United States of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 113th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 159 WASHINGTON, THURSDAY, AUGUST 1, 2013 No. 113

House of Representatives

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

DESIGNATION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

WASHINGTON, DC,
August 1, 2013.

I hereby appoint the Honorable BILL HUIZENGA to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

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

MORNING-HOUR DEBATE

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

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

SENATOR PAUL SIMON WATER FOR THE WORLD ACT OF 2013 (H.R. 2901)

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

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, 5 years ago, if someone asked what a bow tie-wearing progressive Democrat from Oregon and my colleague TED POE, a cowboy, boot-wearing conservative Republican from Texas, could agree on, you would have said, Not much.

Today, we are partners on an issue, however, that makes sense regardless of your politics: ensuring sustainable, equitable access to clean water for nearly 800 million women, children, and men who don't have it and the 2.5 billion without even the most basic sanitation services. TED POE and I think that politics should stop with water. That's why, today, we are introducing the Paul Simon Water for the World Act of 2013 (H.R. 2901).

Since Congress passed the Paul Simon Water for the Poor Act in 2005, the United States has become a global leader in efforts to increase access to clean water and sanitation, developing and implementing some of the most innovative approaches to help those in greatest need. We must not only maintain this progress but work to further refine and focus the efforts at USAID and at the Department of State by enacting the World Act.

We are committed because dirty water and a lack of sanitation affects all areas of development assistance. This is especially the case when it comes to women and children. More children are killed by waterborne disease than any other. Increasing access to clean water and sanitation has a significant multiplier effect on other areas of development, enabling us to do more with less—critical in a time of constrained budget resources.

Every day, the world has more people but fewer freshwater resources. Our bipartisan legislation will give the United States the capacity to avoid unnecessary loss of life and conflict in the future. It would ensure that water, sanitation, and hygiene programs are reflected in other development assistance; prioritize long-lasting impacts of United States foreign aid dollars; and increase the focusing on monitoring, evaluation, transparency, and capacity building.

Children cannot attend school if they're sick from dirty water. Half the world's hospital beds today are filled with people suffering from waterborne disease needlessly. Hours spent getting water are hours not working or in school.

A lack of clean drinking water has a disproportionate effect on women, who, in developing countries, walk an average of 3.7 miles a day to get water. The estimates are that 40 billion working hours are lost each year in Africa alone—200 million hours today.

Having water means girls can go to school and build a better future. It also reduces the risk of violence and sexual assault. A study by Doctors without Borders found that 82 percent of the women and girls treated for rape in West and South Darfur were attacked while they were gathering water or firewood.

The challenge is not getting easier, because 97 percent of the water on Earth is salty and unfit to drink. Of the 2½ percent, roughly, of the Earth's water that is fresh, two-thirds of that is frozen—locked away in the ice caps and glaciers. Although it's rapidly melting because of climate change, that's not going to help us, because it will be largely salty as well. We've got less than 1 percent of global freshwater available for human use; and because of the demands for growing food, energy and industry, only about one-tenth of a percent is available for people to drink. This tiny fraction is further diminished by deficient or nonexistent water infrastructure. Even in the United States, we waste 6 billion gallons of freshwater every day through leaky pipes. We are entering an era of severe water scarcity that the Department of Defense warns could lead to global insecurity.

In short, Mr. Speaker, there is nothing more fundamental to families and global health than clean water and sanitation. More needs to be done, and it needs to be done well. Taxpayers, understandably, demand better results and greater transparency from foreign aid. This bill provides the tools and incentives to do just that.

We urge our colleagues to adopt our motto—''politics stops at water''—and support this effort. This magnitude will take a team working together, united in the goal of saving lives and improving communities around the world. Please join us in this critical legislation, the Paul Simon Water for the World Act (H.R. 2901).

50TH ANNIVERSARY OF MARTIN LUTHER KING, JR.'S MARCH ON WASHINGTON

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

Mr. ROTHFUS. Mr. Speaker, from time to time in our Nation's history, people of faith have stepped forward to call this Nation to something greater. This is steeped in our culture, our tradition, and our founding documents. It goes back to the cross at Cape Henry and to the landing at Plymouth Rock. You see it in our Declaration of Independence and again in the movement to abolish slavery.

Then, in the 1950s and 1960s, it was people of faith who birthed the new civil rights movement. No figure cast a wider shadow on that movement than the Reverend Dr. Martin Luther King. This month, we mark the 50th anniversary of one of the most iconic speeches in American history—Dr. King's address at the Lincoln Memorial. It is a great honor for me to stand here today to recollect the words of Dr. King, a man who stands among the heroes of our Nation.

Dr. King was a pastor. He received a divinity degree from Crozer Theological Seminary in Pennsylvania. His call to the ministry led him to the Dexter Avenue Baptist Church in Montgomery, Alabama, where, in the church's basement, he helped to plan the Montgomery bus boycott of 1955. That Dr. King's actions were motivated by his faith in a just God is evident when you read his words.

From the marble steps of the Lincoln Memorial, he used the words of the prophet Isaiah to articulate his dream of an end to injustice and oppression:

> That one day every valley shall be exalted, every hill and mountain shall be made low; the rough places will be made plain, and the crooked places will be made straight; and the glory of the Lord shall be revealed, and all flesh shall see it together.

Martin Luther King, Jr., looked not for a revolution but for an affirmation of the country's founding principles when he declared:

> That we have come to our Nation's Capital to cash a check. When the architects of our Republic wrote the magnificent words of the Constitution and the Declaration of Independence, they were signing a promissory note to which every American was to fall heir. This note was a promise that all men would be guaranteed the inalienable rights of life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness.

It was not the first time that Dr. King had alluded to the promise of our founding documents. Just 4 months before the March on Washington, in writing from a Birmingham jail, he wrote that African Americans had waited for more than 340 years for their constitutional and God-given rights.

King's letter from a Birmingham jail could not be clearer in its articulation of the moral status of law and the role that religion plays in a just society:

> Now [King wrote] what is the difference between a ''just'' and an ''unjust'' law? How does one determine whether a law is just or unjust? A just law is a manmade code that squares with the moral law of God. An unjust law is a code that is out of harmony with the moral law.

Yes, Dr. King appealed to the Nation's religious roots to encourage social change, and from a Birmingham jail, he encouraged individuals to confront unjust laws:

> [T]here is nothing new [King wrote] about this kind of civil disobedience. It was evidenced sublimely in the refusal of Shadrach, Meshach and Abednego to obey the laws of Nebuchadnezzar, on the ground that a higher moral law was at stake. It was practiced superbly by the early Christians, who were willing to face hungry lions . . . rather than submit to certain unjust laws of the Roman Empire. . . . In our own Nation, the Boston Tea Party represented a massive act of civil disobedience.
>
> We should never forget [King continued] that everything Adolf Hitler did in Germany was ''legal'' and everything the Hungarian freedom fighters did in Hungary was ''illegal.'' It was ''illegal'' to aid and comfort a Jew in Hitler's Germany. Even so, I am sure [King proclaimed] that, had I lived in Germany at the time, I would have aided and comforted my Jewish brothers. If today I lived [King continued] in a Communist country, where certain principles dear to the Christian faith are suppressed, I would openly advocate disobeying that country's anti-religious laws.

King's letter from a Birmingham jail and his ''I Have a Dream'' speech should be required reading for every American high school student and for every Member of Congress.

With the 50th anniversary of Dr. King's speech upon us, it is good to remember his words. It is good to appreciate all that faith in God and the moral law have done to advance the cause of freedom in our country. It is good to reflect on whether policies enacted by government in our time are a step back from, or show a rising intolerance of, the religious freedom that has been instrumental in defining our country and defending our rights.

THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT, AN UMBRELLA ON A RAINY DAY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE) for 5 minutes.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman who preceded me for that very powerful message; and it reminds us generally of, really, the elements of our presence here in this House. When we represent the people of this country, it is important that we are lawmakers and that we have the compassion that was evidenced by the movement that Dr. King led and by the movement that he was leading at the time of the tragedy of his death and that was, of course, the Poor People's March in 1968.

I rise today to discuss that capacity and to say that I know that our friends, Republicans and Democrats, can come together around important service elements that this Nation engages in. The Federal Government is an umbrella on a rainy day. It is the engine of the economy. It is the answer to issues such as transportation and housing. It really provides housing to working families. It boosts the middle class and poor families, and it gives jobs to builders and contractors. So that is why, I think, it was quite appropriate for this, unfortunately, poorly driven and constructed Transportation, Housing and Urban Development appropriations bill to go to its timely death.

How can you with any compassion cut so much money that you cut even the amount of money under the present budget, and you cut 9 percent below the level now mandated by the across-the-board spending cuts by sequestration?

You went below that. This bill was $44.1 billion—shameful—cutting public housing, cutting housing vouchers, cutting opportunities for the homeless, and particularly for our young people. As the cochair of the Congressional Children's Caucus, every day, I note that children in America suffer for a variety of reasons. The Senate, of course, had a bill, which they are pushing through, that was at the $54 billion level—still very far short of the great needs of this community.

So I rise today to say that it landed with a thud, and I think, more importantly, my colleague from Texas—again, from Houston—spoke on the floor of the House about some untimely language on page 52—I remember it—that cut into the light rail system of Houston. It would impact my district. It would stop students at the University of Houston and at Texas Southern University from being able to have access to rail by cutting down on their travel costs because there was a provision in the bill that did not fund just a sector of that light rail.

□ 1015

My colleagues, how can you build light rail when you cut it in the middle, almost like the western movies, where the train rushes up and finds a big hole over the mountains where something has happened and it can't go any further?

It was a bill that was destined to die and should have died because it lacked compassion. I stand here opposing any language that does not fund or find an alternative route in any community's light rail new starts on which that community chooses to move forward. In Houston, we should not be attacked, if you will, for that kind of singular targeting. Our light rail should proceed.

I rise today to again reinforce this question of homelessness by showing this picture, which sates, ''Houston seeks better ways to serve homeless youth,'' and to be able to indicate that in trying to count homeless youth, they were only able to count a tenth, 378. When Houston's leadership went out on streets to try and count them, there were over 4,000. Our school districts say there are 19,000. Yet, we have a home called Little Audrey that the very public dollars that are supposed to be in the HUD funding could fund. We have a directive housing community development near Ratcliff that has a million dollars that could fund this particular facility. Mind you, in a city as large as Houston, there are only four for homeless youth.

I visited Little Audrey. These are the kind of young people who are there:

A young man who lived in a crack house not because he was on crack, but because he had no place else to live. He's found his way to Little Audrey; or the twins whose father died in Hurricane Katrina, were brought here by their mother to Houston, and then the mother died and they were homeless; or a young woman who was abused; or a young man who came and was put out of his house, from Dallas.

Little Audrey is a refuge that would be as helpful to the children that I met with and sat down with as this young man is being helped by Covenant House. Covenant House cannot do it alone. So it is important that communities who receive the public dollars, who, given the opportunity such as the public facilities dollars that the Housing and Community Development office has in the city of Houston, utilize it so we do not have this kind of shame in our community.

I look forward to working with the city Housing and Community Development and the Secretary of Housing to stop youth homelessness in America and to helping these young people. I know we can do it together.

THE TRUTH ABOUT YOSEMITE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlemen from California (Mr. MCCLINTOCK) for 5 minutes.

Mr. MCCLINTOCK. Mr. Speaker, Yosemite Valley is a national treasure that was set aside in 1864 with the promise that it would be preserved for the express purpose of ''public use, resort, and recreation.'' Ever since, Americans have enjoyed a host of recreational opportunities and amenities as they come to experience the splendor of the valley.

Now the National Park Service, at the urging of leftist environmental groups, is proposing eliminating many of these amenities, including bicycle and raft rentals, horseback riding rentals, gift shops, snack facilities, swimming pools, and iconic facilities, including the ice skating rink at Curry Village, the art center, and the historic stone bridges that date back to the 1920s.

For generations, these facilities have enhanced the enjoyment of the park for millions of visitors, adding a rich variety of recreational activities amidst the breathtaking backdrop of Yosemite. But today the very nature and purpose of Yosemite is being changed from its original promise of public resort, use, and recreation to an exclusionary agenda that can best be described as ''look, but don't touch.''

As public outrage has mounted, these leftist groups have found willing mouthpieces in the editorial boards of the left-leaning San Francisco Chronicle and Sacramento Bee. It is obvious their editorial writers have either not read the report or are deliberately misrepresenting it to their readers. They say the plan is designed to relieve overcrowding in the park. In fact, this plan compounds the overcrowding.

