercise alone. The Federal Government should lead the effort to deal and resolve climate change. We can improve our infrastructure, reduce the cost of natural disasters, and ensure that our transportation network serves our Nation's needs well into the future, all while creating jobs.

Let's stop denying reality. Let's address climate change. Let's move our Nation and the world forward.

RECOGNIZING MAPLE GROVE BEYOND THE YELLOW RIBBON

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

Mr. PAULSEN. Mr. Speaker, I stand today to commend and to congratulate the city of Maple Grove for becoming Minnesota's newest Beyond the Yellow Ribbon community. The combined efforts of Maple Grove, the people and

businesses of its community, and the Minnesota National Guard have helped ensure that our military members and their families have a strong support structure at home in their community.

Beyond the Yellow Ribbon is a unique program formed by the Minnesota National Guard to support the thousands of servicemembers who have served Minnesota since 9/11. It provides resources and training to servicemembers and their families before, during, and after their deployment, helping them find jobs and integrate back into their community.

As a Yellow Ribbon city, Maple Grove has gone above and beyond in supporting our troops and delivering a compassionate attitude to the many men and women who serve this great country, ensuring that our military members, when they come home, they come all the way home.

□ 1915

RELEASE BAHRAINI PRISONERS OF CONSCIENCE

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

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I rise to bring attention to the plight of Mahdi Abu Dheeb. Mahdi Abu Dheeb is the founder of the Bahrain Teachers Association and was arrested after taking part in pro-democracy protests in 2011. For this so-called crime, he was tortured and sentenced to 5 years in prison by a military court.

As a member of the Tom Lantos Human Rights Commission, I call for the immediate release of Abu Dheeb and all of the prisoners of conscience. Mahdi Abu Dheeb is a nonviolent activist imprisoned for his beliefs. His release would send a message that the Bahraini government cares about freedom, prosperity, and justice for all of its citizens.

THE ALL-SEEING EYE OF GOVERNMENT TRACKS CITIZEN MOVEMENT THROUGH LICENSE PLATE SURVEILLANCE

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

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, government agencies have been keeping track of Americans' whereabouts by amassing databases of millions of our license plates by using license plate scanners. The information captures data on movements of innocent American citizens going about their daily lives.

Unbeknown to Americans, government technology records our movement from the time we get in our car in the morning to every place we stop during the day, to the time we drive home. Plus, this data can be stored indefinitely.

This reminds me of the days when I was in the Soviet Union and saw how government spied on its citizens constantly. Do we really want a government to have the authority to record us anywhere we go during the day or during the night?

When you go to work, to lunch, to the barber shop, to the airport, to the movies, to the post office, to the banker, to the shopping center, to the car repair shop, to business meetings, to vacations, the parks, to the pool, to grandma's house, to church, to the grocery, to a friend's house, to the hospital, et cetera?

We know by recent experience, abusive government cannot be trusted with dragnet information data files it collects on Americans.

To me, freedom includes government not keeping personal daily logs on individuals and their activities. None of these activities are the government's business.

The Right of Privacy and the Right to be Left Alone include the right to keep snooping government surveillance out of our lives.

And that's just the way it is.

TROOPS IN AFGHANISTAN

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

Mr. KINZINGER of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, as a veteran of Iraq and Afghanistan, I am very concerned about the so-called ''zero option'' that was floated by the President.

Hundreds of thousands have fought for a victory for the Afghan people; and on the eve of victory for the Afghan people, the President is floating the option of no troops post-2014. I ask, Is the Taliban cheering that discussion, or are they scared of it? I would say that they are cheering the idea of no U.S. troops.

Sixty percent of the Afghan people are under the age of 20. It is a new society. Mr. Speaker, I am concerned that we are on the verge of snatching defeat from the jaws of victory. I would call on the President to announce a smaller post-2014 force and send a message to the Taliban that we will not back down and you will never rule Afghanistan again.

SOLUTIONS FOR OUR COUNTRY

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

Mrs. ROBY. Mr. Speaker, I am so pleased to have the opportunity tonight to be here in this Chamber with so many of our colleagues, either to discuss solutions—solutions for our country, solutions for our economy—and I am just going to invite my colleagues to participation in the conversation as they see fit.

Mr. Speaker, I want to just point out to you that we have reached out to our constituents about this leadership hour tonight on Twitter using #4jobs; and, Mr. Speaker, we are hopeful that tonight during this hour, we will continue that conversation with our constituents at #4jobs.

I have a lot of comments from my constituents back home that I'm eager to share as we go through this hour. I want to point out what many of you may have already read, and that is that the President has stated that he plans to pivot, once again, back to jobs and the economy. I thought, well, that's great news. That's what we have been pushing here. Many of you have seen us carrying around our laminated cards that talk about all of the jobs bills that we've passed in this Congress and, last, trying to promote economic growth in this country, to help get hardworking, taxpaying Americans back to work.

But I lost my enthusiasm when buried in that article was the President's statement: White House officials said three speeches will not offer new proposals or approaches.

So we're going to pivot back to jobs and the economy, but we have no new approaches and we have no new ideas. That to me is a pivoting of message and not a pivoting of policy. We are watching, and all of us have stories of going back home to our constituents and meeting with American families that continue to struggle. The rhetoric that we all feel is not helping the reality of the situation of the people that we were sent here to represent.

We are not losing faith; the American people are not losing faith because the President's message isn't working. They are losing faith because his policies aren't working. I'm the first to say that we've got to quit doing a lot of this pointing fingers, so I'm hopeful that tonight we can have this conversation, and I have some solutions that I'd like to put out there. You can't criticize without coming behind it and offering a solution. We've continuously done that in this House and will continue to do so, Mr. Speaker.

I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. KINZINGER of Illinois. I thank the gentlelady from Alabama for organizing this. It is great to be joined with you on this very important subject, the idea that over 7.5 percent of our fellow neighbors—and by the way, the President's own State of Illinois, it's higher than 7.5 percent. If you want to see what Big Government is going to eventually do, just look in my home State. You're going to see people that are desperately searching for work, that wake up every day just wondering if they are going to get a paycheck. If they have a job, they're wondering, Is this the last day? Am I going to go into work today and get that pink slip? Am I going to go into work today and have to tell my wife or husband or kids that we're going to have to tighten the belt because dad or mom just lost their job?

Illinois has been hit very hard. The reason Illinois has been hit very hard is not because it is cold. It is cold in Illinois sometimes in the winter, and my friend from Colorado can talk about that, too. It's not because it's flat, although parts of Illinois are very flat. Illinois, in fact, used to be and still maintains some edge, but used to be the powerhouse for manufacturing in the country, but we've seen the disappearing of manufacturing. And in the bipartisan spirit of not trying to point too many fingers, I'll say that's happened under all administrations, where we've seen manufacturing leave. But the one difference between Illinois and what we've seen, and the States that surround us, is a big, stifling, bloated, bureaucratic government, a government that is so big it takes away the opportunity for the free market to breathe.

Mr. Speaker, I understand, and I'll be the first to admit that my party, the Republican Party, has not done a great job of messaging. I think that's the understatement of the century. Sometimes we get absorbed in the idea of numbers, and we talk about what it means to balance the budget, but we don't explain why we want to balance the budget. Our colleagues on the other side of the aisle talk about the middle class and those in lower incomes.

My father ran a homeless shelter, and he did this for a couple of decades. I was raised in an environment to understand conservatism and how that works with those who are homeless and down and out. My mom is a public schoolteacher. I understand the importance of public education in our society. And I understand that I became a Republican because I believe that a kid born in inner-city Chicago just 40 or 50 minutes from my house should have the same opportunity as a kid born in Channahon, Illinois, where I live, or Inverness, Illinois, a wealthy suburb. They should have every opportunity to find personal achievement to get an education and be successful.

I look forward to having this conversation and talking about the fact that there is a compassion for those who need help and the fact that too many people are out of work today.

I know my colleague from Colorado (Mr. GARDNER) would like to say some things.

Mr. GARDNER. I thank my colleague from Illinois and the gentlelady from Alabama for her leadership and the things we truly need to get under control in order to build better lives for our families and families across this Nation. Thank you, Mr. Speaker, for the time tonight. I know the gentleman from Illinois said that his district is flat. I think I'll surprise a lot of people when I say that I represent the second largest geographic area in the State of Colorado in Congress and most of my district is flat as well, so I understand what the gentleman is talking about when he talks about vast areas of great flat land in the high plains of Colorado.

When we got elected in 2010, the three of us here tonight, who all got elected in 2010 because we wanted to find a way to make America work again, to empower people around this country, whether it was the inner cities of our biggest areas, to people in rural areas across Colorado and this Nation, empower them to build the life that they always wanted to, to pursue their dreams, to ensure that the American spirit is alive and well. I think most of us recognize that we do that when we give people the power to do that for themselves, to get government out of the way and let America work, to tear down regulations that prevent job creation, to help make sure that access to capital is easier, not more difficult, that energy is more affordable and not more costly. And over the past couple of years, we have pursued policies to do just that.

In fact, this upcoming week, we will be voting on legislation to ensure that energy policies don't drive up the cost that it takes to power our economy, but to ensure we have a safeguard over regulations that cost too much, to make sure that the Department of Energy is paying attention to what is happening at the EPA in terms of regulations.

We've passed legislation to make it easier for people in small dollar amounts to loan money to their neighbors, to their friends, to invest in businesses that they're excited about, to try to tear down hurdles to invest at the individual level. You don't need a stockbroker down on Wall Street to figure out how to get involved in the American economy. We've passed legislation that allows individuals to get involved at the very start-up level of companies, innovators and entrepreneurs around this country. We did it because we know there are people who have incredible ideas of how to create opportunity, incredible ideas of how to create new wealth where none existed before.

In my district, whether it's agriculture, whether it's energy, or whether it's high tech, entrepreneurs are leading this Nation. And I know the gentlelady from Alabama and the gentleman from Illinois have similar experiences. We talk tonight about what we can do for this country and legislation that we will be introducing. But we will also be talking about the impediments we have to a full, healthy, economic recovery, and that's the President's plan.

While the President talks a lot about the economy, and I hear that he's going to be talking once again about the economy, but, unfortunately, his actions haven't matched up and the people in this country are still suffering.

Mrs. ROBY. Like I mentioned at the beginning, buried in that article is when the President gives these speeches over the course of the next few days, there will be no new approaches or ideas. I also said that we can't stand here and criticize without offering our own recommendations about how we can do this better and how we feel like we have done it better and offered real solutions for hardworking Americans.

I wanted to compare some of the things that we've done with what I am hearing directly from my constituents. Tonight, Mr. Speaker, specifically we wanted to communicate with our constituents using #4jobs. These are some of the comments that we've gotten.

Chris Ray from Prattville, Alabama says:

> No business is going to risk hiring full-time employees like they did in the past because they will have to provide health care due to ObamaCare. Change that and address the widening skill gap, and I think businesses will begin to hire en masse. So it's a regulation problem and an education problem, in my opinion.

That's from Chris Ray from Prattville.

Well, let's look at our approach and how that matches up with the concerns of our constituents. Instead of pivoting back to no new ideas, because we remain focused on jobs and the economy, let's pivot away from ObamaCare to patient-centered health care that actually improves health care, brings down the cost, takes a market approach to help struggling families, and makes it harder for small businesses to hire; a health care system that ensures when you are sick, you and your doctor are in the driver's seat and making the decisions.

And then to address the concerns of Mr. Ray from Prattville, Alabama, about overburdensome regulations, we want to pivot again back to all these bills that we have offered that ease burdensome regulations so that businesses are free to expand and invest and hire so more people have good jobs.

Okay, so what regulations? I can look at any one of you and you could say, Keystone pipeline, the hindrance of allowing that to move forward; replacement to the health care law. I had a bill, the Working Families Flexibility Act, that amended part of the Fair Labor Standards Act, a 70-year-old restriction that doesn't allow compensatory time in lieu of cash payments for overtime in the private sector which would help these very Americans that we're talking about, about providing flexibility in the workforce and all of the uncertainty that we see. We have stood on this floor many times talking about testimonials that we have heard directly from business owners.

□ 1930

And it just never ceases to amaze me that we're having these discussions here. But we're all about to go home in August, and I would love to hear from even our colleagues on the other side of the aisle about what they're hearing from their businesses. Do they feel certainty? Do they feel like they can ramp things up and hire more people in this uncertain environment with all of this overburdensome regulation that we're

trying so hard to ease so more Americans can have jobs?

Mr. KINZINGER of Illinois. I just would like to add to that.

So, you know, we talked about regulations, and I know, look, the vast majority of Americans, myself included, are not small business owners. And so the vast majority of Americans can listen to this and say, I understand in theory what's being said, but it's not something I necessarily feel.

So let's try to put this in a way that I think a lot of people can relate to. If you're looking at buying a house, now, you have a big decision to make. You're ready to buy a new house. You've got a family you're providing for. You know what your budget is, what you can afford on a mortgage. You know what you can afford for your property taxes.