In 1997, flooding wiped out almost half the campsites in Yosemite Valley. Congress appropriated $17 million to replace these campsites. The money was spent; the campsites were never replaced. That's what's causing the overcrowding—half the campsites for the same number of visitors.

This plan would lock in a 30 percent reduction in campsites and a 50 percent reduction in lodging compared to the pre-flood area. Three swimming pools in the valley give visitors a safe place with lifeguards for their children to cool off in the summer. The park service wants to close two of them. That means packed overcrowding at the remaining pool, pushing families seeking water recreation into the perilous Merced River.

They assure us they're not eliminating all the shops at Yosemite, but only reducing the number of them. Understand the practical impact on tourists. It means they're going to have to walk much greater distances to access these services and then endure long lines once they get there.

Another of the falsehoods is that the plan doesn't ban services like bike rentals, but just moves them to better locations. The government's own report puts the lie to this claim. It specifically speaks to ''eliminating'' and ''removing'' these services. It goes on to specifically state: ''Over time, visitors would become accustomed to the absence of these facilities and would no longer expect them as a part of their experience in Yosemite.'' Their intent could not possibly be any clearer.

We are assured that although bicycle rentals will be—and I'm using the government's word—''eliminated'' from the valley in the interest of environmental protection, visitors will still be free to bring their own bikes. That invites the obvious question: What exactly is the environmental difference between a rented bicycle and a privately owned bicycle?

We're assured in the smarmy words of the Sacramento Bee that the plan merely contemplates relocating raft rentals so they meet visitors at the river. In truth, the plan specifically states that it will ''allow only private boating in this river segment,'' and even then will limit total permits to only 100 per day.

Mr. Speaker, every lover of Yosemite needs to read this report. It proposes breaking the compact between the American people and their government that promised public use, resort, and recreation for all time when the park was established.

My district includes the Yosemite National Park. I represent the gateway communities that depend on park tourism to support their economies. The affected counties and communities are unanimous in their vigorous opposition to this plan; and in a recent phone survey, the people of these communities, who are jealous guardians of Yosemite, expressed opposition to it in numbers well exceeding 80 percent.

Many things need to be done to improve gate access and traffic flow through the park, but destroying the amenities that provide enjoyment for millions of Yosemite visitors each year is not among them.

CLIMATE RESEARCH

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Maryland (Ms. EDWARDS) for 5 minutes.

Ms. EDWARDS. Mr. Speaker, climate change is not a science debate; it never was. As we know, science is never universally agreed upon. It's a constant reexamining of what is deemed the squats quo. Nonetheless, the science surrounding climate change is near universal and it is incontrovertible. Over several decades of study, an overwhelming majority of scientists, including many at NOAA and NASA Goddard, in fact, in my district, as well as researchers worldwide, have concluded that climate change is real, is caused by man, and will have a significant impact on our Earth, it's process, the safety of our public, and our economy. These findings simply must quell the ideological differences and guide our policy decisions with regard to our environment in all due haste.

As a member of the House Committee on Science, Space, and Technology, I remain astounded that so much climate denial exists within these Chambers. This doubt is translated into slashing funding for climate research and Earth science research, both short-term and long-term. It's resulted in preventing agencies with the expertise to maintain and develop Earth-observing systems and conduct the analysis necessary to understand our Earth—all slashed.

Just 2 weeks ago, our House Science Committee reported out legislation that would cut NASA's Earth science budget by a third, something like over $600 million. NASA is a major contributor to our U.S. Global Change Research Program, and such a cut would

not only devastate Earth science research, but hamper our ability to understand what is truly a matter of national significance, indeed, global significance.

Unfortunately, my home State of Maryland will suffer disproportionately if this Chamber refuses to act. Maryland has the fourth longest tidal coastline and is the third most vulnerable to sea level rise, one of the major consequences of climate change. Islands and low-lying communities throughout our State will be impacted by rising seas and severe weather events like Hurricane Sandy. Just last week, The Washington Post reported that Maryland's coastal waters could rise 6 feet by the end of this century. This increase could cause flooding in major cities like Baltimore and Annapolis. Areas on the lower half of the Delmarva Peninsula could be especially impacted. While our State has been proactive about preparing for these kind of environmental changes, thermal expansion of our oceans and waterways will pose significant problems for the State, indeed, for our Nation.

But this is not one State's concern; it's a 50–State concern and a global concern.

Goddard Spaceflight Center, which is located just outside my congressional district, is home to a number of climate scientists who are genuinely concerned about observed and predicted trends for the future. This historical trend of warming and sea level ice, in particular, are not fiction or hyperbole. The are, in fact, facts that are indisputable and in many ways terrifying.

I want to bring to your attention image 1 here. In Maryland, the warming trend over 100 years has increased from 2 degrees Fahrenheit to 6.1 degrees, just since 1960. This is significant and concerning warming in just my State. The U.S. trends are equally staggering, and the global trends are even more overwhelming.

But what concerns me even more is this chart here. This chart depicts polar sea ice, which is important to control and moderate global climate. As sea ice melts in the summer, it absorbs the sunlight and warms our poles. What's happening is that, because, according to the National Snow and Ice Data Center, even a slight warming of the poles will quicken the pace of global warming and likely lead to more severe climate patterns. Since 2000, Arctic ice during the summer has been melting at rates that are scaring scientists. Here, what you see is a sharp decline during the summer ice melting. Last year, half of the sea ice actually melted during the summer.

I want to highlight one more thing. Our most conservative models didn't predict what we've actually observed in terms of decline in sea ice thickness. Our climate model simulations have failed to keep up with actual significant loss. This problem is twofold:

First, additional cuts to climate research and gaps in our satellites—and there are gaps because we're not funding them—make these observations even less accurate and weaken our modeling;

Second, the poles are actually warming faster than we ever predicted. It's estimated that by 2020, all the sea ice during the summer will be melted.

It's time for us to act. For the sake of the future generations of our economy, our environment, let's restore climate research capacity. Let's act for future generations.

HONORING THE LIVES OF THIRTY-TWO AMERICAN HEROES

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

Mr. RIGELL. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in this, the people's House, to pay tribute to, to honor, and to remember the lives of 32 American heroes.

Next Tuesday is August 6, and it is the most sobering anniversary in the district I have the privilege to represent. It was on that day in 2011 that enemy fighters in Afghanistan shot down a Chinook helicopter, killing 5 soldiers, 3 airmen, and 24 Navy SEALs. This tragedy marks the heaviest loss of life for our elite Navy SEAL community.

The warriors we lost that day were loving husbands, devoted fathers, brave sons, selfless patriots. While their families struggle with the loss of their own personal hero, our Nation stands with them, and the good folks in Virginia's Second Congressional District stand with them, as well.

□ 1030

Mr. Speaker, men and women have sacrificed for this country at a high cost. I have wrestled with this question, and I do not know why providence calls upon some to give so much, including in cases like this, for young men or young women to give the full measure of sacrifice in defense of our freedom. But I do know this, Mr. Speaker: I know the duty we have to the fallen, and that's to honor and to remember them and to care for their families and to meet our obligation today in this place and across this great land and press on for the freedom and liberty that they indeed gave their life for.

So it is with reverence and respect, Mr. Speaker, and sincere appreciation from one American to the families of the fallen that I will now read the names of these Americans whose lives were taken that day in defense of our country.

These are Navy servicemen killed August 6, 2011:

Jonas B. Kelsall
Louis J. Langlais
Thomas A. Ratzlaff
Craig M. Vickers
Brian R. Bill
John W. Faas
Kevin A. Houston
Matthew D. Mason
Stephen M. Mills
Nicholas H. Null
Robert J. Reeves
Heath M. Robinson
Darrik C. Benson
Christopher G. Campbell
Jared W. Day
John Douangdara
Michael J. Strange
Jon T. Tumilson
Aaron C. Vaughn
Jason R. Workman
Jesse D. Pittman
Nicholas P. Spehar

The five soldiers killed that day:

David R. Carter
Bryan J. Nichols
Patrick D. Hamburger
Alexander J. Bennett
Spencer C. Duncan

And the three airmen killed that day:

John W. Brown
Andrew W. Harvell
Daniel L. Zerbe

Mr. Speaker, as these families continue to struggle with their loss, we continue to pray for them, asking that God will give them a special measure of grace and peace on this day and the days ahead.

SUPPORT COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT BLOCK GRANTS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from California (Mrs. CAPPS) for 5 minutes.

Mrs. CAPPS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to speak on behalf of support for funding for the Community Development Block Grants, commonly known here as CDBG funding.

Public-private partnerships are great investments for our communities. And on the central coast of California, as well as in communities all across our country, Community Development Block Grants have long been a critical source of funding for local initiatives. CDBG funding gives nonprofits opportunities to provide locally tailored services in an efficient and effective manner. These nonprofits are then able to leverage additional private funding, giving taxpayer dollars an extra bang for the buck in spending power. It is a win-win for everyone. The investments that are made stimulate and grow our local economies. They improve the quality of life for our working families.

My constituents see CDBG funding at work each day, even though they may not know what it is. It's there working on their behalf. It's the Santa Maria Meals on Wheels program, which delivers nutritious meals to local seniors each day. For many of these seniors, it's the only real meal they'll have in a day.

It's the Thrifty Shopper and Catholic Charities' Community Services, which support mobile food distribution and case management for our neighbors in need.

It is the youth education enhancement programs which provide quality after-school youth education programs. These programs improve reading and

study skills. They promote high school graduation, and foster parent participation in a child's academic life. CDBG supports our local Boys and Girls Clubs, the food bank, and legal aid. It's giving Santa Maria a chance to rehab Oakley Park, which benefits the entire community.

CDBG helps those in need, and it makes life a bit better for everyone. These are investments with real local impacts, and that's why cuts to this program, like the drastic ones we've been debating, also have a direct impact.

Already, important programs like Meals on Wheels are having trouble reaching all those in need due to sequestration cuts. So to slash the program in half will only add to this devastation. These aren't disposable projects. They are truly investments in our people and in our community, and that is why I urge my colleagues to stand with the central coast of California, to stand with communities across this Nation who can't afford the bill the House majority has brought to the floor.

STOP GOVERNMENT ABUSE WEEK

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

Mr. CONAWAY. Mr. Speaker, this week in the House, we are voting on pieces of legislation that will roll back the Obama administration's overreach. We term this effort Stop Government Abuse Week. Our message to the administration is quite simple: no more wasted tax dollars, no more abuse of power by Federal agencies. The Federal Government must be accountable to the American people, not unelected bureaucrats.

Right now, a senior Federal employee can be placed under investigation for serious misconduct, yet the Federal Government isn't allowed to put that person on leave without pay, meaning they get an extended paid vacation. That's the case with IRS official Lois Lerner, who took the Fifth Amendment and testified before Congress. She's now on paid leave while Congress continues the agency's misconduct investigation.

The Employee Accountability Act, introduced by my friend MIKE KELLY from Pennsylvania, will address this issue. It will allow agencies to place employees on unpaid leave when they are under investigation for serious offenses.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud of the work the House is doing this week on behalf of the American people. We are sending a very strong message to the Obama administration: enough is enough.

CLIMATE CHANGE

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

Mr. ELLISON. Mr. Speaker, I want to talk today about important issues involving climate change going on all over America, all over this world. But specifically today, I want to talk about our urban communities. Global warming is expected to increase the frequency and intensity of natural disasters, like wildfires in the West and hurricanes like Sandy on the east coast, and record drought conditions that continue for another year across the Midwest.

But in urban areas, cities like D.C., or my hometown of Minneapolis, we have something known as an urban heat island. Urban heat islands are a serious problem because urban areas tend to have temperatures 5–20 degrees warmer than rural areas, which is known as heat island effect. Heat islands are caused by a lack of natural vegetation, dark colored, impervious roads and concrete, and exhaust from vehicles and industry. As global temperatures increase, urban areas are warming at double the rate of the average global temperature, so this is a real serious issue.

Heat islands drive people to increase their use of air conditioning, which of course has a vicious effect in terms of just increasing an already serious problem. In turn, increasing the air conditioning drives up energy costs and increases power plant emissions, which contributes to the heat island in the first place.

These emissions not only contribute to global warming, they impact human health, increase emissions of carbon monoxide, mercury, and particulate matter, which leads to increased risks of heart attacks, strokes, and asthma. Particulate matter is very fine pieces that are emitted from coal plants. They go up into the air and come down, and we breathe that stuff in.

The effect of extreme heat in urban areas disproportionately affects some Americans as opposed to others. It affects anyone who lives in an urban area. But given the populations of urban areas, it affects certain communities more, including communities of color, low-income communities, and the elderly.

This housing segregation that we have in our country in which you have this disproportionate number of some populations in urban areas, concentrates racial ethnic minorities in dense environments, and that's why we see African Americans experiencing some of these heat-related hazards that have to do with everything from asthma and other sorts of issues like that. The low-income, minority, and elderly are less able to adapt and recover from these extreme climate events and are the communities most at risk from heat island effects and heat waves.

These communities are already plagued by higher pollution than wealthy, white communities. Coal plants, bus depots, and trash incinerators are disproportionately located in these areas that I speak of, and the heat island effect makes it worse.

The high cost of air conditioning, the inability to move into special heat wave shelters increases risk. Urban minorities often have more underlying health issues, such as higher rates of asthma, as I mentioned before, which also creates susceptibility to increased pollutants in these heat islands.

In 1995, a Chicago heat wave killed more than 700 people over 5 days, mostly elderly people who couldn't escape. The European heat wave in 2003 killed 30,000 people, although some estimates put that number as high as 70,000. Socioeconomic disparities will worsen through the health and economic effects of climate change.

As global temperatures continue to rise, heat waves in urban areas are increasing in frequency, duration, and intensity; and the effect on my community of Minneapolis, and urban areas all over this country, will be devastating. This is a serious issue that we need to focus on. We need to do something about it. The time is now.

I want to thank the Safe Climate Caucus for organizing Members to discuss this issue for the public today so we can all come to a greater level of awareness about the true dangers of ignoring global climate change.

SUPPORT PATIENT OPTION ACT

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

Mr. BROUN of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, this government is out of control. It has become too big and too intrusive. It is spending too much. It is taxing too much. It is regulating too much. It is borrowing too much. And it's sticking its ugly nose into our business too much. This must stop.

ObamaCare does every one of those things. This law is as disastrous as a train running full throttle without an engineer, speeding toward a head-on collision and wrecking everything in its tracks.

I come before you today with a solution, my Patient Option Act, H.R. 2900. My Patient Option Act will revitalize American health care, not through government interference but by giving the American people full control over their health care decisions. It will make health care cheaper for everyone. It provides coverage for all Americans, and it will save Medicare from going broke.

My Patient Option Act repeals ObamaCare in its entirety and replaces it with some patient-centered, commonsense solutions. These solutions include 100 percent deductibility for health care expenses for everyone, including insurance; flexibility for individuals and businesses to join associations where there will be a smorgasbord of health care insurance options; expanding health savings accounts that patients will own and control; freedom for consumers to purchase health insurance across State lines; and tax incentives to reward physicians who provide free care to patients who cannot afford health insurance.

My Patient Option Act accomplishes all of this, and more, in just 77 pages.

That's a stark contrast to the over 2,700-page regulatory nightmare of ObamaCare. In fact, ObamaCare's regulations are 2 million words longer than the Bible. Any bill that much longer than the Bible has to be bad for America.

My Patient Option Act is the solution that Americans need and deserve. Unfortunately, the clock is ticking and time has almost run out.

A Georgia businessman recently told me that his insurance premiums for his employees have increased by 40 percent this year, compared to last, due to ObamaCare.

Another Georgia businessman, who is an owner of several fast-food restaurants and currently employs over 200 full-time workers, recently told me that he is seriously considering letting them all go and hiring only part-time employees.

And recently, even President Obama's Health and Human Services Department has admitted that you might not be able to keep your current doctor, even if you want to. If Congress does not act soon, we will be hearing more and more of these same stories.

I'm here to tell all Americans and all American families that it doesn't have to be this way.

Mr. Speaker, if Americans want true, patient-centered, health care reform, then they must contact their Congressman and Senators and urge them to pass my Patient Option Act.

Mr. Speaker, if Americans want lower costs, coverage for everyone, and government out of the way of the doctor-patient relationship, then they must contact their Representatives and urge them to pass my Patient Option Act.

If Americans want full control of their coverage and freedom to make their own decisions in health care, then the Patient Option Act is the only true solution.

We don't have much time; but through the voices of we, the people, the American people, we can work to repeal this disastrous law and replace it with legislation that serves the best interest of my patients and all patients, not government. That's my Patient Option Act.

UNFINISHED BUSINESS IN CONGRESS

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

Mr. COSTA. Mr. Speaker, tomorrow afternoon we will board our flights back to the district for the August recess. Sadly, we'll be leaving behind a lot of unfinished business.

Just yesterday, the Republican leadership pulled the catastrophe of a transportation and housing appropriations bill because it couldn't even get the votes within their own caucus.

I ask my friends, when are we going to begin to govern and work together?

When we come back from the August recess period, we will have 9 days, just 9 days left until the farm bill extension expires. But we're leaving the House without passing a true farm bill that we can conference, much less appointing any conferees to work out the differences between the two bills. The farmers, ranchers and dairymen expect better in my district.

Uncertainty swirls around the Capitol, but the only thing that seems certain here lately is that we cannot act on anything that the American people want us to that they view as no-brainers.

Take immigration reform. Over half the voters in this country think we should get this done and pass the Senate bill. Yet we are watching the summer fade into fall without even a timeline for when the House will bring up real immigration reform.

It's far too easy for us to throw up our hands and say this place is broken, but that's not why we came to Washington.

No budget, little in appropriations bills, no tax reform, little progress on immigration reform, and no farm bill.

Yet last week, the Republican leaders said that we should, instead, be measured by the laws that we repeal. Okay. Well, on that score, we've exactly repealed zero laws.

I came here to roll up my sleeves and get to work. We have real problems in this country; but we also, I think, share in real bipartisan solutions to fix those problems. All that we need is the green light.

The problem here is that the art of the political compromise has been lost. And it's about time we rediscover that art of the political compromise.

We have divided government. That's not a secret. We've had divided government in the past. And by the way, we're going to have divided government for the next 3½ years.

Let's get real. It's about time that we begin to figure out ways to work together. My hope is that when we go back home we are reminded that every vote here in the House of Representatives, the people's House, is not a litmus test, and that every issue that we deal with should not be looked at in terms of black and white, but in shades of gray.

We have a lot of challenges facing America. I hope, after the August recess, we come back here in September and that we put solving America's problems before our own political agendas.

America cannot afford to continue this three-ring circus. It's about time we begin to work together, ladies and gentlemen.

HONORING MEDAL OF HONOR RECIPIENT ARMY STAFF SERGEANT TY MICHAEL CARTER

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

Mr. MCNERNEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to ask my colleagues to join me in honoring Army Staff Sergeant Ty Michael Carter, who will be awarded with the Congressional Medal of Honor in recognition of his heroic actions in Afghanistan in 2009.

As the father of a veteran, I am truly honored to represent Staff Sergeant Carter, a resident of Antioch, California. The Medal of Honor is our Nation's highest military award presented for selfless sacrifice and acts of courage above and beyond the call of duty at the risk of his or her life.

Staff Sergeant Carter was born in Spokane, Washington, in 1980 and graduated from North Central High School. After high school, he enlisted in the Marine Corps and served in Japan. He had two additional deployments before being honorably discharged from the Marine Corps in the year 2002.

During this time, Staff Sergeant Carter enrolled in the Los Medanos Community College in California and studied biology. Upon the birth of his first daughter, and after traveling throughout the United States, he enlisted to serve his country as a soldier in the United States Army in the year 2008.

It was on October 3, 2009, when Specialist Carter and the 54 Members of B Troop, 3rd Squadron, 61st Cavalry Regiment came under heavy enemy fire in the Nuristan province of Afghanistan.

At great risk of his own life, Staff Sergeant Carter resupplied ammunition to help his fellow soldiers, provided first aid to a comrade, eliminated enemy troops, and risked his own life to help carry a fellow soldier from harm's way.

The actions that Mr. Carter took during this ambush were critical to the defense of the COP Keating, which was established in 2006 as a provincial reconstruction team camp located near the confluence of the Kushtowz and Landay Sin Rivers.

All of our Nation's servicemembers and their families make great sacrifices, and we can never fully repay them. It's important that we pay tribute to those who show their devotion to the United States through their service and that we ensure those who return home are provided with the services they deserve and have earned.

These brave men and women are committed to one another and to honoring the call of duty to protect our great Nation. We owe them the same respect.

I want to commend Staff Sergeant Carter and all of our Nation's veterans for their courage and dedication to this country. Our Nation has always been able to depend on the selfless actions of men and women in uniform for our very existence.

I ask my colleagues to join me in honoring Staff Sergeant Ty Michael Carter, as well as our servicemen and women, their families and veterans, for their service to the United States.

NATIONAL COACHES DAY

Mr. MCNERNEY. Mr. Speaker, I also want to recognize the efforts of Madeline Woznick, a 12-year-old student athlete who lives in Lodi, California. Madeline is a competitive swimmer and has worked to bring attention to the hard work and dedication of coaches across the country and is advocating for an annual National Coaches Day.

There are tens of millions of student athletes in the country. Coaches can have a fundamental impact on these students, and I'm grateful for their endeavors to train and mentor the next generation.

Today's students are tomorrow's leaders, and it is important that they have teachers and mentors who inspire and encourage them in their educational pursuits. As Madeline says, coaches motivate and inspire students to better themselves.

In 1972, President Nixon declared October 6 as National Coaches Day, and Madeline is working to ensure that every October 6 is National Coaches Day so their efforts are appreciated and recognized by communities across the country.

I urge my colleagues to join me in applauding Madeline Woznick and coaches across the country.

RECESS

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

Accordingly (at 10 o'clock and 55 minutes a.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1200

AFTER RECESS

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

PRAYER

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

God of the Universe, we give You thanks for giving us another day.

We ask Your blessing upon those who have worked so hard these past few days. Many issues remain, and their solutions continue to elude. Not all are completely satisfied, but help us all to proceed graciously, remaining vigilant for those values held most dear while being just.

In the days that come, help each Member to understand well and interpret positively, as they are able, the positions of those with whom they disagree. Grant to each the wisdom of Solomon, and to us all the faith and confidence to know that no matter how difficult things appear to be, You continue to walk with our Nation as You have done for over two centuries.

May all that is done today in the people's House be for Your greater honor and glory.

Amen.

THE JOURNAL

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

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

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER. Will the gentleman from New York (Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

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

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER

The SPEAKER. The Chair will entertain 15 further requests for 1-minute speeches on each side of the aisle.

SEQUESTRATION

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

Mr. FORBES. Mr. Speaker, we're now in the 4th week of the civilian furloughs at the Department of Defense that are wreaking havoc on our national security and the lives of patriotic men and women across this country. Mr. Speaker, I've said repeatedly the decisions that led us here were not the result of strategic analysis but yet another consequence of misguided cuts to our national defense.

Just a few moments ago, we were in a hearing in the Armed Services Committee and a high-ranking member of the Pentagon said that the suggestion that we now know the President made for sequestration was a dumb idea. It was certainly a wrong idea. It was wrong when the President signed it into law, but what is worse is the current position of the White House, that even if the House and the Senate can reach an agreement to fix sequestration and stop these furloughs, that they will not agree to it unless we give the President all the spending he wants in every area of government and increases in taxes in all the areas of government he wants.

Mr. Speaker, this is wrong. We need to address sequestration now for national defense and stop it before it's too late.

NATION-BUILDING AT HOME

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

Mr. HIGGINS. Mr. Speaker, last week I met with Rich Lowry, the editor of the National Review, whose new book, ''Lincoln Unbound,'' urges the Republican Party to embrace an aspirational agenda of Abraham Lincoln, who led an ambitious program of rail and canal construction.

His book calls to mind the words of Sheila Bair, a George W. Bush administration official, who, in February, urged her fellow Republicans to remember that, from Lincoln's transcontinental railroad to Eisenhower's highway system, Republicans have understood that investing in critical infrastructure projects creates jobs and expands the economy.

Yet the appropriations bill that was on the floor this week would have cut $2 billion from the Department of Transportation. It was a total rejection of the Lincoln-Eisenhower tradition.

We have spent $87 billion rebuilding the infrastructure of Afghanistan and just approved $5 billion more. According to the United States inspector general, supporters of the Taliban and al Qaeda are getting the contracts and ''far too much will be wasted'' due to insufficient oversight.

This, Mr. Speaker, is appalling, and it's time to do nation-building right here at home.

OBAMACARE

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

Mr. MULLIN. Mr. Speaker, according to the most recently released numbers by the Congressional Budget Office, ObamaCare is now going to cost the American taxpayers nearly $1.4 trillion.