But let's say there's a lot of government uncertainty out there. Let's say, first off, you may not have a job in 6 months because of this economy. You may be saying, Boy, I just don't know what my cash flow is going to be like, and I don't know if it's going to be there.

Well, let's relate that to the bigger economy. These companies don't necessarily know what's going to be brought and put before them by Washington, D.C., what it's going to cost them.

Let's say your local government was threatening to raise property taxes in a major way. Well, now that comes into play.

Let's say there was a threat of losing your home mortgage interest deduction, and so, as you put that into play and you're trying to decide ''Do I buy this house?'' now that's a threat.

And you watch the television, and all over the television the idea is homes are collapsing in value. We remember that from a few years ago. That's uncertainty. That's the kind of uncertainty that every day Americans feel, the kind of uncertainty that you wake up sometimes in a cold sweat because you don't necessarily know what the next month is going to look like.

Well, Mr. Speaker, that's our point is take that uncertainty that an individual feels, but now put that on a bigger level of a business owner, a business owner who sometimes is the last person to get paid because they sign everybody else's paycheck first.

And sometimes these small business owners are literally in tears at night. They're in bed; they don't know whether they can make payroll. They know they have 5 or 10 people that are relying on them to provide that paycheck because they have families, too. That's a lot of pressure.

So we're not talking about making businesses not pay taxes. We're not talking about getting rid of all regulations and letting this be the Wild West of business, but we're talking about creating a level of certainty that these businesses can plan, and they can begin to know what they can do and take a deep breath and create jobs.

Mrs. ROBY. I want to share something that I pasted on Facebook last week, and it was an article. Many of you may have seen it, but it was in The Washington Post last Wednesday, and this is what I wrote:

If you've ever wondered just how ridiculous Federal regulations can be, just ask Marty the Magician. This front-page Washington Post article tells the story about how USDA regulators required a children's magician to license his trick rabbit and even compile an animal disaster plan to comply with the Federal mandates. It's a lighthearted tale, but the rabbit trail of regulations Marty was forced to navigate illustrates a lesson in one of Washington's bad old habits: the tendency to pile new rules on top of old ones, with officials using good intentions and vague laws to expand the outrage of the total bureaucracy.

If you haven't seen that, I strongly encourage you to get online and find a copy of it. It is a funny story, but it's really sad at the same time because it shows and highlights exactly what you're talking about for a guy that just wants to pull a rabbit out of a hat for some kids at a birthday party.

Mr. GARDNER. I've talked to countless individuals, business owners, people who wanted to start a business, that talked about what it took for them to get started. Some of them maxed out every credit card that they had. They applied for more credit cards just so they could max out to try to get the business off the ground.

Others are looking at it, saying, you know, I've got some great ideas where we could grow, we could expand, or I could even start my own business, but I can't do that because we don't have the ability or the means to do that.

But to your point about the USDA requiring a license of somebody's rabbit, The Wall Street Journal recently talked about a Competitive Enterprise Institute study estimating that Federal regulations cost over $1.8 trillion. Now, that's nearly $15,000 for every American household, $15,000 that, before you can start your business, before you do anything else, is already built into the cost of doing business. That's already part of the factor you have to overcome the regulations. $1.8 trillion, that's about the same size as Canada's GDP, the gross domestic product of Canada.

We are regulating this country to the size of Canada's gross domestic product; and yet we're hoping to solve our unemployment problem by getting people to put it all on the line and risk their houses, their lives to go out and start something, to go out and take a risk, and yet we have regulations, $15,000 every household.

How can we expect this economy to recover when we have the uncertainty, whether it's the President's health care bill, whether it's uncertainty over energy regulations, coal ash bills that we'll be dealing with this week, or, indeed, licensing a rabbit at USDA?

Mr. KINZINGER of Illinois. I understand that. And look, as we go forward, you hear the rhetoric a lot; right? I mean, the House of Representatives is filled with rhetoric; right? It's probably been like that since the day it was built and the day it was created.

Some of the rhetoric I've heard is that our party only cares about big business, that we only care about the 1 percent. Recently, we talked about taking food from the mouths of children; right? We heard about that.

Any sane, reasonable person knows that's not the case. Any sane, reasonable person knows, look, both sides of the aisle are very passionate about the future of the country; they want success. I think it's okay to have a conversation about how we get there.

I believe that my colleagues on the other side of the aisle want their country to be successful. I think if we can hear that they also agree that we want our country to be successful and we can have this conversation, this is so helpful.

Now, let me ask, in that vein, in having a fair and honest debate about this, let's see what the President's plans are. I mean, we hear constantly more and more stimulus spending.

Do you realize that the last stimulus bill that was really passed at midnight, basically, with a lot of Christmas tree ornaments for everybody to get ''yes'' votes, and only about 6 percent of that actually went to infrastructure, which is the job of the Federal Government in the first place; it's denoted in the Constitution. But, you know, interestingly to me, we spent, in one night, almost as much money, maybe even more money, but almost as much money as we had spent in Iraq to that point.

And what did we get for it? What did we get for it? We had a promise of unemployment staying low. It didn't.

Look, I get it. I believe that the President, I believe my colleagues on the other side of the aisle really thought this was going to be the thing that worked. I really believe they believed that. But it didn't. History shows it didn't. History shows this didn't work.

So are we going to really, honestly, revisit the idea of more and more stimulus spending again?

Mr. GARDNER. The gentleman brings up a good point. Just one instance of stimulus spending in my district where it actually threatens jobs, and that was a program that came out of the BTOP grant program to try to provide broadband to unserved and underserved areas across this country, a noble purpose, to try to make sure that we're connected to Internet technologies that we need with high speed, to make sure we're able to educate children and a competitive workforce.

But, unfortunately, the money that came out of the stimulus actually was used to duplicate services by the private sector. In some areas, they actually overbuilt, 100 percent with government money, services, a fiber-optic

cable that was already in place by the private sector.

Many of these companies are very small, small co-ops, telecoms that can't afford to have somebody come in and undermine them with the free government money, trying to offer undercost services, and yet that's exactly what happened in the stimulus bill. They were already providing the service, and yet the government came in and laid a line right next to the line that already existed in there. So that's what happened in the stimulus bill. Instead of creating jobs, it actually undermined our ability to build the private sector up.

And I know the gentlelady from Alabama has been an incredible leader on this.

Mrs. ROBY. Well, I just was thinking, while we were talking about this, part of the President's criticism in this article that came out is about Republicans' approach to just slashing spending.

If any of us cannot recognize that we are spending well beyond our means—we have $17 trillion in debt and our 4th year with over $1 trillion deficit. My kids, Margaret and George, are the reason that I'm here. Why I'm fighting is for that generation that's going to carry this burden after we're all gone.

And for us to not first admit that we have a problem as we move toward finding solutions and admitting that we are spending well beyond our means, that we do have to rein in spending, that we have to change the approach, that's when we see our economy improve. That's when we see hardworking American taxpaying families begin to be able to pick up and make that investment that you mentioned into the business so that they can be the job creators.

So this is great if the President wants to talk about this again because I see, for my kids' future, that this is how we're going to get this country back on track.

Mr. ROTHFUS. It's a pleasure to join this conversation. I thank the gentlelady from Alabama for starting it.

And we've heard this phrase for years now, ''pivot to jobs.'' And, frankly, I'm new here. I've been here a little over 6 months, maybe 7 months, and I've been looking at it from the outside, and I haven't seen that pivot to jobs.

And sometimes folks hear that phrase in Washington, D.C., and they think ''pivot to jobs.'' Well, what they really mean is pivot to government, and that's certainly what we've seen. Every time they think they're going to do something to help the job market, they pivot to more and more government.

Remember when they passed the health care bill, it was suggested that this is going to be a job creator. Well, it really hasn't been, and we're talking to businesses time and again who are not hiring people.

I had a great conversation with somebody in my district, a very tough conversation, and she was upset because her hours are being cut back because of the health care bill. And of course we see this across the country, not just in my district.

And then we see more government as a proposal for more jobs, but we see the regulations coming out of this town that are hurting the jobs in my district.

Just last week, we learned that some power plants are going to be closing in western Pennsylvania. These power plants are not in my district, but you know what? There are people who support those power plants by providing things to those power plants. You have jobs of truckers, of shippers, miners.

More regulations coming out of this town by these Federal elites doesn't help jobs. I'm glad that we're going to pivot to jobs.

I've talked about how you get jobs going in this country for quite a long time now, and I've stumbled on to three Rs. You remember the three Rs from going to school.

Well, the three Rs, I think the number one R, or the first R is ''repeal.'' Repeal ObamaCare.

The administration acknowledged, I think, the problems with this bill by coming out with a unilateral action just a couple of weeks ago, saying, Don't worry, big business; you don't have to comply for another year with the mandates here; but the everyday folks, you still have to comply.

So this House, last week, took an action to provide some relief there. We'll give the President the authority that he assumed unilaterally, but it needs to come from this House, and it's called the rule of law, that the President—it's our authority to give that waiver.

And so we passed a bill last week to say, You know what? Take another year. And to the individuals who are going to be struggling, give them the same break, too.

Mr. GARDNER. The gentleman from Pennsylvania, I think you make some great points, and I just am reminded of the businesses that I've talked to in my district, from employers who are concerned they may have to reduce hours of their workforce, or employees who've already had their hours reduced.

And I don't want to interrupt your comments, but I think you are pointing out how this is actually hurting the economy. So, as the President pivots to jobs, perhaps he should pivot away from the bad policies that are driving this economy downward.

Mr. ROTHFUS. When you look at the regulatory framework that we have, this House is soon to consider a bill known as the REINS Act. It's a very simple bill. It basically says to the agencies that are staffed by bureaucrats, not by individuals who are elected, who are accountable—the people in this House are accountable. We stand for election every 2 years. We get a performance review every 2 years. I tell the people in my district I'm their employee. I'm the employee of about 705,000 people, and I get a performance review every couple of years.

Well, you know, the regulators, we need a check and a balance on them.

□ 1945

So there's a thing called the REINS Act, a very simple bill that talks about if an agency puts out a regulation that's going to have an impact on this economy of $100 million or more. And as the gentleman from Colorado said earlier, the SBA, the Small Business Administration, has said that the cost of complying with all the regulations in our Federal Register is $1.8 trillion across the economy. The REINS Act says if you have $100 million or more in a regulation that's going to go on the economy, it comes back to the Congress for a vote. We get to take accountability there.

And so we get to assess whether the cost benefit is going to be good for this economy and good for the American people. Otherwise, the out-of-control government is going to continue to choke our communities and our businesses. And what happens? Middle class jobs are lost. Power plant workers. You can't replace jobs like that.

Mr. GARDNER. To the gentleman from Pennsylvania, I would just point out that this is not a radical Republican idea. The idea behind the REINS Act is actually something that's embraced across many States in the country right now. In Colorado, we have what's called the rule review bill. When an agency, whether it's the Department of Health, whether it's the Department of Agriculture, issues a new regulation, it actually comes to the State legislature for a vote by the State legislature. The State senate and the State house get to vote up on or down on whether or not that regulation is in the best interest of the people of Colorado, if it complies with the will of the legislature and the executive branch is carrying it out in the right way.

So the REINS Act that you point out is not some crazy idea. It's actually something that's in use right now to protect our economy from overreach.

Mr. KINZINGER of Illinois. Let me add to that. I want to briefly remind people about the State of Illinois. I'm so proud of the people of the State of Illinois. I love my State. I've lived there most of my life, except my time in the military. But let's look at that approach.

That approach has been a regulatory approach. That's been a big government approach. In fact, you look at, again, the south part of Chicago, and you see I think it was like nine people killed just in this last weekend. It's unreal. That's more than you will find killed in a day in Afghanistan. And this is an American city.

How is the best way to fix that? It's to pull people out of poverty. Illinois has a big government. Illinois has very

generous stuff they give. But Illinois is not good lately at generating jobs. So does big government help those people in a tough situation in south Chicago? You know what would help the people in south Chicago is an opportunity to go out, work hard, earn a living, and an opportunity to get ahead. That's what this is about.

This is about how do we give everybody the opportunity that all of us speaking on the floor of the House of Representatives have, who have all the different backgrounds that we've got, whether it was from our parents or our education or from whatever it was. How do we ensure that we replicate that?

Mr. ROTHFUS. The good news is that we can do that. If we empower our communities, empower individuals, and empower families, we can do that. The solutions are not inside this Beltway. They're out there. And Washington needs to get out of the way so that people can take their own initiative and build those real economies out there.

The third R I talked about—we've got repeal ObamaCare and replace it with commonsense, patient-centered reform that gets care to people. The second R is the REINS Act. Stop the overregulating. And thirdly, reform. Reform our Tax Code. We have the highest corporate tax rate in the world, the highest business taxes in the world. This is a world economy. Ninety-five percent of the consumers in the world are outside our borders. We need to be competing for the world's capital to come here to invest in our communities.

I was talking with a business in my district that is a subsidiary. They have a foreign owner. But they were trying to convince the foreign owner to invest in our country, which would be a good thing because that's going to mean more jobs. The parent company said, You're just not competitive right now. And that's a lost opportunity.