With our national debt sitting at $16.8 trillion and rising every single day, I must ask my colleagues who support this: Can America really afford this?

NUCLEAR IRAN PREVENTION ACT

(Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, the dangers of a nuclear Iran are real and represent one of the greatest threats to our country and to our allies.

In addition to the existential threat to our ally, Israel, Iran is a growing source of violence in the Middle East, propping up the Syrian regime, arming Hezbollah, and undermining a fragile peace in Iraq. More troubling, the Iranian regime is pursuing an active nuclear capability, which we cannot allow.

While we have strong laws on the books already, we can and must go even further to isolate the Iranian regime and the major sources of funding that support it. The Nuclear Iran Prevention Act will cripple that country's energy sector and tighten sanctions on Iran's radical leadership and human

rights violators. For the first time, the bill authorizes the President to impose sanctions on any entity that maintains significant commercial ties with Iran.

Without question, we must come together to prevent Iran from acquiring a nuclear weapon, and I urge my colleagues in the Senate to join us in sending a clear message to the Iranians that we will stand firmly with our friend, Israel, until the Iran regime forsakes this reckless course and rejoins the peaceful community of nations.

ELEVENTH UNANSWERED QUESTION ON BENGHAZI

(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, I've been asking a series of questions over the last 3 weeks about what happened in Benghazi last September. After a year of investigation, none of the questions have been answered publicly, not one.

Tomorrow is the last day before Congress departs for its August recess, and I plan to resubmit all the questions that I've asked so they are listed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for history to see—and history will determine whether the American people ever learned the truth.

Yesterday, I focused my questions on the other U.S. facility that was attacked that night, the CIA annex. Today, I have only one question: Who in the White House knew what was going on in the annex? That's it. One question: Who knew? The Chief of Staff? Then-Deputy National Security Advisor and current CIA Director John Brennan?

Something is just not right.

It is time to honor both those who were killed and the survivors by creating a House select committee and, in the words of the editorial page of The Wall Street Journal, let Benghazi's chips fall.

ANNIVERSARY OF OAK CREEK SHOOTING

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

Ms. CHU. Mr. Speaker, a year ago, the Sikhs at the Oak Creek, Wisconsin, temple, or gurdwara, were peacefully preparing meals for Sunday worship, but that peace was shattered when a 40-year-old neo-Nazi man walked in and began shooting anyone in his path. I stand here today to honor the six victims of this senseless massacre:

Suveg Singh Khattra
Satwant Singh Kaleka
Ranjit Singh
Sita Singh
Paramjit Kaur
Prakash Singh

You will never be forgotten.

Sikhs have been the targets of discrimination and violence. Just this week, the word ''terrorist'' was scrawled against the wall of a gurdwara in Riverside.

In the memory of Oak Creek, we will recommit to fighting against intolerance wherever and whenever it occurs so that the lives of those six brave souls will not be lost in vain.

STOP GOVERNMENT ABUSE

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

Mr. CANTOR. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the measures we're bringing to the floor this week aimed at stopping government abuse.

With millions of working middle class Americans struggling, House Republicans have chosen to lead on the issues that matter to them. We've focused on creating jobs, lowering energy prices, offering children a better education, and lessening the burden of regulations and red tape on their lives. This week, we are holding government accountable to them by increasing transparency, cutting waste, and giving them new protections from an out-of-control bureaucracy.

Our plan is to stop the reckless waste of taxpayer dollars with new controls for Federal agency spending and to give new powers to our citizens so that government bureaucrats can be held accountable for any political intimidation or poor customer service that may occur.

These reforms are reforms that our country needs because many in Washington simply have forgotten the most important principle—the Federal Government works for the people and not the other way around.

I'm surprised that the Democratic leaders have urged opposition to several of these commonsense measures. Why do they want to forbid citizens from transparently recording conversations with Federal regulators? You have to ask: Why do they want to keep paying out hefty bonuses to well-compensated executives in these times of fiscal stress and economic restraint? Why is it that the opposition leaders want to keep paying senior Federal officials who are under investigation for serious ethical wrongdoing? Why do they want to use taxpayer dollars to do that? It just defies logic, Mr. Speaker.

The package of bills being brought to the floor this week are common sense, and they should easily garner bipartisan support. There's simply no reason for Members of either party to support megabonuses, expensive paid vacations, and zero accountability measures for Washington bureaucrats.

We are here to represent the people, not the government. Working families in America want to trust their government, and they want to rebuild their faith in our economy. These bills are a much-needed step in the right direction toward accomplishing this goal.

I urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to support this commonsense legislation. I urge the Senate to join us in this effort and not waste time while these abuses continue.

RECOGNIZING TAFT EARLY LEARNING SCHOOL

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

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I rise to congratulate Taft Early Learning School in Uxbridge, Massachusetts, for being named as a Bronze Award Winner in the USDA Healthier School Challenge. This initiative recognizes those schools enrolled in Team Nutrition that have created healthier school environments through promotion of nutrition and physical activity, a program that is now part of First Lady Michelle Obama's Let's Move campaign.

To achieve this challenge, Taft applied for and received a salad bar grant, which enabled them to offer lots of fresh fruit and vegetable choices every day as part of lunch. They incorporated more whole grains and beans into the menu. They hired an experienced cook to make this happen and added extra physical activity every day, which required the creativity and cooperation of the classroom teachers.

I want to congratulate Principal Judi Lamarre, Food Service Director Janice Watt, the teachers, administrative staff, students, and parents for their hard work in improving the food, nutrition, and exercise programs at Taft Early Learning School. This is a big deal, and I'm proud of this important accomplishment.

KEEP THE IRS OFF YOUR HEALTH CARE ACT

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

Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, in May, the IRS proved to the American people it cannot be trusted to fairly enforce laws.

As if the intentional targeting of Americans was not troubling enough, ObamaCare will give the IRS even more power in just a short month. That's right, the agency that bullied Americans for exercising their right of free speech will be the same agency involved in enforcing health care. Patients and their doctors should make the decisions that work best for them, not Washington, much less the IRS.

Allowing the IRS to enforce ObamaCare opens the door to more abuse, targeting, and intimidation of Americans. That's why I join my colleagues in support of a commonsense bill, H.R. 2009, Keep the IRS Off Your Health Care Act, that will stop the IRS from enforcing or implementing any part of ObamaCare.

It's time for our friends across the aisle to listen to the American people.

Keep the IRS out of our lives and out of our health care.

□ 1215

IN MEMORY OF LOIS DEBERRY

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

Mr. COHEN. Mr. Speaker, the United States lost a great citizen and a legend on Sunday when Lois DeBerry passed away. Lois was the Speaker Pro-Temp Emeritus of the Tennessee General Assembly and the longest-serving member of the Tennessee General Assembly. I had the honor to serve with her. She was a great orator, and she was the go-to person of the Tennessee General Assembly on civil rights issues, women's issues, children's issues, education issues, and anything about Memphis. She served with distinction and was recognized all over the country. The Delta Sigma Thetas were valued to her and valued to have her as a member. She was a past president of the National Association of Black Local Elected Officials and respected in the National Conference of State Legislatures.

Yesterday, a flag flew over the Capitol, which I have to present Saturday at her funeral, the day that we celebrate the 50th anniversary of the March on Washington, a march in which Lois participated as a very young person. Her's was a life well lived. She will be missed by all in Memphis and me.

HONORING CHERYL SCOFIELD

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

Mr. GARDNER. Mr. Speaker, I rise to honor Cheryl Scofield of the USDA Rural Development Office in Wray, Colorado. Cheryl will retire next month as the USDA Rural Development Northeast Area director after 30 years of dedicated service. A fourth-generation Yuma County resident, Cheryl studied at Jones Real Estate College and the University of Colorado, earning a graduate degree in public administration.

After getting her start at Wray State Bank and World Savings Mortgage Company, she took a job with the Department of Housing, but it was at the USDA Rural Development Office where Cheryl spent 31 years as an outstanding and invaluable asset to her agency. Her rural background, education, and true passion for her work gave wind to Cheryl's impressive career.

Outside of work, Cheryl has been an active member of her community—board member, small business development, and a wealth of professional experience she's shared with communities throughout the eastern plains. She's been married to her husband, Delbert, for 41 years. There's not a single community on the eastern plains that Cheryl's work hasn't impacted. Her legacy will live on on every Main Street of eastern Colorado.

Thank you, Cheryl, for your service.

SUPPORT NIH FUNDING

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

Mr. GARCIA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to support funding for the National Institutes of Health and to stop the mindless and automatic sequestration cuts.

Earlier this month, I met with Carlos Santos and James Hodge, two young men from Florida. We talked about their sisters, who suffer from cystic fibrosis, and how potential budget cuts to the NIH will drastically affect their lives.

Cystic fibrosis is a chronic disease with no cure. While discoveries from NIH over the past 30 years have helped double the life expectancy of those with cystic fibrosis, there is much more we can do, including finding a cure for this disease in our lifetime.

Because of NIH's groundbreaking research into this disease and others, I ask my colleagues to support funding for NIH. We must secure our Nation's future by making smart investments in our Nation's health.

SUPPORT CANCER RESEARCH

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

Mr. WALDEN. Mr. Speaker, I recently met with my good friend, Linda Sindt, a former colonel in the United States Air Force from Medford, Oregon. For many years, Linda has served on my service academy nominations board, helping me find honorable young men and women to serve their country in our academies.

This time, though, we discussed a much different issue. Last year, Linda lost her husband, U.S. Air Force Major Duane Sindt, to pancreatic cancer. It's a terrible disease with an extremely low survival rate. We owe it to Linda and other families affected by this disease to help improve treatment and to find a cure.

So last year, with the help of Linda and her fellow advocates, Congress passed and the President signed the Recalcitrant Cancer Research Act, which helps incentivize research and treatment for this horrible disease and others like it. There is still much more work to be done, but we are hopeful we can continue to build upon this effort and find treatments and cures to help patients and families nationwide.

AMERICAN PEOPLE WANT JOBS

(Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, the American people have said loud and clear that what they want the most from Congress is jobs. And what is Congress giving them? Jabs—threats to bring the government to a halt; threats to let the United States Treasury default; threats to slash the funding for mass transit that brings people to their jobs. And the tentacles of sequestration will strangle growth even more. The Congressional Budget Office estimates that sequestration will cost us 900,000 fewer jobs next year.

It's time to stop playing politics with our economy and do the people's work. We need to provide a strong workforce, a strong infrastructure, and manufacturing sectors. We need to provide a living wage to grow the middle class and strengthen America's standing as a leader in education and pioneering research.

But still, our friends on the other side of the aisle are marching to the tune of their own drum when what they should be listening to is the cry of the American people for more jobs.

STOP GOVERNMENT ABUSE

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

Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of the legislation that the House is considering this week. The people of eastern and southeastern Ohio sent me to Congress to get the government off their backs, to allow them to create jobs and to earn a living and raise a family without government overreach and interference.

Over the past 2½ years, the Republican-led House has done exactly that on a daily basis. However, some in Washington have not gotten the message. I'm proud to continue supporting legislation that stops government abuse like we've seen in the IRS, restrains a runaway Federal Government that doesn't seem to have any brakes, and that empowers the American people with greater opportunities to pull themselves up by their bootstraps.

The people of eastern and southeastern Ohio want a strong economy that will create a more secure future for them. The House Republican plan to stop government abuse lays the groundwork for more secure jobs and a more secure future with new jobs, more freedom, and expanded opportunities.

LEGISLATIVE AGENDA

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

Ms. TITUS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to speak out against the misguided priorities that are driving the GOP's obstruct, repeal, and repeat agenda, and

to call instead for a new policy that addresses the serious challenges our Nation faces.

When we adjourn tomorrow, Republican leadership will leave behind a staggering record of unfinished business and partisan messaging bills that put politics ahead of the American people's priorities. Since January, Republicans have not even allowed a vote on a real jobs bill. They haven't finished a budget, passed comprehensive immigration reform, restored funding on nutrition programs, or fixed the sequester.

Their aversion to meaningful action is undermining the important economic progress we've made. It's keeping 11 million undocumented immigrants in the shadows, and it's disproportionately harming low-income women and families. Hopefully they will see the light during the August recess and put aside the obstruct, repeal, and repeat agenda and set a new one that answers the public's outcry for action.

IRS CANNOT BE TRUSTED

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

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, ObamaCare is a train wreck quickly approaching the station near you. This unworkable, unaffordable law will destroy hundreds of thousands of jobs, disrupt the doctor-patient relationship and offer a ''Free Ticket, No Show'' health care system.