Our corporate tax rate is 35 percent. And do the corporations really pay that? Our Tax Code is so riddled with loopholes and picking the winners and the losers, rather than having a competitive, fair playing field. We have to move to have the most competitive tax system in the world.

Mr. GARDNER. I was speaking to a business in my district several months ago, and they had a conversation with somebody who isn't interested in reducing the burden on American families by making common sense out of our Tax Code, creating a flatter, fairer tax system. This is a manufacturing business in Colorado. They were talking about what their tax rate is and that they have looked at every way, every provision, every code possible to try to figure out how to lower that rate, and they can't go any further. They're still in the lower thirties.

The response they got from a legislator was, Well, you just need to hire a new accountant. Instead of actually trying to get to real reform of our Tax Code to lower the rate, flatten the code, they actually were told to just get a new accountant because they're not doing the right jobs. That's not how we're going to create jobs in this country.

Mr. KINZINGER of Illinois. I think the great point on that is why do we want to lower the tax rate, right? Is it because we want to protect the 1 percent? I've heard that a thousand times. And I'll be honest, I probably haven't been the best at coming back at that and explaining why we want to lower the Tax Code and why we want a fair Tax Code for everybody—a tax that people pay what they need to pay to the government, they aren't overcharged, but then people aren't also allowed to get away with being undercharged.

It's because on an individual level you literally have mothers filling their vans up with gasoline, buying groceries, and not able to afford to feed their children because the government, in some cases, takes a third of what these single mothers make. They just take it. And then we see people that can get away with all the loopholes in the system. They hire enough accountants and they don't pay that percent.

So let's make it fair for everybody.

Mrs. ROBY. But we got ourselves in that trouble, as far as the government goes. We can't point fingers at somebody that is smart and figures out how to do it. What we do is fix the problem, which is the underlying code, by making it fairer and flatter.

I'll just say, we were saying earlier, Mr. Speaker, that we've been communicating tonight with our constituents at #4Jobs. Just some of the things that I'm hearing go directly to this point.

Josh from Troy says:

Throw out the Tax Code.

I just want to highlight that the people that we're hearing from, Mr. Speaker, are saying exactly what our frustrations are on this floor, as the President tells us to pivot back to jobs and the economy.

James from Dothan, Alabama, says:

Taking out ObamaCare will help free employers to hire full-time employees, which our economy really needs.

Sara from Dothan:

Health care is the biggest problem. Employers are afraid to hire until they know the whole deal.

We've talked about that in your three R's, the repeal and the replace being the first, about this uncertainty not just in the regulatory environment that businesses have to deal with, or, with the Tax Code, which is the point you were all just making, but also in how these laws are going to be implemented. We've passed these gargantuan bills. We don't know what's in them. And they get passed. And now the uncertainty associated with it.

How many people have you talked to have had to hire a new person just to come into compliance with what they think the health care law might be, instead of hiring another individual that can then produce what that company produces to provide a product for this country? Instead, they're having to compete with all of the Federal employees that are put in place to implement these laws. Employers are going to go out to hire somebody just to come into compliance with the laws.

Now I hear from our bankers back in our State—and you've probably heard this one—that not only is the regulator showing up, but the regulator is now showing up with a lawyer as well. So the bank has to go get their lawyer there because they're not going to find themselves in a position to not be duly represented at a time when there's a Federal regulator in their office. This is just costing businesses more and more dollars.

Mr. ROTHFUS. It's not just costing businesses. Again, for the mom who's sitting at that kitchen table.

Mrs. ROBY. It's passed off to me, the consumer.

Mr. ROTHFUS. You think of the mom who no longer has the free checking. They're paying the monthly bills. They're looking at that utility bill. The electric bill is coming in. And remember when the President in 2008 said that electricity rates are necessarily going to skyrocket with his plan? Well, there's the mom who's going through the monthly bills, wondering how she's going to make ends meet. And all of a sudden there's another $5 or $10 or whatever the charge is going to be for losing the free checking. That's real money. And then she goes to the gas tank and all of a sudden prices are going up at the gas tank again. Another $10 there, $10 for the checking. That's $20 right there. And it grows and it grows and it grows.

Mrs. ROBY. Then she goes to the grocery store and she sees that the cost of milk is higher because the cost of gasoline is higher. I'm that mom that puts gas in her car and goes to the grocery store. And you can see the net effect that this has on the individual. So you're absolutely right. It's not just the businesses. The businesses then have to turn around and pass that cost on to the consumer.

We have solutions for these problems—real commonsensical solutions that we have put forth and put forth and put forth, reducing the regulatory environment, a health care solution that works, that allows for individuals to make those decisions between themselves and their doctor, an all-of-the-above energy plan that is actually put into practice here in the House of Representatives instead of being that campaign rhetoric. We really have demonstrated our belief in our approach to an all-of-the-above energy plan.

Speaking of energy, thanks for joining us.

Mr. GRIFFITH of Virginia. Glad to be with you this evening.

I thought it was interesting. You just raised the issue where the President

said that costs would necessarily skyrocket. I actually carry that quote around in my back pocket. So I pulled it out, my little folded-up version that I have, and what he said was:

When I was asked earlier about the issue of coal, you know, under my plan of cap-and-trade system, electricity rates would necessarily skyrocket. Even regardless of what I say about whether coal is good or bad because I'm capping greenhouse gases, coal power plants, you know, natural gas, you name it, whatever the plants were, whatever the industry was, they would have to retrofit their operations. That will cost money.

And you know what he said next? Exactly what you've been talking about. That they, talking about those plants that would have to retrofit, will pass that money on to consumers.

But it's not just the higher cost to the consumers, the moms and dads that are going out there shopping, trying to make ends meet, trying to look at their grocery bill getting bigger, their gas bill getting bigger, et cetera, et cetera, but it's also the impact on the families. Because no matter what they say about we can do this with jobs and we can create jobs, that's not been the case, particularly in my district, which is a natural gas and coal-producing district.

I was at a Remote Area Medical program this weekend in my district. Senator KAINE was there. I was doing intake and helping folks get those documents filled out. One of the people that came through was there because she needed some help, her husband needed some help, and her daughter needed some help. Her husband lost his job in the mine. This is happening all across my district, all through central Appalachia. They're laying off people. Every month, we're losing more and more jobs. A lot of folks don't know that those jobs are bringing in money to the community and that these are big-paying jobs. The estimate is somewhere between $75,000 and $95,000 dollars a year. That's what these jobs bring into the community.

So here's a lady that needs help because they've lost their job because of the policies of the administration that have killed those jobs. But as the gentleman previously stated, it's not just the jobs in the coal mines, it's not just the coal operators. It's the people that sell the cars to the people who used to work in the mine. It's the people who sell the mine safety equipment to the people who run the mines and work in the mines. It's the people who haul the coal. It's the people who work for the train companies that haul the coal. And it's the cost of making goods in the United States of America, where those costs are going up and up and up compared to other parts of the world.

In fact, there's an article just recently that says that Southeast Asia, even though natural gas is available to that Asian market, is choosing coal over and over again because per Btu, it's better for them to use coal. And a lot of times people talk about the low cost of natural gas in this country. I have to tell you, it's a great boon to us in many, many fields and lots of areas. But you have to remember, at $4 per million Btus created, coal and natural gas are equal. Anything above $4, coal is more efficient. It's cheaper to use. But guess what? This year we've been over $4. Right now, today, it's at $3.83. This year we've been over $4.

□ 2000

So what we're doing is we're passing these costs on. We're taking our jobs and we're shipping them overseas. And I know you all have heard this before, but Mr. Speaker, I want everybody in the country to know that we send these jobs overseas. They're making the goods that we used to make in this country; they're getting the money that we used to have in this country for our jobs, our employees. And according to a NASA study, it takes 10 days for the air from the middle of the Gobi Desert—that's in central China—to get to the Eastern Shore of my beloved Virginia. The air is coming back over here.

So what we need to be doing is we need to be looking for things that resolve this issue of the pollutions and so forth on a global basis, and we don't need to be killing jobs in the United States of America while we look for those solutions. We need to make sure we're encouraging those jobs in the United States of America.

Mr. KINZINGER of Illinois. That was very well said. Wouldn't it be nice if we could just all have conversations like that all the time? I mean, look, there are people that really believe that coal is bad. I disagree, I disagree vehemently. They believe it. And I'm sure my friend from Virginia would love to debate them, and debate them respectfully. I remember hearing rhetoric about our party supporting black lungs and that rhetoric that's meant to fuel instability and anger and division. That's what's disappointing to me.

Mr. Speaker, as I look to the President to lead this country, I want to look at a man who—of his past and who he is is a very dynamic person. He came from some very tough circumstances to become President of the United States. I wish he would say that, you know what, my job is to lead this conversation about jobs and the economy. My job is to lead this conversation. Look, we tried stimulus spending. I really thought it would work, but it didn't. Some Republicans, why don't you come to the White House. Why don't you have a conversation with me. I haven't been invited to the White House in years. Why don't you come to the White House, and let's have a conversation. Maybe we're not going to find any agreement, but at least we can respect each other's opinions and say what do we need to do to get this economy back on track. Why is it that over 7 percent of our neighbors don't have jobs? Many more than that are underemployed in jobs they don't want. Why is that? What can we do to come together?

Mr. GARDNER. One of the things that I think the gentleman brings up in tonight's conversation is he continues to talk about opportunity and what we stand for and what we've been able to do for jobs. I know that the gentlelady from Alabama is leading, if you're interested in engaging in this conversation around the country, wherever you are over the next days, weeks, months, as we talk about the economy, and beyond then, sending a tweet with the #4jobs in terms of engaging in this conversation. But you talked about what we can do. What we can do right now—and the gentleman from Virginia knows very well—it is energy.

We've talked to people about a manufacturing renaissance in this country. There are articles in the paper about businesses that were located in Germany that are looking to relocate into the United States. A company we talked to said the cost of energy in India is four times what they were paying here.

Traveling to my district, the Niobrara Formation, Eastern Plains, Western Slope, the energy that we can create there that's allowing this to happen. Whether it's coal, whether it's natural gas, whether it's renewable energy in my district, we have incredible opportunities to create these kinds of jobs that we know will put food on people's plates around the table, that will actually allow people to go on vacation, to afford to put gas in the car, to find a better way for their families.

So these are the kinds of jobs with this revolution that we can continue to foster, but we have to have a President that doesn't just pivot to jobs once in a while, but is committed to a long-term, healthy economy that gets the regulatory mess out of the way, that provides certainty.

I talked to a restaurant owner in my district. He owns three different bagel shops. He's actually going to have to sell one of them. He's worried because he doesn't know how he's going to be able to comply with the new health care plan. That's not the kind of certainty that we're looking for.

So don't stop what's going good in this country—the manufacturing renaissance, energy development, opportunity—and let's fix what's not going great; let's fix what's going wrong in this country.

Mrs. ROBY. I wanted to share a few numbers with you.

Since the President took office in January 2009, the U–6 unemployment rate has remained stuck at 14 percent. That's workers that are stuck in part-time jobs, or they just have dropped out of the workforce altogether. During that same time we've watched, as I mentioned earlier, the national debt go from $9.8 trillion to $16.9 trillion; and according to Gallup, 17.3 percent of Americans consider themselves underemployed, which goes to your point.

The President also promised 1 million new manufacturing jobs by the end of 2016, but factory employment has

continued to fall in 2013, where 4.3 million Americans have been out of work for 6 weeks or more. The point is that we started this hour talking about The Washington Post article where the President came out and said that he is going to pivot back to jobs and the economy; and to the gentleman from Colorado's point, he should have never left the issue of jobs and the economy.

Here in the House, our majority has been working tirelessly, as the gentleman from Illinois said, to bring the other side and say look, we have these commonsense solutions. This is about my kids and yours. This is about the future of this country. And we have an opportunity as leaders here in Washington representing all of the people that we do back home—and a responsibility at that—to do all that we can to get the Federal Government out of the way so that people like your constituent back home in Colorado with the bagel stores can open another bagel store instead of having to worry about closing.

Mr. KINZINGER of Illinois. Let me just add really briefly to that.

You talk about our ideas and the fact that, you know, look, the President can—the REINS Act, for instance, that makes sense, some of those things.

I make a promise here today: if the President comes to the Republicans and says, give me some ideas, and we give him ideas and he takes them, I will not go out and say that is a victory for Republicans.

So let's get the partisanship out of this and say it's time to not be Republicans or Democrats about this; it's time to be Americans. Look, Mr. Speaker, I would say that the President has made, in his mind, a valiant attempt to save the economy. Unfortunately, I hate to say it, it hasn't worked. So come to us. Let us give you some ideas. And if you adopt our ideas, I—I personally—promise that I will not go out and say that the Republican Party just rolled the President, or we just rolled the Democrats, or anything like that. I will say America just won because we've worked together to get some big things done.

Mr. GARDNER. That's exactly, at this time, what this country needs. I'm working, in a bipartisan fashion, with a Democrat from Vermont, PETER WELCH, on an energy-efficiency measure. The President has also talked about this kind of approach, using performance contracts to create jobs, lower the amount of energy consumed by the United States Government—the largest economy consumer in the country. But we do it without government mandates; we do it without government subsidies. But we're doing something that's going to create private sector jobs, save the taxpayer dollars, and use less energy at the Federal level. The President's doing this. We're doing this here.

These are the kinds of opportunities we have to work together that are creating jobs, And they're not to bow down or to kowtow to a certain element of an agenda. It's actually to move the country forward by doing the right thing.

Mr. GRIFFITH of Virginia. I believe if we use our energy sources—which I believe can be a bipartisan issue and it is in my part of the world in central Appalachia—but if we use our energy resources, I am convinced that the United States of America can remain the number one economic Nation in the world well into the next century—recognizing we've just started this one—well into the next century. But we have to make sure that Washington doesn't get in the way and completely stop that economic engine.

Mrs. ROBY. Well, I just want to thank all of my colleagues, Mr. Speaker, for joining us to talk about these important issues.

As we will hear from the President in his next three speeches about pivoting back to jobs and the economy, we here in the House remain focused on jobs and the economy for all Americans families. But we are also remaining focused on an all-of-the-above energy approach; repealing ObamaCare so that I can make those decisions with my doctor about what's best for me; a fairer, simpler Tax Code that we know will help all Americans. We've got to ease burdens and regulations so that businesses can create more jobs instead of having to worry about the ones that they're going to lose.

This is about making life work for Americans. This is about easing the pain that so many Americans are feeling because of this bloated government that refuses to, first and foremost, admit that we have a spending problem.

This is about refocusing our efforts here in the House and making sure that we are remembering the people that sent us here, the families that we've talked about tonight that we want to ensure that government is not hurting, but government is getting out of the way so that they can thrive in these United States of America.

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

CONGRESSIONAL BLACK CAUCUS

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

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. JEFFRIES. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous materials into the RECORD on the subject of this Special Order.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. JEFFRIES. Mr. Speaker, it is my honor and my privilege once again to anchor this CBC Special Order where, for the next 60 minutes, the members of the Congressional Black Caucus will have an opportunity to speak directly to the American people on the important issue of race in America. Where do we go from here?

The events of the last several weeks have startled many throughout this country; most recently, the verdict down in Florida where Mr. Zimmerman was acquitted and the result that shocked many all across this country, a verdict that was viewed by many as unjust.

A few weeks prior to that, the Supreme Court struck down an important provision of the Voting Rights Act, an act that had been the most effective piece of civil rights legislation in this country which has helped to bring our democracy to life and is designed to make sure that all Americans, regardless of race, have an opportunity to participate in our democracy in a meaningful way.

The debate over the farm bill that has left many people troubled by the fact that the SNAP program, in an unprecedented fashion, was left out; and if we don't come to an agreement here, our failure to step up and help those who are hungry will disproportionately have an effect on many in the African American community.

These are just some of the recent events that have come together to put us in a position where, as the President has recently indicated, it's time for us to have a meaningful conversation on race—a direct conversation, a forthright conversation, an honest conversation. That's why the members of the Congressional Black Caucus are here today.

We have made tremendous progress in America. We've come a long way in this great country, but we certainly still have a ways to go. The road to equality is still under construction, and we're here today to try and lay out a roadmap for how we can get closer to a more perfect union here in America.

I'm pleased today that we've been joined by the chairwoman of the Congressional Black Caucus, the distinguished gentlelady from Ohio (Ms. FUDGE), who has been such a tremendous, eloquent, forceful leader in her position as chair of the CBC.

I yield to the gentlewoman from Ohio.

Ms. FUDGE. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I want to thank you, Congressman JEFFRIES, for leading the Congressional Black Caucus Special Order hour on this very important topic tonight, a topic that has once again captured national attention and sparked a dialogue in communities across this Nation.

On Friday, President Obama helped provide context to the emotion Americans—and particularly African American men—have had around the tragedy of Trayvon Martin. Over the weekend, people of all ages and races gathered at Federal Government buildings in their

cities to stand together, to rise up for justice and in honor of Trayvon.

To many, the verdict we all heard on Saturday, July 13, was a miscarriage of justice, a consistent failure of our system that we've seen in this country one too many times. But tonight, I want to broaden this conversation on race and justice in America. I want to talk about how the emotion and discontent we are seeing from the average community and people of other races in this country is about much more than the Zimmerman verdict.

Much of the emotion we are seeing is in response to the continual attack on the rights and the closing of doors to opportunity for millions of individuals in this country. I'm not just talking about African Americans tonight. I'm talking about people who come from poor families, who are trying to find their way out of a cycle of poverty. I'm talking about students who are doing all they can to pay for school, but who have to choose between being in the classroom or paying back loans that are becoming a source of profit for the government to help decrease the deficit.

□ 2015

I'm talking about thousands of students from Historically Black Colleges and Universities who had to leave school because of changes to loans their parents took out to help them get an education. These changes were made without any consideration of how they would hurt these young people. I'm talking about tonight, Mr. Speaker, immigrants of Hispanic, African, Asian, and European descent who are working in this Nation but have no rights. I'm talking about people in communities across this Nation who must now fight harder to have their voices heard in our democracy because others will use subversive, and now permissible, tactics to make it harder to vote.

And, yes, to the Supreme Court of the United States, this is still a problem. You see, what we are experiencing and talking about right now is not just about Zimmerman. It is not just about race in America. It is about a system that should be just in creating and protecting the conditions for everyone to succeed, but instead it continues to favor some over others.

Since its inception in 1971, the Congressional Black Caucus has stood against injustice in our society so that inequity in treatment and opportunity under the law comes to an end so that all people are treated equally. Today, we continue that fight and ask America to join with us, not so that one group of any particular race can win, but so that, in the end, we all win.

Mr. JEFFRIES. I thank the distinguished chair of the CBC.

Our objective here today, as part of our mission in the Congress, is really just to make sure that all Americans, regardless of skin color, have access to the American Dream, have an opportunity to pursue life and liberty and happiness here in America, unencumbered by any barriers connected to the color of their skin. That's our hope in America. That will make America all that it can be, this great country even better, in the quest toward a more perfect Union.

I am pleased that we've been joined by the distinguished gentleman from New York, the lion of Lenox Avenue, a legendary Member of this great institution, Congressman CHARLES RANGEL.

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

Mr. RANGEL. Let me thank my friend and colleague from the great Borough of Brooklyn, city of New York, and my colleagues, for coming down to the floor.

Mr. Speaker, when we started the Congressional Black Caucus in 1971, I guess most people said: Why do you need a Black Caucus? Thirteen of you of color have been able to break the walls of racism and discrimination to reach the Halls of the United States Congress. Obviously, you don't have to say that you're Black.

What we tried to do then, and I guess we are still involved in that struggle, is to try to make certain that there's absolutely no need for any group of people to have to identify themselves for protection and for aggressiveness on programs because of their color.

I tell the gentleman from New York—I guess you were about born when we started the Caucus—I wish by the time you got here and you were looking for the Congressional Black Caucus, I would be able to say: Hakeem, that's all over. That's when we were not treated as full Americans. That's ancient times, the same way I had thought that poll taxes and things of that nature that the late—my predecessor—Adam Clayton Powell had been able to overcome.

So now comes the question where people feel so awkward to say race was a factor in the killing of young Mr. Martin. Why would they feel so awkward? It is so easy to understand if two people have a problem, one was minding his business, the other was stalking him, one had a gun and the other ended up dead, and he had already described to the police who he was following and it was a person of color. I don't think I've heard anyone challenge if the colors were reversed it wouldn't take all of the weeks, days and weeks that it took just to arrest somebody.

The reason that we are asking for the Justice Department to examine this is because the Justice Department has been successful in examining a whole lot of criminal activity where the local community somehow didn't see it. And George, as the family in Sanford calls him, obviously was a part of that family. I would think anybody would like somebody that's not a part of that family to go in and see what happened to Trayvon.

But having said that, if you want to know where do we go from here, we don't have to explain why Blacks are killing Blacks. If we say that's an epidemic, if we say that's a sickness, if we say that's a disaster, I ask my fellow Americans: What the heck do you do when you find a disaster? I think one of the things that you do is try to stop it from spreading and find out what do these areas have in common.

First of all, why is it that members of the Congressional Black Caucus have more of these than other Members in the Congress? We don't want to talk about color. Color is not an issue, right? Right.

But are we talking about the poorest communities that we have in the United States of America? Well, what's that got to do with it? Are we talking about communities that have the lousiest education system in the United States of America?

RANGEL, I don't see why you are bringing that up. Are we talking about sick people physically, where they have mental problems they call them crazy instead of disoriented?

RANGEL, you're going way off now. Are we talking about legislation that actually, in an investment of the United States, less money goes into these communities than communities of wealth?

Listen, you put all this together, RANGEL, that doesn't explain why people shoot each other.

Well, I don't know why people shoot each other, but I know one thing: Who doesn't shoot each other? Our young kids that are inspired. They've got education. They've got families. They've got a country that's the wind behind their wings that want to make a contribution to this great country. They can walk anywhere, talk anywhere, and nobody is going to be following them talking about, ''You look like someone that may hurt somebody.''

Now, we can't solve the problem unless we talk about it. If you are talking about Hurricane Sandy, if you are talking about fires, if you are talking about disasters, why can't we talk about this? This is costing America human beings. It is costing lives. It is costing money. It is costing us embarrassment.

We are losing in terms of having stronger productivity. We are losing in terms of competition. It is not just the communities and their families that are losing. America is losing, the same way we would not hesitate to reach out to any village or any town or any State that has any type of an epidemic.

So don't just look at the color. Look at the economic circumstances that are in the community that has it. If you want, you might want to look up and see what Member of Congress represents this.

They say that sometimes we look to cut our districts. Well, take a look. We didn't look to cut our districts. Our districts looked for us to represent them. The day we become color blind is the day the Constitution should say we walked out of this body.

Our job here is to give this Congress sight. ''Color'' isn't a dirty word. It could be one of the most beautiful words that we have in the United States of America. Different colors, different cultures, different languages, different ways that we can enjoy being with each other, learning from each other.

So if we have a problem in Chicago, in Dallas, in Harlem, let's share that problem. Whenever there is a problem anyplace in these great United States, that all of us can come together and try to bring people up so that this country doesn't have to take a back seat to anybody when it comes to saying: This is the land of the free; this is the home of the brave. And when you shoot someone down, you don't have to look at the color of the victim or the perpetrator, justice shall rein and discrimination and color shall not be a cause for lack of justice.

Let me thank my gentleman from Brooklyn for giving us this opportunity. We've taken a death. I was with the family this weekend. The mother said she lost her son but will dedicate her life to make certain she does all that she can so that no mother and father would lose their son. She didn't say ''Black''; she didn't say ''White.'' The President said that you have to walk in his shoes. Anybody that's a father that loses a teenage son, the more that son looks like you, the more pain that you suffered.

I am about to take my seat, but I was just reminded when I went to Korea and we were going up the lines, we saw all kinds of dead people: South Koreans, communist Koreans, North Koreans, and our colleagues that were White soldiers that had died before we got there. But my colleague from Brooklyn, before we got up to the lines, two trucks, the catafalios flew off them because of the speed that they were driving, and in those cars were Black dead soldiers in our uniform cross-length, like they were logs on the way to grave registration. I don't have to tell you we felt a lot different in looking at those people who looked exactly like us.

Thank you so much for this opportunity.

Mr. JEFFRIES. I thank the distinguished gentleman from New York for his very insightful, passionate, and wonderful remarks as they relate to the situation that we in America find ourselves in today, the way forward, as well as an understanding of why we have arrived in this position.

Before I turn the floor over to the distinguished gentlelady from Texas, I just want to thank the Congressman from Harlem for mentioning the fact that we here in America do have a capacity, I think, to address multiple problems at the same time. We can multitask.

It's wrong when a child is killed in the inner city. It's wrong when a child is killed, 17 years old, walking home down in Sanford, Florida. We have an ability to address all of these problems, but there are some in this country that criticize those of us who raise problems of injustice in America by immediately pointing out that in inner cities all across this country—in Brooklyn, in Harlem, in Houston, in Chicago—there's Black-on-Black violence. We understand that it is our children who are dying. That is why the CBC, this Friday, will be in Chicago convening a summit to discuss the problem of violence in the inner city communities in places like Chicago, Illinois. But that doesn't mean we turn a blind eye to injustices that exist in other parts of the system.

We are pleased that we've been joined by the distinguished gentlelady from Houston, Texas, who has been working hard on this issue, on many issues of concern and injustice here in America. So let me now yield to Representative SHEILA JACKSON LEE.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Let me thank the distinguished gentleman from New York and let me thank our chairperson, the Honorable MARCIA FUDGE, and all my colleagues that are on the floor tonight to accept the challenge that has been given over the airways by many people.

I want to thank Mr. JEFFRIES for pointing out—as I stand here as a mother, I would make the argument of a son, of a Black son. I can affirm that any child's life is of great value. In fact, we spent the weekend in Houston reaffirming the value of a child's life.