According to a recent CBS News poll, 54 percent of Americans disapprove of the health care law, while only 36 percent approve. It is clear the American people have lost faith in the President's government health care takeover bill. The Federal Government, especially the IRS, has betrayed the trust of the American people. Every day, more groups come forward and reveal unfair targeting by the IRS.

House Republicans are acting to protect every American family from the abuse, targeting, and harassment by the IRS. This week, we will vote on the Keep the IRS Off Your Health Care Act, legislation that bars the IRS from implementing ObamaCare.

I urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to support this bill and help restore the American people's faith in limiting government.

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

I am grateful to welcome the Sunny and Jay Philips family to the Capitol.

HONORING ANDREW WALTER

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

Mr. COSTA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize a talented educator in my district, Andrew Walter. Mr. Walter is a math teacher at Stagg High School in Stockton, California. He is one of five California finalists for the 2013 Presidential Awards for Excellence in Mathematics and Science Teaching.

For the past 20 years, Mr. Walter has been enriching the lives of youth in San Joaquin County as the chair of the mathematics department, as well as serving as the math, engineering, science, and achievement adviser for pre-engineering students. An education in STEM-related fields is critical for our students to help them survive in these competitive fields.

Mr. Walter has led his Math Engineering Science Achievement, or MESA, team to win the State championships multiple times and the national championship last year with a wind turbine built solely by his high school students.

It is this type of dedication and commitment that will lead to innovation, the creation of good-paying jobs, and keep America as a world leader in these areas.

I urge my colleagues to join me in congratulating Andrew Walter not only for his nomination, but everything he has done for his students.

ATTORNEY GENERAL MISLEADS CONGRESS

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

Mr. GOSAR. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to address Attorney General Holder misleading Congress with deceptive testimony. If I or any other ordinary citizen did what the Attorney General did, we would be thrown in jail for perjury. In front of the House Judiciary Committee on May 15, Holder said he knew nothing of the targeting of journalist James Rosen, yet Holder himself signed the subpoena for Mr. Rosen's records.

Does the Attorney General suffer from Sergeant Schultz syndrome—where he hears nothing, sees nothing, and knows nothing? How convenient for Mr. Holder—but at what cost to our Constitution?

We are a Nation of laws, but the Attorney General has created an atmosphere of lawlessness in America. Nobody is above the law. He must be held accountable.

As Supreme Court Justice Brandeis said:

> In a government of laws, the existence of the government will be imperiled if it fails to observe the law scrupulously. If government becomes a lawbreaker, it breeds contempt for the law. It invites every man to become a law unto himself. It invites anarchy.

I ask you: Has the Attorney General invited anarchy? I will continue to make my case here in the people's House, at the people's pulpit. I will be back.

SHELTER HOUSING FOR THE HOMELESS

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

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, this is a picture of a homeless young person; 19,000 of them are in Houston, according to 28 school districts. And just think, on the floor of the House before it went thud, there was a housing bill that cut the housing appropriation for homeless and veterans and working Americans to $44.1 billion. But more importantly, under the sequestration amount offered by the Republicans, even the Senate, in a compromise manner, put it at $54 billion.

So I rise today to ask, is anyone speaking for these young people, such as those who reside in a place called Lil Audrey in my district, where I sat down with young people who had lived in a crack house, not because they were on crack, but because that was a place for them to live until they found Lil Audrey? Or the young lady that was abused until she found Lil Audrey? Or the twins who were homeless with no parents until they found Lil Audrey?

I'm going to ask the city of Houston to use its public facilities money, money that it has been blessed to have from the Federal Government Housing and Urban Development, to help build a facility for Lil Audrey, and I'm going to insist that when local communities get Federal dollars that we fight so hard for, to be able to use them creatively to serve people, to serve the taxpayer, to serve the homeless, to serve homeless youth.

How long are we going to have to cry out for young people who suffer from mental concerns and others who have no place to live? I hope Houston will listen, and I hope my friends on the other side of the aisle will have mercy on those who need housing.

END SEX TRAFFICKING ACT—PROSECUTE THE DEMAND

(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, for some of us, growing up was the best of times; simple times; safe times. But life isn't that way anymore for some kids.

Today, young girls, the average age between 12 and 14, are lured into a crooked, despicable business. It's sex trafficking—modern day slavery. Girls have been threatened, raped, forced into selling their bodies on the streets by the worst deviants in our society. Some of these girls are smuggled into the United States by slave traffickers from other countries, and some are from our own neighborhoods.

Sex traffickers should be put into the jailhouse forever. But society must get to the root of the problem: the demand. That's why I have introduced the End

Sex Trafficking Act, along with Representatives MALONEY, GRANGER, and NOLAN. Our bill targets the interstate criminals who purchase sexual acts from child victims and ensures that they, too, are prosecuted as human traffickers. No longer can these deviants hide. Let the long arm of the law punish the child-molesting pedophiles who steal the innocence of children.

And that's just the way it is.

□ 1230

LET'S TURN OFF THE SEQUESTER

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

Ms. HANABUSA. Mr. Speaker, a word not much known about 2 years ago now is a household word. It is ''to sequester,'' a verb, and ''sequestration,'' a noun.

Today, in the Armed Services Committee, we heard the Republican chair and the Democratic ranking member state in almost unison, Sequestration must end. It is a threat to our great Nation's readiness posture, affects jobs, and the manufacturing base.

DOD alone has 800,000 civilian employees. It is not only defense that's being affected. It is all of the discretionary budget. CBO estimates it will cost about 750,000 jobs this year alone. We saw it earlier this year with the FAA.

We will see how the U.S. Forest Service is affected by 500 firefighters that are lost, 50 to 70 fire engines, and two aircraft.

We will also see 70,000 children lose access to Head Start.

What will it take to turn it off, to quote our HASC ranking member?

We all agree it was not meant to be. It's a mistake. Mr. Speaker, let's turn it off.

THERE IS A BETTER WAY

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

Mr. TIPTON. Mr. Speaker, the President is giving speeches on his plan for economic growth. His economic plan is to grow government, regulate more, spend more, and tax more. His speeches will not create jobs.

The economy does not improve when the administration piles on tens of thousands of pages of costly new regulations. Families don't thrive when the only jobs they can find are part-time because of ObamaCare's onerous mandates forcing employers to cut back on hours in order to be able to keep their doors open.

This administration's oppressive regulations cost small businesses, on average, $10,585 per employee. To create jobs and jump-start the economy, we must pull back on unnecessary punitive regulations, hold the bureaucracy accountable, and shrink the size of government and reward, rather than punish, success.

This week we are voting to be able to stop government overreach, stand up for the American people, and give them a fighting chance to be able to succeed, to have access to fair and affordable and effective health care systems, not to have to worry about the Federal Government increasing burdens on their lives, abusing power, and stunting economic growth and putting their jobs at risk.

The American people need this response.

BRING THE AMERICAN JOBS BILL TO THE HOUSE FLOOR

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

Ms. WILSON of Florida. Mr. Speaker, tomorrow begins a long district work period. When I arrive, the number one question will be: Congresswoman WILSON, what are they doing in Washington to help us with unemployment and the economy? What are they doing about sequestration?

I will say, The Republicans have not allowed one vote on serious legislation to create jobs or jobs training programs, not one vote to rebuild our bridges and schools, not one bill to hire more teachers and police officers, and nothing to stop sequestration.

Mr. Speaker, bring the American Jobs bill to the floor. It creates jobs and stops sequestration.

The farm bill is still up in the air. Judicial confirmations are on hold. Immigration reform is still on the radar, and Mr. Snowden is still a fugitive from justice.

Still, all the polls tell us that the number one issue for the American people is jobs and the economy.

Bring the American Jobs Act to the floor. It deserves a vote, and it stops sequestration. Jobs, jobs, jobs should be the mantra of this Congress.

THE GREAT LAKES ECOLOGICAL AND ECONOMIC PROTECTION ACT

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

Mr. JOYCE. Mr. Speaker, the Great Lakes are truly one of the jewels of North America. They contain 20 percent of the world's surface water and provide drinking water for 30 million people. They're also a driver of our economy, as studies have shown 1.5 million jobs are directly connected to the Great Lakes, generating $62 billion in wages.

That's why I'm encouraging my colleagues to support my Great Lakes Ecological and Economic Protection Act. This bill will help ensure we have a healthy Great Lakes, while boosting the economies along the Great Lakes region.

This bill already enjoys bipartisan support, and I hope my colleagues will join me in protecting one of the most precious resources in North America, the Great Lakes.

OBAMACARE

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

Ms. HAHN. Mr. Speaker, as we see ObamaCare go into effect, we see that it is making affordable health insurance a reality for hardworking families. Thanks to ObamaCare, 360,000 small businesses have the right to receive tax credits to help with the cost of providing coverage to their employees.

Thanks to ObamaCare, senior citizens have the right to affordable prescription drugs and free preventative benefits.

Thanks to ObamaCare, millions of young adults have the right to stay on their parents' health insurance until they're 26.

And thanks to ObamaCare, women have the right to no longer be denied coverage because they are sick or have preexisting conditions; and thanks to ObamaCare, women no longer have to pay higher premiums for health insurance just because we're women.

We are finally making great progress in fixing an outdated health care system that has been broken for far too long. Let's not vote to take away the American people's rights.

HONORING THE SERVICE OF SERGEANT CARL MOORE, III

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

Mr. GRIFFIN of Arkansas. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Sergeant Carl Moore, III, from Bigelow, Arkansas, for his continuing service to our country. Sergeant Moore, a fellow Screaming Eagle, is with the 101st Airborne Division.

In early June of this year, Sergeant Moore was wounded while on patrol in Afghanistan. A bullet struck him under his arm, puncturing one of his lungs and grazing his spine.

Sergeant Moore is currently at Tampa Polytrauma Rehabilitation Center where he is recovering. He's unable to walk, but he has feeling in his legs and toes, and his prognosis is good.

I pray for Carl's speedy recovery so he can get back to enjoying the things he loves. My thoughts go out to his parents, Carl and Teresa, of Conway, Arkansas, and his wife, Heather, and their 4-year-old daughter, Addison.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to join me in thanking Sergeant Moore for his service and saluting all who have served and continue to serve our Nation.

HONORING THE LIFE OF LILLIAN KAWASAKI

(Mr. LOWENTHAL asked and was given permission to address the House

for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. LOWENTHAL. Mr. Speaker, I sadly come before the Congress to recognize and honor a person that I loved very much, Lillian Kawasaki. Lillian Kawasaki was a dedicated public servant, a respected community leader, a beloved wife, a sister, and she was a dear, dear friend of mine.

Sadly, on July 18, Lillian passed away, and a memorial service will be held this Saturday, August 3.

Lillian was a generous soul. Her generosity of self always was done with grace and enthusiasm. She engendered tremendous respect and love from all who knew her. She possessed an infectious smile. Her laugh made everybody feel better.

Her work for the last two decades was on environmental efforts, first with the Port of Los Angeles, and then with the Los Angeles Department of Water and Power. It brought not only recognition to her throughout California but also throughout the Nation.

She was an expert on water issues and when she passed away was a member of the Water Replenishment District, elected.

Long Beach has lost one of its finest. I, and countless others in California, already miss Lillian. She will not be forgotten.

OBAMACARE

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

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, the bad news on ObamaCare just keeps rolling in. As if it's not bad enough that the IRS will be helping run ObamaCare, Maryland announced last Friday that health insurance premiums will go up 25 percent next year under ObamaCare.

Whatever happened to the President's promise that premiums would go down, not up? Just another empty promise?

Maryland's middle class families, already struggling to pay their health insurance premiums, will see their policies cost over $1,000 more next year under ObamaCare. Many will just drop their insurance, and that will just increase the long lines we already see in our crowded emergency rooms.

Mr. Speaker, ObamaCare is a disaster. We should repeal it before it does more damage to our hardworking middle class taxpayers and before it destroys even more jobs.

CELEBRATING AMERICA'S IMMIGRANT HERITAGE

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

Mrs. DAVIS of California. Mr. Speaker, last week I joined my colleagues in a bipartisan trip to New York City to celebrate America's immigrant heritage. Together, we sailed toward the Statue of Liberty and Ellis Island.

We stared down those dark, cascading waterfalls at the 9/11 Memorial, and remembered our ancestors at the Museum of Jewish Heritage and the African burial grounds. All around us were reminders of how people came to America, by choice or not, sometimes not by choice, but then hoping for a better life.