I want to cite and compliment Bishop James Dixon and Pastor Kirbyjon Caldwell, Pastors Henderson and Nash and Lawson and many other pastors that were there, who obviously joined with so many, including my colleague who is here on the floor of the House, Congressman AL GREEN. I heard nothing but an affirmation of the value of life.

I'm delighted as a lawyer and as a legislator that you reaffirm that African Americans do not coddle crime of any kind, a crime that happens to be between two African Americans or, in essence, two Caucasians. It is noted, if my facts are correct, that 84 percent of the crimes perpetrated on White Americans are done by White Americans.

□ 2030

Eighty six percent of the crimes done on Black persons, on Black Americans, are done by Black people.

It might be that it speaks again to the isolated, segregated neighborhoods that we travel in, but the one thing, Mr. Speaker, that is unique is that you can count on the fact that those African Americans who perpetrated crimes are incarcerated over and over again at a higher number than any other population in this Nation.

Their lives, the premise of much of what we are discussing tonight—and I would hope that as I finish that it will also be a pleading that we have a discussion on race. Let me just cite these numbers since I started out with the idea of incarceration. Incarceration is not an equal opportunity punishment.

For example, incarceration rates in the United States by race were as follows: 2,468 per 100,000 are Black; 1,038 per 100,000 are Latinos; 409 per 100,000 are White. The United States locks up its Black males at a rate 5.8 times higher than what previously has been known as one of the more racist countries in the world, which is South Africa. Under apartheid in 1993, Black males were only 851 per 100,000. In 2006, Black males were 4,789.

I would say to my colleagues and to the Speaker and to my colleagues here: What are we to think when the scales of justice are unequally balanced?

As my friends have said, it is the pain that we felt at the loss of Trayvon Martin and the simplicity of an arrest and then ultimately, with a Sanford jury in a State trial, that we could not even find with much evidence to prove that there was not enough commonality of cultural connection and that they could not see that something should have valued the loss of an innocent child who simply was walking to get home.

Maybe it is the words of Frederick Douglass that he said on April 16, 1883:

> It is a real calamity in this country for any man, guilty or not guilty, to be accused of a crime. We are all upset when that happens—guilty or not guilty, perpetrator or not—but it is an incomparably greater calamity for any colored man to be so accused. Justice is often painted with bandaged eyes. She is described in forensic eloquence as utterly blind to wealth or poverty, high or low, White or Black; but a mass of iron, however thick, could never blind American justice when a Black man happens to be on trial.

I would say to my colleagues that that is something we have to move beyond in America.

In an E.J. Dionne article, he said:

> The dignity and grace of Trayvon Martin's family should inspire all of us to keep our eyes on the future. We should not blind ourselves either to the persistence of racism or to our triumphs in pushing it back.

It does not help when those who are not like those of us who are on the floor—members of the Congressional Black Caucus—want to push back and call those of us who raise questions of justice—which, by the way, if you impact and correct the criminal justice system, you're going to impact Whites and Latinos, and you're going to impact African Americans. If you address the question of mandatory minimums, if you address the question of rehabilitation funding, if you address the question of providing housing and opportunity for work for those who have come out of prison—no matter from where they come out, the Federal system or, in fact, the State system—you make it better for all. But every time we raise the question of improving issues of justice, we get called or get labeled as being racist.

So I want to say to America and to our friends: Can we not be called ''Americans''? Because that is what the Congressional Black Caucus stands for.

In 1997, John Hope Franklin finished a report that called itself ''One America in the 21st Century: Forging a New Future.'' I will read one sentence:

America's greatest promise in the 21st century—which we're in right now—lies in our ability to harness the strength of our racial diversity.

We have not done that, and that is why the Congressional Black Caucus is here on the floor of the House to be able to accept the challenge that the President made as he indicated to America, unabashedly and without fear: that it's not only that Trayvon may have been my son, but that he may have been me.

The President said something very powerful. He said that we must, all of us—Members of Congress and Governors and pastors and plain civilians and young people—do some soul searching, and that we must as families and churches and workplaces find the possibility of being a little bit more honest and at least ask yourself your own questions: Am I ringing as much bias out of myself as I can? Am I judging people as much as I can based not on the color of their skin but on the content of their character? That, I would think, would be an appropriate exercise in the wake of this tragedy.

So tonight, Mr. Speaker, in joining with my colleagues, I'm going to stand unabashedly and ask for that kind of discussion. I want it for those who were standing on the street corners yesterday in Houston, Texas, shouting out that people were racist because they were concerned about a court decision that they didn't think was fair. I am concerned that all of those people who were marching would be labeled across America, in all the cities in which they were—peacefully without arrest or incident—as ''un-American.'' That's when we have to ring, if you will, our souls and find that we take from it the bias that we might perceive to be blocking us from understanding the richness of our diversity.

So I would argue that we are blessed because we have Asians, blessed because we have White people, blessed because we have Latinos, blessed because we have African Americans, blessed because of the diversity in sexual orientation, blessed because we have people who are short and tall, blessed because we have people who are wealthy and middle class, and blessed because as a Congress we can work on those who are impoverished, and we can stop the devastation of the SNAP and provide the opportunity for those individuals who are impoverished to do better.

Finally, let me say this. This past week, we honored an icon who moved me because of the diversity of those who were honoring—from Senator CORNYN from my State and Senator MCCONNELL, organized by MAXINE WATERS and ERIC CANTOR, the Speaker of the House of Representatives, Senator DURBIN, and on and on and on, Leader PELOSI and CLYBURN and HOYER—and I'm sure I've missed many others—our chairwoman and ELEANOR HOLMES NORTON. What a vast diversity of individuals who rose to honor Madiba, Nelson Mandela.

Nelson Mandela said something that should be potent as we look to fix the inequity of self-defense laws, as many of us look at racial profiling, which exists extensively in this country, as evidenced by the heinous crime that generated the hate crimes legislation in our State of Texas—the killing of James Byrd, an individual who was dismembered, who was an African American male who was minding his business while walking along a lonely rural road. Another man was killed in Mississippi, who just came to a hotel and went out to his car, and was killed tragically just because of who he was. The numbers of cases that we've had are that impact that we have not yet understood—the greatness of America.

So we've got to change stand-your-ground laws, and I intend to introduce that legislation this week. I look for bipartisan support because, as Senator MCCAIN said, maybe we need to look and to review federally what stand-your-ground laws are doing, not the Castle laws, but the extension of those that then carry this power out into the public where you do not have to retreat.

But I read these words of Mandela's. They say:

Our struggle has reached a decisive moment. We call on people to be able to intensify the struggle on all fronts.

He had another quote that I'd like to read:

Honor comes when you pursue and are determined in your struggle.

He mentioned the fact that, even with humiliation, even with insults and even with defeat, if you continue in your struggle, then there is honor due.

Let me thank Mr. JEFFRIES for laying out the opportunity for the Congressional Black Caucus to answer the question: the road to equality is under construction. Also, let me thank him for allowing us to rise to the floor.

I go to my seat by saying that equality will come when school districts like North Forest Independent School District will not be destroyed and closed in Houston, Texas, when we raise up education; equality will come when we focus on ridding this Nation of poverty by making sure that we have the kind of economic programs; and equality will come when we recognize that justice should roll down on all of us, and that we address the question of the criminalization of African American males and others so that justice is equally applied but, as the individuals return and have done their time, that they will come to a place that is welcoming so that they can serve their Nation.

For that reason, I yield back my time with a great hope of the same message that came in the treatise by John Hope Franklin. He chaired the committee on race and said that America's greatest promise is in her diversity.

I call upon my colleagues, my friends in Texas, my friends in my district: let's sit down at the table of harmony. Let's talk about race as we embrace each other and love each other, because that's what America is all about. Thank you to the Congressional Black Caucus for its vision and its leadership.

Mr. JEFFRIES. I thank the distinguished gentlelady from Texas for her very thoughtful and eloquent remarks.

We in the CBC simply want a justice system that is color blind. That should be our goal, our objective, our mission here in America. We can't have a set of laws unequally applied—over-enforced with one group that looks a certain way and under-enforced with another group that looks a different way. That's not the type of America we want.

One of the reasons so many folks were troubled with the verdict down in Florida was that it appeared that the stand-your-ground defense seemed available for a self-appointed vigilante who shot down a 17-year-old in cold blood but, apparently, was not available for a battered woman who simply fired a warning shot against someone who had had a history of abusing her. We just want a set of laws equally applied to everybody.

We are pleased that the distinguished gentlelady from New York—my neighbor back at home—who has been a fighter for justice here in the Congress over the last 6-plus years, has joined us. Let me now yield to Representative YVETTE CLARKE.

Ms. CLARKE. Mr. Speaker, let me thank the gentleman from Brooklyn, my closest colleague in the New York State delegation—both of our districts being in the borough of Brooklyn—for leading us in this Special Order hour today: Race in America—where do we go from here?

For more than a year, many people have tried to give voice to Trayvon Martin and to present his perspective into the debate concerning the injustice of the criminal justice system in Black males. With his remarks on Friday, President Obama provided Trayvon Martin a voice. By sharing his experiences, he offered America a perspective on the experiences of other African American men, women, boys, and girls, and he gave voice to millions of Americans who felt the pain of the Martin-Fulton Family as their own.

When President Obama introduced racial profiling into the conversation, he held up a mirror to the faces of all of us as Americans—to a truth that some commentators have tried to ignore and that many more are in deep denial of—for, despite the promises of equality in the Declaration of Independence and the Constitution, our practices have been inadequate to our ideals. Our beliefs, the best traditions of our Nation, have not become a reality for millions of Americans of African descent. The tragic death of our

young man Trayvon Martin, followed by the acquittal of the man who pursued him and killed him, has reminded us that, although it may seem as if African Americans and other minorities have achieved full equality in our civil society, we are still victims of racial profiling—in violation of our laws and our morals.

The lives of Black men and women are not accorded the same value as the lives of White Americans. This is the reality for far too many Black Americans. Compounding the 21st century's divisive racial tone is the reality of knowing that our lives have been devalued, our exercise of the liberties to which Americans have been entitled have been devalued and diminished, such as the right to vote. With millions of Americans, I was deeply disappointed with the Supreme Court's decision to prevent the enforcement of the Voting Rights Act. We cannot forget that prior to the enactment of voting rights that democracy did not exist in many parts of the Nation, with the deliberate denial of the right to vote to Black people.

□ 2045

Mr. Speaker, while the Supreme Court's recent decision and the Trayvon Martin case are crucial to this conversation, they cannot fully address the problem of racial inequality without a discussion of racial profiling, the structural discrimination of our judicial system, the disintegration of the educational system, and the lack of jobs and economic opportunity, especially for the African American community.

Tonight I want to just quickly hit on the issue of racial profiling and our justice system. In a June 2013 report from the ACLU, ''The War on Marijuana in Black and White'' demonstrated that even as rates of marijuana usage between Blacks and Whites are comparable, Blacks are nearly four times more likely to be arrested for marijuana possession.

In my district in Brooklyn, and all over New York City, African American young men are harassed simply because of the color of their skin. The excessive use of Stop-and-Frisk, known in New York City as the Stop-and-Frisk program, it has been proven that this program disproportionately targets African Americans and Latinos, these two groups comprising 87 percent of all stops while only about 50 percent of the City's population.

According to the New York City Civil Liberties Union, the number of stops of young Black men neared the entire population of young Black men, 133,119, as compared to 158,406 in the population in the year 2012. That means that there were some young men that were getting stopped more than once

Commissioner Kelly increased the number of stops 600 percent since 2002 when he became Commissioner, reaching a peak of almost 700,000 stops in the year 2011.

They have almost a 90 percent fail rate. Only 12 percent of the number of massive stops result in an arrest or a summons and have been less effective in getting guns off the street than random searches of all New Yorkers would. It is a clear violation of civil rights and civil liberties of African American and Latino men.

So where do we going from here?

Well, members of the Congressional Black Caucus have introduced and sponsored legislation on racial profiling, and that will represent a comprehensive Federal commitment to healing the rift caused by racial profiling and restoring public confidence in the criminal justice system at large.

I want to encourage my colleagues to take a look at this legislation, because this is where the conversation can begin, and this is where the healing should start. This can be done through the changing of policies and procedures underlying the practice of racial profiling and through, like the President said, working with the State and local governments on training that helps enforcement officials become more aware of potential racial and ethnic bias.

I urge my colleagues to go back to their districts and to hold town hall meetings and discussions on race. Speak to your constituents. Speak to your families and friends. Have conversations at home and in your neighborhoods.

We must not sit back and watch the progress gained by those who came before us who worked diligently and often made the ultimate sacrifice for freedom and the rights that we all enjoy today, we cannot permit their sacrifices to be forgotten or erased from history. Today we must take a stand against further racial injustice of all kinds. Enough is enough.

You know, it's ironic, because when I think about my age and having come of age in the 1970s in the United States of America, there was just a lot more optimism about us becoming a more perfect Union. And to arrive in the House of Representatives in the 21st century and see the type of digression that is taking place in our Nation, to know that my nephews that are millennials are going through some of the same issues that young men in the 1950s and 1960s were facing in a desegregated Nation is extraordinarily painful.

We are an enlightened civil society, and we have an obligation to do what we can to make sure that all Americans are worthy of all that this Nation has to offer. And that means that we have to have an honest conversation about the inequities, the racial injustices that continue to persist. While not as blatant as they were in the 1950s and sixties, they still fester and continue to be a blight on a Nation that is poised for greatness.

Mr. JEFFRIES. I thank the distinguished gentlelady from New York.

The conversation on race is not an easy one, but certainly is a necessary one here in America and one that should be embraced because the diversity of our society, as the gentleman from New York, Congressman RANGEL, pointed out, is one of our greatest strengths here in America.

We've been joined by a classmate of mine, the distinguished gentleman from New Jersey, Representative DONALD PAYNE, not only one of the sharpest dressed Members of Congress, but he's got one of the sharpest minds. And so I'm pleased to yield to him such time as he may consume.

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Speaker, let me thank the gentleman from New York. It is really an honor and a privilege to stand here with him as one of the freshmen Members in the 113th Congress to discuss an issue that has plagued this Nation for centuries.

I am here tonight to talk to you about an issue that has interested me for most of my life, and it is the issue around people having respect for one another, irrespective of their racial makeup.

I grew up in Newark, New Jersey, which is a town, the largest city in the State of New Jersey, with many suburbs surrounding that metropolis, and our travels in and out of those communities were fraught at some times with peril for young men. So that was 40 years ago.

But fast-forward to the past 18 months, and what do we have? We have the same situation still before us. A young boy armed with a bag of candy and a drink is profiled and followed. The car follows him, and then the individual gets out of the car and follows the young man on foot.

Now, at 17, I wonder how I would have felt if a car had followed me, a grown man gets out of the car and continues to follow me. It is a situation that I have thought about over the past 18 months because of my triplet children. Two are boys who just turned 15, so they're right around Trayvon Martin's age. And I wonder: Have I taught them enough to be safe? Will they find themselves in this position?

And on hearing the outcome of the verdict that Saturday evening, one of my young sons texted his mother to say what had happened and why had that happened, because we taught them in this Nation that justice prevails. And how the victim becomes the guilty party in a situation like this I still cannot understand, because it became about who and what this young man was and what he had done and what he had been doing rather than the perpetrator following him.

I was fortunate to be in New York during the time of the 100 rallies across the Nation in finding justice for Trayvon Martin. I proudly stood with Trayvon Martin's mother on Saturday, a dignified woman.

In all of this crisis and sorrow there must be in her heart, she's remained a dignified individual and only asked for justice for her son; not that people should act out in a manner in which

the masses thought that they would, but to have a peaceful demonstration about the injustices that came out of that case.

Stand your ground. Did Trayvon Martin have the right to stand his ground? He was the one that was being followed. He was the one being profiled. When did he lose the right to defend himself?

We are in a difficult time here in this country, but it seems like we always get to this point at some time and we start the conversation, but we never finish it. We need to have an open discussion about the conditions that we find ourselves in as Americans, all of us. We need to understand both sides of the issue, all sides of the issue so we can move forward with this great experiment called the United States of America.

It is the greatest Nation in the world, it is true, and many come here to live the American Dream. Many nations emulate the United States. But we have a long way to go in this Nation as well. The injustices that we're facing are widespread and threaten some of the most fundamental rights of this country.

So I ask my colleagues, let's have that discussion. I ask the citizens of the United States, let's have that discussion so we can form that more perfect Union.

I have had situations in my life where I've found myself not in the exact situation of Trayvon Martin, but issues of racism that were perpetrated on me. But I'm not bitter towards an entire population. Those were individuals. We have to come to grips with prejudging people in this country.

And I'd just like to end with something Dr. King said:

> In the end, we will not remember the words of our enemies, but the silence of our friends.

And my father, the late Congressman Donald Payne, who was a great teacher, humanitarian, and felt all people deserved the right to freedom, justice, and equality, taught me a poem very early on in my life, and I will end with that. It said:

> Whether you have blonde fleecy locks or black complexion,
> It cannot forfeit nature's claim;
> Skin may differ in black and white,
> But it is all just the same.
> Were I so tall as to reach the poles,
> Or span the oceans with my hands;
> I must be measured by my soul,
> The mind is the standard of a man.

Mr. JEFFRIES. I thank Congressman PAYNE for those very eloquent remarks and for noting the conversation that he had with his young son, conversations that have been taking place in the aftermath of this verdict in households all across this country, with parents and their young sons and daughters trying to make sense of an inexplicable verdict in the eyes of many.

Mr. Speaker, how much time do we have remaining in this Special Order?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman has 10 minutes remaining.

Mr. JEFFRIES. I'm going to now turn to the distinguished gentlelady from the Virgin Islands, Dr. DONNA CHRISTENSEN.

Mrs. CHRISTENSEN. Thank you for yielding.

And it's my pleasure to join the CBC for another Special Order, and thank you for bringing this issue of race in America before the American public tonight, because racism in America is so pervasive in so many aspects of our lives. Its impact, of course, was most recently and painfully felt in the killing of young Trayvon Martin, as we've spoken about this evening, and of course the insensitivity, the slow, the poor, and the racially influenced response of the justice system to his death.

□ 2100

Our prayers, our thoughts, and our support are with his parents and loved ones, and all of our families who face the same fears for their children.

But I want to speak just briefly about how race in America affects health care of African Americans, Latinos, and other people of color. According to the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights, despite the existence of civil rights legislation, equal treatment and equal access are not a reality for racial-ethnic minorities and women in the current climate of the health care industry. Many barriers limit both the quality of care and utilization for these groups, including discrimination.

Just in the last National Health Care Disparities Report of 2012, it reported that Blacks received worse care than Whites, and Hispanics received worse care than non-Hispanic Whites for about 40 percent of quality measures. American Indians and Alaskan Natives, worse care than Whites for one-third of quality measures. Asians received worse care than Whites for about one-quarter of quality measures. And it goes on and on and on.

But just to be very brief, I want to just show you one example of how racism affects health care of African Americans and Latinos. Because I think this is a stark example of how it happened.

This is an emergency mortality rate. It's a study done by a doctor not too far from here. You can see that whether they're insured or uninsured, African Americans and Latinos arriving at an emergency room with the exact same injuries are more likely to die. In fact, when compared with an uninsured White patient, Black patients with equivalent injuries but without insurance had a 78 percent higher risk of dying; uninsured Hispanics, a 130 percent higher risk of dying. So even if Trayvon Martin had lived, you wonder what would have happened if he had arrived at the emergency room.

And so I just wanted to add the impact of racism in American, which continues to this day, and how it affects the health care and the lives of African Americans and Latinos. The Affordable Care Act, as we talk about where do we go from here, has begun to change this by providing coverage and access to care.

We really have to find ways to change the heart of America. And we can't do that by legislation. We thank the CBC for all of its efforts, like the efforts that will take place in Chicago and across the country.

Mr. JEFFRIES. I thank the distinguished gentlelady for those very powerful remarks and observations.

I now yield to the distinguished gentleman from Houston, Texas, a fighter for civil rights and equality prior to arriving in the Congress and during his tenure here in this great institution, Representative AL GREEN.

Mr. AL GREEN of Texas. I thank you very much for the opportunity to speak. I do want your constituents to know that you have been an awesome Congressperson from the awesome Eighth District. And if they are as proud of you as I am, you shall have an opportunity to continue to serve them. I wish you much success in Congress.

I would like to thank the President of the United States of America for his comments on this issue of Blacks—especially Black males—in America. I believe that the President understands that although the arc of the moral universe is long, it bends toward justice. But it doesn't bend toward justice without some assistance. It doesn't have the kinetic energy to do so without some help from mortals. I think the President went a long way toward bending the arc of the moral universe toward justice with his comments as they relate to the plight of African American males. I'm grateful and I'm thankful.

With reference to the Trayvon Martin trial, we live in a world where it's not enough for things to be right. They must also look right. And it doesn't look right when a 17-year-old boy leaves home to go to the store, and on his way back home, unarmed, encounters a person with a firearm, is killed—and it is done so with impunity. It may be right, but it does not look right. And because it doesn't look right, we have to understand that although you can have a fair trial, you may not have justice as the outcome.

I believe that this trial was fair to Mr. Zimmerman. I don't believe it was fair to Trayvon Martin. And I don't believe that we can say that this was a just decision.

Now there are people who would differ with me and say that you shouldn't say this. Many of these same people would say that O.J. Simpson had a fair trial but that he didn't get a just verdict from that court. And the same people who don't want me—us—to protest, you have to understand that if it was right for the farmers to come here in their tractors and protest the conditions related to farming, then it's right for me to protest. If it was right for the veterans after World War I to come up here and set up a tent city in protest,

it's right for me to protest. If it was right for the Tea Party to come to Congress and stand along the way across from one building to another and protest, then it's right for me to protest. And by the way, I think it was right for them to come to Congress to protest. I support their right to protest.

If you think it's wrong for me to protest, then you've got to change the First Amendment to the Constitution of the United States of America. We have the right. We must exercise the right because an injustice has taken place.

Because time is short, and there is at least one other speaker, I want to mention this as my closing remark. There's something bigger than Trayvon Martin and Mr. Zimmerman that's taking place in this country, indeed, in the world. There is something bigger than us as individuals and individual cases.

J. Patrick Kinney has appropriately put this together. He has a poem styled ''The Cold Within'' that addresses something that we have to confront—this coldness that's so pervasive. This is his poem:

Six humans trapped by happenstance
in bleak and bitter cold.
Each one possessed a stick of wood,
or so the story's told.
Their dying fire in need of logs,
the first man held his back
for of the faces round the fire
he noticed one was Black.
The next man looking 'cross the way
saw one not of his church
and couldn't bring himself to give
the fire his stick of birch.
The third one sat in tattered clothes.
He gave his coat a hitch.
Why should his log be put to use
to warm the idle rich?
The rich man just sat back and thought
of the wealth he had in store
and how to keep what he had earned
from the lazy shiftless poor.
The Black man's face bespoke revenge
as the fire passed from his sight.
For all he saw in his stick of wood
was a chance to spite the White.
The last man of this forlorn group
did nought except for gain.
Giving only to those who gave
was how he played the game.
Their logs held tight in death's still hands
was proof of human sin.
They didn't die from the cold without,
they died from the cold within.

Mr. JEFFRIES. I thank the distinguished gentleman from Texas.

We, unfortunately, are approaching the close of this Special Order. To close us out in the remaining time we have Representative MARC VEASEY from Dallas, who's done a tremendous job as a Member of this freshman class.

Mr. VEASEY. Thank you, Congressman JEFFRIES. I appreciate you letting me talk about this very important topic because we need to talk more about equality and have a conversation on race and injustice in this country.

I really liked a lot what Representative CLARKE, your colleague from New York, said when she talked about the over-enforcement of African American males, particularly when it comes to stop and frisk, and other Members that talked a lot about the verdict in the Trayvon Martin trial that really did discourage a lot of people that were really starting to gain hope in our criminal justice system and thought that things were getting better.

I'm concerned about what is going on right now with voting. Because in my own State of Texas, there's been so many laws that have been enacted, laws that have attempted to be enacted that would scale back many of the gains that African Americans have made when it comes to exercising our suffrage—discriminatory practices that I didn't grow up with when I was a young man but that many people that were before me had to deal with and thought that we had made the progress.

And so at some other point in time I do want to continue to talk about this. Because whether it's Trayvon Martin, whether it's over-enforcement of African Americans and the disproportionate number of African Americans that end up as part of the criminal justice system, or protecting our Voting Rights Act, we need to talk about it more because I, too, believe that we can do better as a country and a Nation.

I want to thank you for holding this hour and also everybody in the Black caucus that talked about this very important topic this evening.

Mr. JEFFRIES. I thank the distinguished gentleman from Texas. We've come a long way in America. But we, of course, still have a ways to go.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, as we celebrate the 150th anniversary of the Emancipation Proclamation and the 50th anniversary of the historic March on Washington, a new fight for the preservation of equal protection and justice under the law has emerged.

Just last month, the United States Supreme Court overturned a critical component of the decades-old Voting Rights Act, effectively exposing millions of Americans to discriminatory voting practices. Our inability to protect American citizens from discrimination while exercising the right to vote brings into question our ability to implement other aspects of the law without regard to race.

In fact, there is significant evidence that we have much more work to do to create a nondiscriminatory justice system. The recent court decision involving Trayvon Martin's death is the latest injustice suggestive of discrimination throughout this system, which is further exemplified by the harrowing statistics as they pertain to minorities. For example, African Americans account for only thirteen percent of the U.S. population, yet they represent more than 28 percent of all arrests. Further, while more than half of all the individuals on death row are people of color, 42% are African American.