Our country has been the better because of it. Whether it's the laborers who built our bridges or the scientists and leaders who made their mark in history, we couldn't be where we are today without immigrants.

I was reminded of that as I witnessed a naturalization ceremony; 82 people from 27 countries became new Americans that day, and you could see their beaming faces.

Immigration is at our core, the moral fiber that binds us together and makes us stronger. Congress now has a responsibility to pass an immigration bill that is worthy of our rich heritage.

Let's write the next chapter of American history, one that our children and our grandchildren can be proud of.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 367, REGULATIONS FROM THE EXECUTIVE IN NEED OF SCRUTINY ACT OF 2013; PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 2009, KEEP THE IRS OFF YOUR HEALTH CARE ACT OF 2013; PROVIDING FOR PROCEEDINGS DURING THE PERIOD FROM AUGUST 3, 2013, THROUGH SEPTEMBER 6, 2013; AND PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 2879, STOP GOVERNMENT ABUSE ACT

Mr. COLE. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 322 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 322

Resolved, That at any time after the adoption of this resolution the Speaker may, pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule XVIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the bill (H.R. 367) to amend chapter 8 of title 5, United States Code, to provide that major rules of the executive branch shall have no force or effect unless a joint resolution of approval is enacted into law. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. General debate shall be confined to the bill and shall not exceed one hour equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on the Judiciary. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. It shall be in order to consider as an original bill for the purpose of amendment under the five-minute rule the amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on the Judiciary now printed in the bill modified by the amendment printed in part A of the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution. That amendment in the nature of a substitute shall be considered as read. All points of order against that amendment in the nature of a substitute are waived. No amendment to that amendment in the nature of a substitute shall be in order except those printed in part B of the report of the Committee on Rules. Each such amendment may be offered only in the order printed in the report, may be offered only by a Member designated in the report, shall be considered as read, shall be debatable for the time specified in the report equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question in the House or in the Committee of the Whole. All points of order against such amendments are waived. At the conclusion of consideration of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted. Any Member may demand a separate vote in the House on any amendment adopted in the Committee of the Whole to the bill or to the amendment in the nature of a substitute made in order as original text. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

SEC. 2. Upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider in the House the bill (H.R. 2009) to prohibit the Secretary of the Treasury from enforcing the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act and the Health Care and Education Reconciliation Act of 2010. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. The bill shall be considered as read. All points of order against provisions in the bill are waived. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and on any amendment thereto to final passage without intervening motion except: (1) one hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Ways and Means; and (2) one motion to recommit.

SEC. 3. House Resolution 292 is laid on the table.

SEC. 4. On any legislative day during the period from August 3, 2013, through September 6, 2013, —

(a) the Journal of the proceedings of the previous day shall be considered as approved;

(b) the Chair may at any time declare the House adjourned to meet at a date and time, within the limits of clause 4, section 5, article I of the Constitution, to be announced by the Chair in declaring the adjournment; and

(c) bills and resolutions introduced during the period addressed by this section shall be numbered, listed in the Congressional Record, and when printed shall bear the date of introduction, but may be referred by the Speaker at a later time.

SEC. 5. The Speaker may appoint Members to perform the duties of the Chair for the duration of the period addressed by section 4 of this resolution as though under clause 8(a) of rule I.

SEC. 6. Each day during the period addressed by section 4 of this resolution shall not constitute a calendar day for purposes of section 7 of the War Powers Resolution (50 U.S.C. 1546).

SEC. 7. Each day during the period addressed by section 4 of this resolution shall not constitute a legislative day for purposes of clause 7 of rule XIII.

SEC. 8. Upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider in the House the bill (H.R. 2879) to provide limitations on bonuses for Federal employees during sequestration, to provide for investigative leave requirements for members of the Senior Executive Service, to establish certain

procedures for conducting in-person or telephonic interactions by Executive branch employees with individuals, and for other purposes. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. The bill shall be considered as read. All points of order against provisions in the bill are waived. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and on any amendment thereto to final passage without intervening motion except: (1) one hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform; and (2) one motion to recommit.

SEC. 9. Upon passage of H.R. 2879, the following bills shall be laid on the table: H.R. 1541, H.R. 2579, and H.R. 2711.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. YODER). The gentleman from Oklahoma is recognized for 1 hour.

□ 1245

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

GENERAL LEAVE

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. COLE. Mr. Speaker, yesterday, the Rules Committee met and reported a rule for consideration of H.R. 367, the REINS Act; H.R. 2009, the Keep the IRS Off Your Health Care Act; and H.R. 2879, the Stop Government Abuse Act.

The rule provides a structured rule for consideration of the REINS Act, allowing debate time for 12 of 23 amendments submitted. In addition, the rule incorporates a technical correction to the bill from Chairman SESSIONS. The rule provides for 1 hour of debate equally divided between the chairman and ranking member of the Judiciary Committee.

Additionally, the rule provides a closed rule for consideration of H.R. 2009, the Keep the IRS Off Your Health Care Act, and provides for 1 hour of debate equally divided between the chairman and ranking member of the Committee on Ways and Means.

Furthermore, the rule provides a closed rule for consideration of H.R. 2879, the Stop Government Abuse Act, and provides for 1 hour of debate equally divided between the chairman and ranking member of the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, the rule provides floor management tools to be used during the August recess.

Mr. Speaker, America's job creators have struggled against strong headwinds to recover. In fact, since President Obama took office, 131 new major regulations, costing at least $70 billion, have been added to America's regulatory system.

Under current law, Congress only has the power to disapprove regulations put forward by the executive branch. H.R. 367 flips that presumption on its head. Any major regulation estimated to cost over $100 million would need to be approved by Congress and must be given an ''up-or-down'' vote within 70 legislative days.

In his State of the Union address, President Obama said:

To reduce barriers to growth and investment, when we find rules that put an unnecessary burden on businesses, we will fix them.

H.R. 367 does just that. It allows Congress to decide whether major rules place unnecessary burdens on job creators.

The second bill covered by this rule, Mr. Speaker, would prohibit the Treasury Department, including the IRS, from implementing or enforcing any provision of ObamaCare. In the last few months, the American people have learned that the IRS has targeted and intimidated Americans exercising their First Amendment rights. Given the recent scandal and the massive amount of sensitive information the IRS is required to collect under ObamaCare, it's completely inappropriate for the IRS to be given this responsibility.

A recent poll showed that 53 percent of Americans want ObamaCare repealed entirely. Mr. Speaker, health care decisions should be made by a patient and his or her doctor, not Washington bureaucrats.

The final bill covered by this rule, H.R. 2879, was extensively debated on the floor yesterday. In fact, it combined three bills, all aimed at limiting government and returning that power back to the people. This bill accomplishes three major objectives:

First, it caps bonuses for Federal employees at a maximum 5 percent of their salary through the end of fiscal year 2015. With Federal officials furloughing employees due to sequestration, the government should not, at the same time, be handing out millions of dollars in bonuses to other employees;

Second, this bill allows for senior Federal officials under investigation for serious misconduct to be put on unpaid leave. Under current law, agencies have little recourse but to put officials on paid leave, where they can collect a paycheck for months or even years while the investigation occurs;

Finally, this bill allows for citizens to record their meetings and telephone exchanges with Federal regulatory officials. In my home State of Oklahoma, along with 37 other States, this is already the case. However, 12 States require all parties involved in the conversation to consent to recording. This bill would allow individuals in all 50 States to record their conversations when meeting with Federal officials acting in their official capacity.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 367, H.R. 2009, and H.R. 2879 all express the views of my constituents. They're increasingly concerned and opposed to an intrusive and expansive government that seeks to tell them what they can and cannot do. These bills seek to stem the tide of crushing regulation and rein in an overbearing Federal bureaucracy.

I urge support for the rule and the underlying bills, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. I thank my colleague for yielding me the 30 minutes, and I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, this is the final week that the House will be in session before we begin our recess. I don't like to call it recess since we work as hard at home, but this is probably the last time we'll get together until we come back in the fall. As the clock runs out on another legislative session, we are voting for the 40th time to repeal or to undermine the Affordable Care Act.

By now, we all know how today's debate will end. The majority will pass the bill, the Senate will refuse to take it up, and we will have wasted, again, the public's time and their patience. And then they will adjourn for August recess, only to return in September with issues like jobs, immigration reform, and sequestration left unsolved, as they are today.

The other night, I was watching comedian Stephen Colbert on his program. He was talking about the number of times we've voted to try to repeal health care. He had a good idea for the Republicans. He said, Obviously, you're not going to be able to do it if you say you're going to repeal health care, so he suggested that a bill be written that is titled, ''This is Not Another Repeal of ObamaCare, We Swear, But Don't Look Inside It, Just Sign It Act.'' If you put that act out, maybe you would get somewhere with it.

Some speculated the GOP is desperate to get rid of this law because they know it is working and will work better as it gets fully implemented and they know they have firmly planted their feet on the wrong side of history once again. I can't comment on their motivation, but it's clear that millions of Americans are using this law because of the incredible benefits that it provides.

I was really stunned by the last speaker on the 1-minutes this morning talking about Maryland, because we just got the statistics from Maryland. The health plans are better than ever. Just last week, Maryland announced their rates are going to be among the lowest in the country, and not, as he said, a 20 percent increase.

Nevada announced a young adult will be able to purchase a catastrophic health insurance plan for less than $100.

And I said last week, when we had the other vote to get rid of health care, New York had just come out with wonderful news on the exchanges. Seventeen insurers had applied to provide insurance in the State of New York, and it would cause those premiums to fall by more than 50 percent. And we join 11

other States with the same kind of news. It's happening all over America.

For those States that decided not to do an exchange and are going to let the government do it, fine. I think they'll do okay there. Maybe we'll move closer to single-payer, which is what we should be doing.

Sixty-two days from now, those new exchanges will open their doors and they're going to provide millions of Americans with secure and affordable health care. For the very first time, insurers are going to be barred from denying coverage because of a preexisting condition and barred from placing lifetime and yearly limits on an individual's health care. They are sending checks back to customers all over the country, because the new law requires them to spend 80 percent of the premium dollar on health care. And since far less than 80 percent is spent, many companies are doing rebates, and people are getting those checks.

I really can't go on much further without talking about what it is we are doing here today. I think it's somewhat historical, but it may not be the first time. It's probably not. I have not had the pleasure before of doing a rule which consists of five bills with very little in common being stuffed into one because the House, basically, imploded yesterday. I've done all of the rules on health care repeal. If I had a machine, I could just press ''repeat'' and walk out of the room and do the same speech over and over again.

The other day I asked Dr. McDermott, who's a psychiatrist, ''What do you call someone or one group that does the same thing over and over and over again, anticipating a different result?'' and he gave me the psychiatric definition for that.

□ 1300

We all know that today's vote is not a single thing except another cynical attempt to score political points. As we go to our districts this August, the question is whether or not the majority will double down on their failed agendas in September and continue the irresponsible attempts to repeal the health care law. If they do, they will be escalating their brinksmanship to a new level and risking a government shutdown simply because they don't want to compromise.

Already, as you know, Members of the majority are threatening to shut down the government if the Affordable Care Act is not repealed. That does show kind of an act of desperation, doesn't it? In fact, a dozen Republican Senators have signed a letter vowing to vote against a continuing resolution—that we have to have because nobody got their work done—that funds the Affordable Care Act, and more than 60 House Republicans have called on the majority's leadership to defund the Affordable Care Act in any continuing resolution that comes before the House.

Instead, I want the majority to make a change here. My fellow Kentuckian, HAL ROGERS, who is the chairman of the Appropriations Committee, yesterday made it plain to everybody that this is all a hoax. He talked about sequestration and the impossibility of bringing a transportation bill that scarcely has enough money to maintain what roads we have, and it imploded on the floor when nobody would vote for it. While we're out on recess, please think about this, and think about what sequestration is doing in the United States.

I hope you read former Senator Byron Dorgan's article in The New York Times talking about the devastation on the Indian reservations because of the money that we owe them by treaty, which is being lost through sequestration; the people who are doing health research at the National Institutes of Health, where they tell me in the human genome project that they are very close to finding a cure for cancer, but now they have to stop it. As a scientist, I can promise you, you do not turn research off and on like a faucet. And think of all the people who can't get their treatment because of sequestration. Think of all the people who live in this area and work for this government and keep this government working, many of them two members of the family on the Federal payroll, who have suffered as much in that family as a 40 percent pay cut.