Mr. Speaker, we must reflect on our values and determine what kind of future we would like to see for our children. Do we want to leave behind a divided nation where the rule of law applies only to select groups of individuals? Or do we want to live in a nation united under equal opportunity and justice for each and every American? I choose to support an equal and just America, one that is built upon uncompromising pillars of democracy, and I would urge my colleagues to do the same by speaking out against this blatant discrimination.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, the shooting death of Trayvon Martin and subsequent acquittal of his killer by an all white jury is an echo of this nation's past that the African-American community is shocked to experience in the 21st century. It harkens back to the words of interposition and nullification, waking the ghosts of Emmet Till and Schwerner, Chaney and Goodman.

It is simply the nightmare of every parent of an African-American male. Anyone who lacks empathy for Trayvon's parents or who has never experienced the indignity of being held suspect due to his race should take careful note of what this trial will mean for the nation. That issue brings the CBC to the House floor this evening: Where do we go from here. . . .

This weekend, tens-of-thousands across the country rallied for the cause of justice for Trayvon Martin. These crowds included people from across all ages and racial lines. Following King's path of nonviolence protest, they asked for simple justice. Here in Congress, we have been advised that the Department of Justice has an open and active investigation to determine whether Federal charges will be filed in the case. Notably, two African-American men, Attorney General Eric Holder and President Barack Obama, have sought to assure all Americans that justice will be served in the case.

Some have tried to criticize the President and Attorney General for their comments, saying that they are politicizing the case or grandstanding for the black community. I would disagree. Their comments were measured and to the point, seeking to reassure a nation transfixed by the powerful images attached to the incident and trial.

The more interesting point is how a nation, led by two such powerful men, can still hold young black men as a suspect class. When you look at the stop & frisk number in New York, there really is no serious question about whether racial profiling is a reality in America. When I introduced data collection legislation during the 105th Congress, the phenomenon of driving while black was well known in the African-American and Latino communities.

However, some commentators still tried to deny the credibility of people who came forward to tell stories about their treatment by the police. But as the litigation mounted and data was collected, it became obvious that the nation had a serious problem with the use of race by law enforcement. These attitudes, however, were not a product of policing, but rather a product of society. No matter who is in the White House, it seems that race never takes a holiday.

So, where do we go? At the official policy level, we can address the suspect use of race by law enforcement through legislation. This week, I will re-introduce the End Racial Profiling Act. Based upon the work around that legislation, by September 11, 2001, there was significant empirical evidence and wide agreement among Americans, including President Bush and Attorney General John Ashcroft, that racial profiling was a tragic fact of life in the minority community and that the Federal government should take action to end the practice.

Moreover, many in the law enforcement community have acknowledged that singling out people for heightened scrutiny based on their race, ethnicity, religion, or national origin had eroded the trust in law enforcement necessary to appropriately serve and protect our communities.

The End Racial Profiling Act is designed to eliminate the well documented problem of racial, ethnic, religious, and national origin profiling. First, the bill provides a prohibition on racial profiling, enforceable by declaratory or injunctive relief. Second, the bill mandates that training on racial profiling issues as part of Federal law enforcement training, the collection of data on all routine or spontaneous investigatory activities that is to be submitted through a standardized form to the Department of Justice.

Third, the Justice Department is authorized to provide grants for the development and implementation of best policing practices, such as early warning systems, technology integration, and other management protocols that discourage profiling. Finally, the Attorney General is required to provide periodic reports to assess the nature of any ongoing discriminatory profiling practices.

We should be clear, however, that legislation, like ERPA, can only go so far. After all, Trayvon's killer was not a sworn law enforcement officer. Consider legislation the starting point for societal change. His death demonstrates that racial profiling remains a divisive issue that strikes at the very foundation of our democracy. Though not the result of a law enforcement encounter, the issues of race and reasonable suspicion of criminal conduct in this case were so closely linked in the minds of the public that his death cannot be separated from the law enforcement profiling debate.

Ultimately, Trayvon Martin is one of too many individuals across the country who have been victimized by a perception of criminality, simply because of their race, ethnicity, religion or national origin. These individuals are denied the basic respect and equal treatment that is the right of every American. Until we address those broadly held views through important dialogues like this one, too many parents will anxiously await the safe return home of their sons.

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 9 o'clock and 12 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 2158

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. WOODALL) at 9 o'clock and 58 minutes p.m.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 2397, DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2014; AND PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 2610, TRANSPORTATION, HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2014

Mr. NUGENT, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 113–170) on the resolution (H. Res. 312) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 2397) making appropriations for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2014, and for other purposes; and providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 2610) making appropriations for the Departments of Transportation, and Housing and Urban Development, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2014, and for other purposes, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. CULBERSON (at the request of Mr. CANTOR) for today on account of illness.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. NUGENT. 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, Tuesday, July 23, 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:

2288. A letter from the Acting Under Secretary, Department of Defense, transmitting authorization of 10 officers to wear the authorized insignia of the grade rear admiral (lower half); to the Committee on Armed Services.

2289. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the Department's report entitled, ''Report to Congress on Head Start Monitoring for Fiscal Year 2010''; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

2290. A letter from the Acting Director, Office of Workers' Compensation Programs, Department of Labor, transmitting annual report on Operations of the Office of Workers' Compensation Programs for Fiscal Year 2011; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

2291. A letter from the Director, Defense Security Cooperation Agency, transmitting Transmittal No. 13-30, Notice of Proposed Issuance of Letter of Offer and Acceptance, pursuant to Section 36(b)(1) of the Arms Export Control Act, as amended; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

2292. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting Transmittal of D.C. ACT 20-111, ''YMCA Community Investment Initiative Real Property Tax Exemption Temporary Act of 2013''; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

2293. A letter from the Director, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting Transmittal of D.C. ACT 20-110, ''Better Prices, Better Quality, Better Choices for Health Coverage Temporary Amendment Act of 2013''; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

2294. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting Transmittal of D.C. ACT 20-109, ''Heat Wave Safety Temporary Amendment Act of 2013''; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

2295. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting Transmittal of D.C. ACT 20-107, ''Extension of Time to Dispose of Justice Park Property Temporary Approval Act of 2013''; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

2296. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting Transmittal of D.C. ACT 20-108, ''Foster Youth Transit Subsidy Temporary Amendment Act of 2013''; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

2297. A letter from the Principal Deputy Assistant Attorney General, Department of Justice, transmitting the Annual Report to Congress on the implementation, enforcement, and prosecution of registration requirements under Section 635 of the Adam Walsh Child Protection and Safety Act of 2006 (Pub. L. 109-248)(AWA); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2298. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Special Local Regulations for summer events; Captain of the Port Lake Michigan Zone [Docket No.: USCG-2013-0327] (RIN: 1625-AA08) received July 2, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2299. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; Private Party fireworks; Lake Michigan, Chicago, IL [Docket No.: USCG-2013-0462] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received July 2, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2300. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; Fifth Coast Guard District Fireworks Display, Currituck Sound; Corolla, NC [Docket Number: USCG-2013-0421] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received July 2, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2301. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule — Croatian Per Se Corporation [Notice 2013-44] received July 2, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

2302. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule — Eligibility for Minimum Essential Coverage for Purposes of the Premium Tax Credit [Notice 2013-41] received July 2, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk

for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. SHUSTER: Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure. H.R. 2353. A bill to amend title 23, United States Code, with respect to the operation of vehicles on certain Wisconsin highways, and for other purposes (Rept. 113–162). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. SHUSTER: Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure. House Concurrent Resolution 44. Resolution authorizing the use of the Capitol Grounds for the District of Columbia Special Olympics Law Enforcement Torch Run (Rept. 113–163). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. UPTON: Committee on Energy and Commerce. H.R. 1582. A bill to protect consumers by prohibiting the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency from promulgating as final certain energy-related rules that are estimated to cost more than $1 billion and will cause significant adverse effects to the economy; with an amendment (Rept. 113–164). Referred to the Committee of the whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. SMITH of Texas: Committee on Science, Space, and Technology. H.R. 1422. A bill to amend the Environmental Research, Development, and Demonstration Authorization Act of 1978 to provide for Scientific Advisory Board member qualifications, public participation, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. 113–165). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington: Committee on Natural Resources. H.R. 412. A bill to amend the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act to designate segments of the mainstem of the Nashua River and its tributaries in the Commonwealth of Massachusetts for study for potential addition to the National Wild and Scenic Rivers System, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. 113–166). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington: Committee on Natural Resources. H.R. 687. A bill to facilitate the efficient extraction of mineral resources in southeast Arizona by authorizing and directing an exchange of Federal and non-Federal land, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. 113–167). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington: Committee on Natural Resources. H.R. 841. A bill to amend the Grand Ronde Reservation Act to make technical corrections, and for other purposes (Rept. 113–168). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington: Committee on Natural Resources. H.R. 957. A bill to reduce temporarily the royalty required to be paid for sodium produced on Federal lands, and for other purposes (Rept. 113–169). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. NUGENT: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 312. Resolution providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 2397) making appropriations for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2014, and for other purposes; and providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 2610) making appropriations for the Departments of Transportation, and Housing and Urban Development, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2014, and for other purposes (Rept. 113–170). 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. ISSA (for himself and Ms. CHU):

H.R. 2766. A bill to make improvements to the transitional program for covered business method patents, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GARRETT (for himself, Mr. HENSARLING, Mr. NEUGEBAUER, Mrs. CAPITO, and Mr. MCHENRY):

H.R. 2767. A bill to protect American taxpayers and homeowners by creating a sustainable housing finance system for the 21st century; to the Committee on Financial Services, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. ROSKAM:

H.R. 2768. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to clarify that a duty of the Commissioner of Internal Revenue is to ensure that Internal Revenue Service employees are familiar with and act in accord with certain taxpayer rights; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ROSKAM:

H.R. 2769. A bill to impose a moratorium on conferences held by the Internal Revenue Service; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California (for himself, Mr. TIERNEY, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. NADLER, Mr. BISHOP of New York, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. GRIJALVA, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Ms. LEE of California, Ms. NORTON, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Mr. CARTWRIGHT, Mr. HUFFMAN, Mr. HINOJOSA, and Mr. LOEBSACK):

H.R. 2770. A bill to provide subsidized employment for unemployed, low-income adults, provide summer employment and year-round employment opportunities for low-income youth, and carry out work-related and educational strategies and activities of demonstrated effectiveness, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. POE of Texas (for himself, Mr. CARTER, and Mr. OLSON):

H.R. 2771. A bill to repeal the requirements under the Natural Gas Act for obtaining authorization for the exportation or importation of natural gas, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ (for herself and Mr. MARINO):

H.R. 2772. A bill to direct the Attorney General to make grants to States that have in place laws that terminate the parental rights of men who father children through rape; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JOYCE (for himself, Mr. PETRI, Mrs. MILLER of Michigan, Mr. LEVIN, Mr. DINGELL, and Ms. SLAUGHTER):

H.R. 2773. A bill to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act to protect and restore the Great Lakes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. BILIRAKIS:

H.R. 2774. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide a credit against tax for hurricane and tornado mitigation expenditures; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mrs. BLACK:

H.R. 2775. A bill to condition the provision of premium and cost-sharing subsidies under the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act upon a certification that a program to verify household income and other qualifications for such subsidies is operational, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois (for himself, Mr. GOODLATTE, Mr. PETERSON, Mr. HUDSON, Mr. LAMALFA, Mr. CRAWFORD, Mr. RIBBLE, Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia, Mrs. ROBY, Mr. NEUGEBAUER, Mr. VALADAO, Mr. COLLINS of New York, Mr. GIBBS, Mr. ROGERS of Alabama, Mr. YOHO, Mr. SCHRADER, Mr. KING of Iowa, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Mr. ENYART, Mrs. HARTZLER, Mr. MCINTYRE, Mr. DESJARLAIS, Mr. FINCHER, Mr. CONAWAY, and Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi):

H.R. 2776. A bill to establish a regulatory review process for rules that the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency plans to propose, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. GRIFFIN of Arkansas (for himself and Mr. WOLF):

H.R. 2777. A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to authorize the Secretaries of the military departments to suspend the pay and allowances of a member of the Armed Forces who is held in confinement pending trial by court-martial or by civil authority for any sex-related offense or capital offense; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. KINGSTON (for himself, Mr. WESTMORELAND, Mr. POSEY, Mr. PITTS, Mr. BRADY of Texas, Mrs. BACHMANN, Mr. SALMON, Mr. FLORES, Mr. GOHMERT, Mr. BARTON, Mr. WALBERG, Mr. BROOKS of Alabama, and Mr. BROUN of Georgia):

H.R. 2778. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to clarify eligibility for the child tax credit; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KINGSTON:

H.R. 2779. A bill to establish a separate Inspector General for the Bureau of Consumer Financial Protection; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, and in addition to the Committee on Financial Services, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mrs. LOWEY (for herself and Mr. REICHERT):

H.R. 2780. A bill to amend the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 to provide assistance for developing countries to promote quality basic education and to establish the achievement of quality universal basic education in all developing countries as an objective of United States foreign assistance policy, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. PETERS of California (for himself and Ms. KUSTER):

H.R. 2781. A bill to require the closure of expired grants accounts, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, and in addition to the Committee on Appropriations, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. RUPPERSBERGER (for himself, Mr. HARRIS, Mr. SARBANES, Ms. EDWARDS, Mr. HOYER, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. CUMMINGS, and Mr. DELANEY):

H.R. 2782. A bill to award posthumously a Congressional Gold Medal to Dr. R. Adams Cowley, in recognition of his lifelong commitment to the advancement of trauma care; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. RYAN of Ohio (for himself, Mr. TURNER, Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio, Mr. O'ROURKE, and Mrs. DAVIS of California):

H.R. 2783. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for continued eligibility for the health care tax credit for PBGC pension recipients eligible for the credit at the end of 2013; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. STIVERS (for himself and Mr. RICHMOND):

H.R. 2784. A bill to amend the Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act to require the Secretary of the Interior to conduct offshore oil and gas leasing, to use revenues from such leasing to capitalize bonds that provide a dedicated source of revenue to fund highway, other transportation, and water infrastructure projects, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources, and in addition to the Committees on Ways and Means, Transportation and Infrastructure, and Energy and Commerce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. WALZ (for himself, Mr. DENHAM, Mr. BENTIVOLIO, and Ms. SPEIER):

H.R. 2785. A bill to amend title 5, United States Code, to improve the hiring of veterans by the Federal Government and State governments, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. CASSIDY (for himself and Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois):

H. Res. 313. A resolution supporting the goals and ideals of the MAGIC Foundation; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. LANGEVIN (for himself, Mr. YODER, Mr. CICILLINE, Mr. FARR, Mr. LEWIS, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. NUNES, Mr. KING of New York, Mr. CÁRDENAS, Mr. NADLER, Mr. MORAN, and Mr. LOEBSACK):

H. Res. 314. A resolution commending and supporting the United States delegation and the United States Deaf Sports Federation in their representation of the United States at the 2013 Summer Deaflympics in Sofia, Bulgaria; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

CONSTITUTIONAL AUTHORITY STATEMENT

Pursuant to clause 7 of rule XII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the following statements are submitted regarding the specific powers granted to Congress in the Constitution to enact the accompanying bill or joint resolution.

By Mr. ISSA:

H.R. 2766.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 8

By Mr. GARRETT:

H.R. 2767.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The primary Constitutional authority for this legislation is the Commerce Clause.

By Mr. ROSKAM:

H.R. 2768.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18, which states ''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. ROSKAM:

H.R. 2769.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18, which states ''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. GEORGE MILLER of California:

H.R. 2770.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1, 3, 18 of the U.S. Constitution; Article I, Section 9, Clause 7 of the U.S. Constitution.

By Mr. POE of Texas:

H.R. 2771.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 3

By Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ:

H.R. 2772.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The Constitutional authority on which this bill rests is the power of Congress to provide for the general welfare of the United States as enumerated in Article 1, Section 8.

By Mr. JOYCE:

H.R. 2773.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. BILIRAKIS:

H.R. 2774.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The constitutional authority to lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts and Excises as enumerated in Article I, Section 8, Clause 1 of the United States Constitution. pg–74

By Mrs. BLACK:

H.R. 2775.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

United States Constitution Article I Section 8

By Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois:

H.R. 2776.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 1 of the United States Constitution, in that the legislation concerns the exercise of legislative powers generally granted to Congress by that section, including the exercise of those powers when delegated by Congress to the Executive;

AND

Article I, Section 8, clause 18 of the United States Constitution, in that the legislation exercises legislative power granted to Congress by that clause ''to make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof;'

By Mr. GRIFFIN of Arkansas:

H.R. 2777.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 14. To make Rules for the Government and Regulation of the land and naval Forces.

By Mr. KINGSTON:

H.R. 2778.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, 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. KINGSTON:

H.R. 2779.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 18

The Congress shall have the 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 Mrs. LOWEY:

H.R. 2780.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1 of the Constitution.

By Mr. PETERS of California:

H.R. 2781.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Section 8

By Mr. RUPPERSBERGER:

H.R. 2782.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 6 of the Constitution.

By Mr. RYAN of Ohio:

H.R. 2783.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

To make Rules for the Government and Regulation of the land and naval Forces.

To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States or in any Department or Officer thereof.

By Mr. STIVERS:

H.R. 2784.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article IV, section 3, clause 2

By Mr. WALZ:

H.R. 2785.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

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.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 129: Mr. SABLAN.

H.R. 282: Mr. NUNNELEE.

H.R. 498: Mr. HASTINGS of Florida.

H.R. 515: Ms. SINEMA.

H.R. 519: Mr. ENGEL.

H.R. 556: Mr. BRADY of Texas and Ms. FOXX.

H.R. 565: Ms. BROWN of Florida.

H.R. 647: Mr. OWENS, Mr. AMODEI, and Mr. BARR.

H.R. 685: Mr. KILDEE, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Mr. MCKINLEY, Mr. TIBERI, Mr. HOLDING, Mr. MCHENRY, Mr. VARGAS, Mr. SHIMKUS, and Mr. CRAWFORD.

H.R. 698: Mr. HARPER.
H.R. 755: Mr. DESANTIS.
H.R. 792: Mr. JORDAN.
H.R. 850: Ms. TSONGAS.
H.R. 906: Mr. LUETKEMEYER.
H.R. 980: Mr. TIERNEY.
H.R. 991: Mr. CRAWFORD.
H.R. 1027: Ms. KAPTUR.
H.R. 1077: Mr. TIBERI.
H.R. 1094: Mr. YARMUTH, Mrs. LOWEY, and Mr. MULVANEY.
H.R. 1095: Mr. ENYART, Mr. LAMALFA, Mr. LOEBSACK, Mr. DAINES, and Mr. LATTA.
H.R. 1099: Mr. AMODEI.
H.R. 1132: Mr. KLINE.
H.R. 1146: Mr. MCKINLEY and Mr. DEFAZIO.
H.R. 1149: Mr. RUSH.
H.R. 1199: Mr. BISHOP of Georgia.
H.R. 1204: Mr. MCCAUL and Mr. HUDSON.
H.R. 1250: Mr. FORBES, Mr. CLAY, and Mr. DAINES.
H.R. 1286: Mr. GRAYSON and Ms. GABBARD.
H.R. 1303: Mrs. LUMMIS.
H.R. 1317: Mr. ELLISON.
H.R. 1331: Mr. NUNNELEE.
H.R. 1404: Mr. LAMBORN.
H.R. 1410: Mr. HUFFMAN and Mr. CONYERS.
H.R. 1440: Mr. DUFFY.
H.R. 1515: Mr. SMITH of Washington, Ms. MOORE, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, and Mr. MORAN.
H.R. 1518: Mr. DENHAM and Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico.
H.R. 1563: Mr. SHUSTER.
H.R. 1582: Mr. MCKINLEY and Mr. HARPER.
H.R. 1634: Mr. HIMES.
H.R. 1658: Mr. PETERSON and Mr. GRAYSON.
H.R. 1666: Ms. WATERS and Mr. ANDREWS.
H.R. 1692: Mr. SCHNEIDER, Mr. ROHRABACHER, Mr. MEADOWS, and Mr. WITTMAN.
H.R. 1701: Mr. NUNNELEE.
H.R. 1717: Mr. ADERHOLT.
H.R. 1726: Mr. CASTRO of Texas and Mr. HIMES.
H.R. 1775: Ms. GABBARD, Mr. PERLMUTTER, and Mr. GRIJALVA.
H.R. 1779: Mr. BARBER and Mr. PITTS.
H.R. 1795: Mr. LOWENTHAL.
H.R. 1816: Mr. GRIMM and Mr. CASTRO of Texas.
H.R. 1825: Mr. DESANTIS and Mr. BOUSTANY.
H.R. 1837: Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York, Ms. WATERS, and Mr. CARNEY.
H.R. 1838: Mr. RUNYAN, Mr. WELCH, Mr. TONKO, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, Ms. PINGREE of Maine, and Mr. HECK of Nevada.
H.R. 1869: Mr. MURPHY of Florida.
H.R. 1878: Mr. ROSS and Ms. CLARKE.
H.R. 1908: Mr. LAMBORN.
H.R. 1916: Mr. SCHRADER.
H.R. 1931: Mr. BENTIVOLIO and Mr. NUNNELEE.
H.R. 1950: Mr. BENISHEK and Mr. JONES.
H.R. 1975: Mr. THOMPSON of California.
H.R. 1981: Mr. SCHIFF.
H.R. 1985: Mr. TONKO.
H.R. 2000: Mr. BLUMENAUER and Ms. GABBARD.
H.R. 2018: Ms. SINEMA.
H.R. 2019: Mr. COOK.
H.R. 2084: Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York and Mr. RIBBLE.
H.R. 2086: Mr. BUTTERFIELD.
H.R. 2101: Mr. RYAN of Ohio.
H.R. 2134: Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ.
H.R. 2157: Ms. SINEMA.
H.R. 2232: Mr. KILMER.
H.R. 2283: Mr. BISHOP of New York and Mr. HIMES.
H.R. 2305: Mr. STIVERS, Mr. BENISHEK, Mrs. ROBY, Mr. ROSS, Mr. ROONEY, and Mrs. CAPITO.
H.R. 2319: Mr. DAINES.
H.R. 2342: Mr. GRIJALVA.
H.R. 2346: Mr. CRAWFORD.
H.R. 2347: Mr. CRAWFORD.
H.R. 2375: Mr. ADERHOLT, Mr. ROSS, Mr. GARDNER, Mr. YOUNG of Florida, and Mr. ROE of Tennessee.
H.R. 2385: Mr. SCHOCK.
H.R. 2417: Mr. CALVERT and Mr. BISHOP of Utah.
H.R. 2449: Mr. BARTON, Mr. HOLDING, Mr. STOCKMAN, and Mr. LARSEN of Washington.
H.R. 2485: Mr. GARCIA, Mr. VARGAS, Mr. NOLAN, Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California, Mr. CÁRDENAS, and Mrs. KIRKPATRICK.
H.R. 2495: Mr. PETERS of California.
H.R. 2500: Mr. LOEBSACK.
H.R. 2506: Mr. RUNYAN, Mr. MICHAUD, and Mr. PERRY.
H.R. 2510: Ms. NORTON and Mr. ENYART.
H.R. 2520: Mr. HASTINGS of Florida.
H.R. 2523: Ms. DUCKWORTH.
H.R. 2527: Mr. TAKANO.
H.R. 2536: Mr. YODER.
H.R. 2549: Mr. LOWENTHAL and Mr. RANGEL.
H.R. 2557: Mr. MARCHANT and Mr. PAULSEN.
H.R. 2565: Mr. FARENTHOLD, Mr. MURPHY of Florida, Mr. POSEY, and Mr. DESANTIS.
H.R. 2571: Mr. LATHAM.
H.R. 2579: Mr. MULLIN.
H.R. 2627: Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois.
H.R. 2641: Mr. SMITH of Missouri.
H.R. 2671: Mr. BOUSTANY.
H.R. 2677: Mr. WITTMAN.
H.R. 2682: Mr. HASTINGS of Washington, Mr. MULLIN, Mr. PERRY, Mr. AMODEI, Mr. MCCLINTOCK, Mr. NUNNELEE, and Mr. BURGESS.
H.R. 2686: Mr. COSTA.
H.R. 2689: Mr. RUNYAN.
H.R. 2691: Mr. KING of New York.
H.R. 2711: Mr. WOMACK and Mr. ROSKAM.
H.R. 2717: Mr. LANCE, Mrs. BACHMANN, Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio, Mr. WESTMORELAND, Mr. SCHNEIDER, Mr. KLINE, Mrs. DAVIS of California, and Mr. TIBERI.
H.R. 2720: Mr. MCCAUL, Mrs. BLACK, and Mr. BUCHANAN.
H.R. 2721: Mr. LOEBSACK.
H.R. 2736: Ms. NORTON and Ms. SPEIER.
H.R. 2737: Mr. HIGGINS.
H.R. 2745: Mr. STOCKMAN.
H.R. 2750: Mr. FARENTHOLD.
H.R. 2760: Mr. LOWENTHAL.
H. Con. Res. 24: Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania.
H. Con. Res. 41: Mr. ENYART, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, and Mr. LANGEVIN.
H. Res. 30: Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico.
H. Res. 203: Mr. TAKANO.
H. Res. 222: Mr. CRENSHAW.
H. Res. 227: Ms. TITUS.
H. Res. 281: Mr. CHABOT, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Ms. FOXX, Mrs. WAGNER, Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio, Mr. POCAN, Mr. WEBER of Texas, and Mr. PETERSON.
H. Res. 287: Mr. LOWENTHAL.
H. Res. 291: Mr. MCCAUL.
H. Res. 293: Mr. BARBER, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, and Ms. SHEA-PORTER.
H. Res. 296: Mr. SIMPSON.
H. Res. 302: Mr. SCHIFF.
H. Res. 309: Mr. LOWENTHAL.

DELETIONS OF SPONSORS FROM PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were deleted from public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 1213: Ms. SCHAKOWSKY.