And the bills that are in here today, again, saying to the Federal employees: We don't value you for anything. We've already passed legislation in here that hurts their pensions. They haven't had a raise in 4 years. What we're saying now, if this bill passes today, is that they can be fired without cause and that their phones will be tapped by any citizen in the United States. I really am concerned about what's going on here.

We talk about too much regulation. I want to close with something I mentioned last night at the Rules Committee because I realize most Americans don't know it. But let me talk about under-regulation.

In the food market, chickens are inspected 100 at a time—100 a minute going through the conveyor belt. They're covered with barnyard debris and feces and whatever else. One person is inspecting them as 100 of them go by. So what's going to happen now they have decided to regulate? They will have to do 140 chickens a minute.

Recently, The Washington Post had a front-page story that stunned me to the core. It said that a young food inspector, working for the government, his lungs bled out and he died from the chemicals that he inhaled from his chicken inspection days. Now, after the chicken goes through a conveyor belt, it goes into a bath of cool water and Clorox. Then it's ready to be packaged and all plastic-ed up and have it for dinner. Is that overregulation? For heaven's sakes, give me more regulation than that.

But I want to urge my colleagues today to vote ''no'' on this rule, the underlying legislation, and quit this farce in the House of Representatives.

I reserve the balance of my time.

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

I want to quickly respond, if I may, to a couple of points my good friend made.

First, I want to begin by agreeing with her because, quite frankly, as I've stated publicly on many occasions, I don't believe a government shutdown is a good idea either. I think that's not a responsible political tactic. And while my good friend has been concerned that some people in my party have advocated that, I would also express a similar concern, quoting press reports that some advisors to the President have recommended that, should we send a so-called ''continuing resolution'' that funded the government that did not repeal sequester, he should veto it and that would shut down the government.

So I think there's been a little bit of irresponsible discussion about shutting down the government—which, with my friend, I agree, is never a good idea—that's come from both sides of the aisle.

In terms of her observations about sequestration, as an appropriator, again, we probably find some common ground here. I would like to see us also get rid of sequestration, but I'd like to do it by redistributing the cuts to the nondiscretionary side of the budget where I think they belong. We need to keep the savings—that's why the deficit is coming down—but there are certainly smarter and better ways to do that. And if the President is willing to do that, I suspect he would find a willing negotiating partner on our side of the aisle.

In fact, though, many of my friends advocate what is effectively a third tax increase this year. We had a tax increase with the so-called ''fiscal cliff.'' When all the Bush tax cuts ended, the President used that to raise taxes. We have a tax increase this year associated with his health care plan kicking in that's major. And now my friends on the other side of the aisle want a third tax increase to keep the government open and operating. We think we can spend money better and smarter, and that we ought to continue to reduce spending, not increase the burdens on the American people.

Finally, I want to talk to my friend, who discussed ObamaCare, and she's absolutely right; we certainly would like to repeal it, and we certainly have tried to make that point repeatedly. Frankly, her disagreement is not with us so much as it is with the American people. This is an extraordinarily unpopular law. No poll has ever shown that more people like it than dislike it; quite the opposite. People would like to see it repealed. It's simply not a very good idea. Frankly, we're seeing signs of that right now. The President himself, in a signature piece of legislation, had to ask that the business mandates actually be pushed back by a

year. We would like to help him in that, and we'd like to do it for individuals as well, but that suggests this was certainly a bill not ready for prime time.

A former Presidential candidate—I very seldom quote Howard Dean in agreement, but he had an interesting piece in The Wall Street Journal this week on why the central cost-control mechanism of ObamaCare—the Independent Payment Advisory Board—simply wouldn't work. Now, that's not us; that's criticism from somebody that probably supports a national health care plan of some kind.

Finally—and I think this does get overlooked in a debate, and I want to end my comments on a point of agreement, because while we have voted repeatedly to repeal, there have actually been times that we have, on both sides of the aisle, agreed—and agreed with the President—about changing this bill.

In the last couple of years, we have actually passed seven pieces of legislation when we were in the majority—they obviously had to go through a Democratic Senate and to the President's desk—that changed or modified ObamaCare—and saved, by the way, about $62 billion. My friends, after ramming that legislation through, looked at the so-called 1040s that were going to be attached to every $600 purchase and said, you know, you guys are right, that's a really bad idea. The President thought so too. And we got rid of it.

We also got rid of the assisted living portion of it, the so-called ''CLASS Act'' that was just financially unsustainable. Why? Secretary Sebelius looked at it and said, you know, this really isn't going to work. And I'll bet you sooner or later we'll get a medical device tax elimination down here on this floor—people on both sides know it's nuts to be taxing people's wheelchairs and oxygen cans because they're sick and use that to fund health care, and I'll bet you we can probably find common agreement on that.

So, while we would like to repeal, we certainly are willing to work when we find common areas and continue to try and improve a very flawed product.

With that, I'd like to yield such time as he may consume to my good friend and fellow Rules Committee member from Florida (Mr. NUGENT).

Mr. NUGENT. I thank my good friend on the Rules Committee, a member that I have the pleasure of serving with.

Today, I rise in support of House Resolution 322 and the underlying legislation, H.R. 367, the Regulations from the Executive in Need of Security Act. I want to thank my friend for bringing this forward as the rule. But this is better known as the REINS Act. The underlying legislation would bring much-needed reform to our broken regulatory process.

Now, my good friend from New York (Ms. SLAUGHTER) talked about chickens—and she mentioned it last night. But the issue really, what she's talking about when you're talking about the number of chickens being observed by the USDA, this is the President. They want to increase the number. They want to go to a private system. So I agree that it's a bad idea. But maybe the REINS Act could actually help in that particular instance because you could bring it back to this House to talk about it because, as a valued member of the Rules Committee, she brought up a good idea.

But somewhere along the line we have lost sight of what Congress' responsibility in the role of regulation is all about. Through the years, we have delegated away our responsibility. We gave it to unelected bureaucrats to make decisions that have far-ranging effects on the American people. I'm pretty sure that our Founding Fathers really didn't envision us doing that; that bureaucrats are going to decide the fates of small businesses and industries. That's exactly what we let happen because it was easy—it's easier. And all too often, in making regulations in D.C., we just aren't in touch with how that actually affects real Americans, real jobs in this country.

We all hear from folks back home about how regulations passed in D.C. are preventing their businesses from growing and expanding. It's a common refrain, Mr. Speaker.

The REINS Act, however, would return us to the vision our Founding Fathers had for this institution and for this Nation. It does so by ensuring that any major rule—that's a rule that has over $100 million in impact to our economy—receive approval from this body and from the Senate before it actually goes into the process of regulation.

Certainly, regulations with an impact this large deserve to have our attention, our review, and ultimately our blessing by our vote. Frankly, they deserve more than just a public comment period that regulatory agencies give the public. For that reason, I urge support of the rule and the underlying legislation.

I'll just give you one anecdote, Mr. Speaker. Back home, we have a cement kiln that produces cement for use all over the United States; employs 200 people right there. And I come from a county today that still has unemployment of 8.9 percent. What the EPA is looking to do is put those businesses out of existence.

When I talked to the folks that actually run the cement kiln, they said, Rich, we can just go across the border into Mexico, where they don't have any restrictions on air pollution, and we can do it cheaper because we don't have to have the pollution controls. But you know what, that air doesn't stop at the border, it comes back into the United States. So when you force companies out—and we have some of the strongest and most stringent EPA requirements for air and water—when you force those companies to leave our country, take the jobs with them, we still breathe dirtier air than we would have. So there has got to be a common ground.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, let me take just a second to say another case of un-regulation is the fertilizer plant blowing up in West, Texas, that had not been inspected in over 20 years.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER), the Democratic whip.

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

Mr. HOYER. I thank the ranking member of the Rules Committee, my friend, Ms. SLAUGHTER, for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I want to say that I have a great deal of respect for the gentleman from Oklahoma. But I say that this House is not working. And the American people are angry with all of us, 100 percent of us.

The gentleman from Florida just said ''surely we can find common ground.'' The gentleman talked about shutting down the government being an unreasonable response, although many in his party promote that. The President's not promoting it; the President is against it. You know our side is against that. Surely, we can reach common ground.

Yesterday, we had eight bills on the floor on suspension. The public doesn't know process, I understand that—they're not too interested in hearing about process. But suspensions make for short debates and no amendments, no ability to make changes in those bills. That's why they were offered on suspension.

□ 1315

Apparently, three of those bills were pulled because they didn't think they had the votes. I don't think they had the votes either—''they'' being the majority.

So what did they do in their pursuit of a transparent ''let the House work its will'' pledge that they had made to the American public when they sought control, being in the majority? They've gone to the Rules Committee. One rule, five bills. How can you debate five different bills with rules, whether the rules are correct? And what are those rules? Closed, no amendments, limited discussion.

Yesterday, we had an appropriations bill on the floor. It was pulled. It was pulled, as I predicted it would be, because the Republican majority cannot get its act together. It disagrees with itself. It is a deeply divided party.

I was just on television, and they played a clip of Rush Limbaugh before that, and Rush Limbaugh said ''we ought not to compromise because we don't have anything in common with them''—meaning Democrats. My response was: ''Oh, I think Rush Limbaugh is wrong.''

We are all Americans, and we are all elected here by Americans to serve

them and to serve their country, to serve our communities and our neighbors, and to try to do things that make sense. Americans elected all of us from different places, different interests.

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

Ms. SLAUGHTER. I yield an additional 2 minutes to the gentleman from Maryland.

Mr. HOYER. I say this because, Mr. Speaker, the American people need to know what's happening.

They pulled the Transportation-Housing bill. I wasn't for that bill as it came out of committee, nor were any Democrats that voted on it in committee, but they brought it to the floor and then pulled it. Nine days from tomorrow, nine legislative days from tomorrow, we are going to have that issue of how we are going to fund government and keep it running.

The Senate just a few minutes ago refused to allow the Senate—because the Republican Party voted ''no'' on bringing debate to close after days of debate and discussion, and they voted ''no'' to take the HUD bill up for discussion.

So in both Houses the Republican Party has abandoned the appropriations process. Now, I've just said that.

HAL ROGERS, chairman of the Appropriations Committee, a conservative Republican, says this:

''I am extremely disappointed with the decision to pull the bill from the House calendar today. The prospects of passing this bill in September are bleak at best, given the vote count on passage that was apparent this afternoon. With this action, the House has declined to proceed on the implementation of the very budget it adopted'' without a single Democratic vote.

He went on to say—Mr. ROGERS, conservative, Kentucky, chairman of the Appropriations Committee, Republican:

> Thus, I believe that the House has made its choice: sequestration—and its unrealistic and ill-conceived discretionary cuts—must be brought to an end.

The Ryan budget was unrealistic when it was considered on this floor. Mr. ROGERS voted for that budget. He knew then it was unrealistic. He knew then it could not be implemented.

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

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield an additional 30 seconds to the gentleman from Maryland.

Mr. HOYER. I predicted then that if you took every Democrat out of the House and every Democrat out of the Senate, that that budget could not be implemented through the appropriations process and through the Ways and Means process, and I was right.

Yes, we need to seek common ground. We are hurting the economy, we are undermining the confidence of the American people and, indeed, we are undermining the confidence of our international partners.

TOM COLE sits here representing the Rules Committee. I want to tell everybody in America TOM COLE is a reasonable Member of this House. He's been a leader of this House. He wants to see common ground, in my view, so I do not criticize him.

But I say, Mr. Speaker, as you tap the gavel, time is not only running out on STENY HOYER, time is running out on this House, time is running out on America, time is running out on the patience of Americans that their House is not working.

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

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, we are witnessing on full display the utter failure of Republicans to govern as the majority.

Yesterday, after the Speaker and Majority Leader pulled the Transportation, Housing, and Urban Development appropriations bill from the floor, because they didn't have the votes to pass it, chairman HAL ROGERS of the Appropriations Committee—that is, Republicans' top appropriator—issued a scathing rebuke to his party's own sequester strategy.

He wrote:

> With this action, the House has declined to proceed on the implementation of the very budget it adopted just three months ago. Thus, I believe that the House has made its choice: sequestration—and its unrealistic and ill-conceived discretionary cuts—must be brought to an end.

Not my words, Mr. Speaker, but the Republican chairman of the Appropriations Committee.

What a shame that we are now harming our national security and limiting our ability to protect the most vulnerable people in America through this sequester process.

It is also hurting our economic recovery, as the nonpartisan CBO has estimated it could cost us as many as 1.6 million jobs that would have been created by the end of the next fiscal year—and 1.3 percentage points of added GDP.

The sequester is a result of Congress stalling on tough decisions and an insistence by tea party Republicans on divesting from America and dismantling the foundations of the American Dream.

And it has been embraced by the Republican leadership as their singular approach to deficits.

But the sequester is not a rational or responsible solution.

It was never meant to be.

The mere threat of sequester was intended to be so severe that it would compel both parties to cooperate and find a balanced alternative.

Now, like Chairman ROGERS, many Republicans are growing tired of the sequester and are ready to compromise.

But not the Republican leadership, and that is very sad.

The complete implosion of their appropriations strategy demonstrates that, in order to pass appropriations or any substantive legislation, Republicans will have to compromise and work with Democrats in a bipartisan way.

It is sad and shameful that we are about to adjourn for a 5-week district work period, leaving critical business to create jobs and tackle deficits unfinished, while Republicans waste this Congress's time on a 40th vote to repeal ObamaCare.

When we return in September, I hope Republicans will see this week's appropriations debacle as their own appropriations chairman has—and abandon their reckless support for the sequester.

Let us focus now on seeking bipartisan compromise and the big, balanced solution that will restore fiscal sanity and give American families and businesses the certainty they deserve.

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

My friend—and he is my friend—I think is really one of the great speakers of this Chamber. I mean that with all sincerity.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. COLE. But this isn't the Senate. We don't have unlimited debate over here, so he's kind of stretching it a little bit, but it's always worth listening to.

Mr. HOYER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COLE. I will certainly yield to my friend.

Mr. HOYER. I used to be the majority leader, and the thing that I hated losing most was my magic 1 minute, because as the gentleman will recall, it was an unlimited 1 minute.

Mr. COLE. And I want to say, my friend, the gentleman, exercised it to the extreme, but he's always worth listening to.

I want to underscore a point my good friend made, because I do agree with you very much about government shutdown. I don't think that's a responsible tactic. I've seen it advocated from time to time from people on both sides of the aisle. We've had reports of it from advisors to the President. I certainly wouldn't suggest the President would agree with that. But I hope we don't get there, and I will pledge to work with my friend to make sure that we do not.

I also think, though, that we ought to recognize that we have worked together on some occasions. My friend and I worked together on the fiscal cliff, we worked together on violence against women, we worked together on Sandy, we worked together, actually, on the CR in March. So there are times when we can come together.

We are working together now. I suspect the President will soon sign the Student Loan Act, an act that was originated on our side—problems were on the Senate side—and passed. Eventually, they came around and saw the same thing the way the President and we saw it on this side of the aisle.

Mr. HOYER. If the gentleman will yield, I say respectfully to my friend, we think the President sent down a piece of legislation similar to yours, correct. But we both worked together; you're right.

Mr. COLE. We did. I appreciate that, and we found common ground. I hope we can again.

But also when we're lectured a little bit on rules—and, look, we both wear

these hats occasionally—I will remind my friends, when they were in the majority, the rules under which they brought a massive health care bill to this floor with almost no debate, a massive stimulus, billions of dollars, with essentially no debate and no consideration, the Dodd-Frank rule.

So whatever sins have been committed on our side of the aisle, I would suggest this is one where you need to look at the log in your own eye in terms of the size and scope of that legislation and the rules that accompany them.

Mr. HOYER. Will my friend yield on that point?

Mr. COLE. I will yield to the gentleman on that.

Mr. HOYER. The gentleman is correct. Both sides have done it. But you will recall, your side criticized us very substantially and said you would not do it. That I think is the difference. But both sides, you're absolutely correct, have brought rules that have been closed and limited in their scope.

Mr. COLE. Reclaiming my time, I seriously doubt that you have never said we wouldn't do this. I've heard the same thing when we talk about debt ceiling where we know the rules get reversed from time to time.

So I think this legislation—and I think it's very significant legislation—but I don't think it ranks with either of the three examples that I gave in which this body was not given the opportunity. Frankly, I think the Republican majority is here today largely because that's the way the House was operated the way the last time my friends had an opportunity to do that.

But regardless of that, I appreciate my friend's remarks as always. I always enjoy the exchange, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. WAXMAN), the distinguished ranking member of the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

Mr. WAXMAN. I thank the gentlelady for yielding to me some time to talk about one specific bill that this rule would allow the House to consider.

Mr. Speaker, I would urge a ''no'' vote on the rule and a ''no'' vote on the underlying bill. It's called the REINS Act, Regulations From the Executive in Need of Scrutiny Act.

What does that mean? Well, that's a bill that says anytime there's a regulation adopted pursuant to a law that we passed that costs over a certain amount of money, Congress is going to pass the regulation. Well, that just delays things and means special interests can get in here and stop those regulations that are needed to protect the public health and the environment.

I want to give an example. I asked the Rules Committee to make in order that this particular bill shouldn't stop proposed FDA food safety regulations. Well, they didn't even allow me to offer that amendment.

But the reason I wanted to offer that amendment and the reason this bill is not a good bill, is that foodborne illnesses, we are seeing outbreaks striking often and more frequently, and that can happen to anybody, Democrat or Republican. Foods we never thought would have imagined to be unsafe—everything from spinach to peanut butter—have sickened an untold number of Americans. Our food supply has also become increasingly globalized, which poses another danger. So 50 percent of our fresh fruit and 20 percent of our fresh vegetables are imported, and this imported food is responsible for a large share of the number of foodborne illness outbreaks. Since 2011, eight of the 19 multi-State outbreaks were from imports.

So what did Congress do? Well, we said we've got to do something about it, and we adopted a bill on a bipartisan basis called the FDA Food Safety Modernization Act. It passed in 2010. That law provided FDA the power to set a way to police the food supply and make significant improvements throughout the food chain from the farm to the dinner table to stop these unsafe foods.

FDA has been working hard to comply with this mandate. This year, they issued three proposed rules that would implement some of the key pieces of the food safety legislation.

One rule would require farmers to comply with science-based standards for safe production and harvesting of produce. Another would require companies that process or package foods to implement preventive systems to stop outbreaks before they occur.

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

Ms. SLAUGHTER. I yield an additional minute to the gentleman from California.

Mr. WAXMAN. The purpose of these rules are to stop and prevent the outbreak of foodborne illnesses.

Last week, FDA issued a proposed rule to mandate that importers demonstrate that the food they bring into the country is safe. Well, these rules will not be allowed to go into effect until Congress—both the House of Representatives and the Senate of the United States with all their committees and subcommittees—meet to consider the regulations that FDA adopted. While they're doing all of that, we'll be exposed to foodborne illnesses.

My amendment would make this process of the REINS bill unnecessary as it applies to this particular area, but it illustrates why the REINS bill is not well thought through. Congress shouldn't have to adopt every regulation if we adopt a law saying to an agency ''adopt regulations based on the science, adopt regulations to enforce the law.''

I would urge we oppose the rule and oppose the REINS bill as well.

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

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. NOLAN).

□ 1330

Mr. NOLAN. Mr. Speaker, there were 87 new Members elected in the last session of the Congress—about half of them Republicans, about half of them Democrats. I'll tell you what, we all got the same message in the last election, and that was that the people in this country had had it with gridlock and partisanship, and they wanted to see some more collaboration, some cooperation, some problem-solving, fixing things, getting things done.

There is so much that we agree on. I mean, our roads are in need of repair; our bridges are literally falling down; the rich are getting richer and the poor are getting poorer; the middle class is getting crushed, and we all want to rebuild this middle class; there are millions of people who are unemployed every day, and there are millions more who are underemployed.

Mr. Speaker, I'm a businessman. I've been a business owner, responsible for the bottom line and for getting things done in my business. I've got to tell you, if we weren't getting the job done, we wouldn't be going on a 5-week recess, vacation—or whatever it is you want to call it. There are so many pressing needs, and we are scheduled to be in session for 9 days in September, and we know what those Mondays and Tuesdays are like. We know what happens here. So we're looking at about 3 or 4 days, and what have we got to deal with? We have to deal with appropriations, the budget, the farm bill, the jobs bill, immigration, transportation, the debt ceiling—and there are Members of this Congress who are calling for a shutdown of the Federal Government.

So I wanted to address just two things today. One is to postpone, or delay, this recess; and let's take up a couple of things. Like I said, our bridges are falling down. Let's take up the SAFE Bridges Act that Congressman RAHALL has offered. Let's take up the American Jobs Act that the President has offered. Let's put people to work in this country. Let's support Congresswoman SLAUGHTER's motion to defeat the previous question, and let's amend it to allow for the consideration of the SAFE Bridges Act.

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

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to a member of the Committee on Rules, the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MCGOVERN).

Mr. MCGOVERN. I thank the gentlelady for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, what is particularly frustrating about what we are doing here today is that this is a colossal waste of time. We are taking up five bills that are going nowhere in the Senate. The President has already issued veto threats on all of them. These are just press releases that the Republican National Committee has decided would be good things for Republican Members to release in their

districts. None of this stuff is meaningful. It's going nowhere.

We are also repealing the Affordable Care Act for the 40th time. When the gentleman says that the Affordable Care Act is not popular, I will remind him that we had a referendum on the Affordable Care Act—it was called a Presidential election. The last time I checked, Mitt Romney was not in the White House. I think he's out on his yacht somewhere, but he's certainly not in the White House.

So we are doing this meaningless stuff, and we have 9 legislative days left before the end of the fiscal year, before we approach a government shutdown, and we have people on the other side of the aisle—people running for President on the other side of the aisle—publicly bragging about how they want to shut the government down.

Now, I have great respect for the gentleman from Oklahoma. I think he is a reasonable, rational, good Member of this Congress. I wish there were more like him on his side of the aisle, but there aren't. In fact, the Republican Party is being ruled by the fringe right-wing elements of that party—those who are pushing for a shutdown, those who are saying compromise on nothing, those who helped defeat the farm bill, those who, quite frankly, are insisting on budget numbers that are so unbelievably low for things like our infrastructure that they had to pull the Transportation-HUD bill from the floor yesterday.

We ought to be fixing sequester. CHRIS VAN HOLLEN, on our side of the aisle, has an alternative to sequester. We ought to vote on it. My Republican friends haven't allowed a vote on an alternative to sequester all year—nothing. We ought to go to conference on the budget so that we can actually get a budget so that we can have reasonable numbers on our appropriations bills that we can pass and be proud that we're doing something to put people back to work. We are doing nothing in this House. We ought not go on recess until we do the people's business.

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

Mr. Speaker, we did have a referendum on ObamaCare. Do you know what we got? We got a split decision because, while the American people certainly reelected the President, they also reelected a Republican House. That's a hard thing to achieve in what my friends would regard as a great Presidential victory. We had 435 different referendums about this. So the American people, for whatever reason, either wanted the debate to continue or certainly didn't want to leave the President, as they did in 2009 and 2010, with essentially total control over the legislative branch. They didn't like what they saw then, and I don't think they would like what they would see if that were to happen.

As for our friends in the Senate, letting them decide what the agenda is going to be in the House, I think, is, quite frankly, a mistake. They don't get a lot done over there. Every now and then, though, they'll surprise you.

I remember hearing these same arguments about the Student Loan Act in that, gosh, what we were planning and proposing, even though it was relatively close to what the President proposed, was never going to happen. In fact, if you'll remember at one point and if I recall correctly, I think the President, himself, issued a veto threat against the legislation. So, had we followed our friend's advice, everybody's student loans in America would be skyrocketing right now.

Every now and then, you just have to go out and fight for the things that you believe in; and, amazingly, sometimes the United States Senate will come around, and, occasionally, the President of the United States will change his mind or at least will decide this was close enough to be good enough.

So I would suggest we just continue to get up every day as we all do, to work as best we can for the things that we believe in, and at the end of the day—believe me—the American people will make a judgment, and we'll see what happens.

With that, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from New Mexico (Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM), a member of the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in opposition to this rule.

Every weekend, I go home to New Mexico, and my constituents always ask me: What's going on in Congress? What is Congress doing to create jobs and grow the economy and end the sequester?

There are currently 2,000 constituents in my district who are getting furloughed every week, and they want to know. There are countless teachers, construction workers, small business owners, and first responders; and they want to know. Unfortunately, the answer is ''nothing'' because of the House Republican leadership. They simply cannot govern.

Yesterday, Republicans pulled the Transportation, Housing and Urban Development appropriations bill from the schedule, illustrating that the sequester and the Republican budget are not feasible. Tomorrow, we will adjourn for a 5-week district work period, and we still haven't passed a jobs bill or a budget that replaces the sequester or that reduces the deficit, and we haven't passed comprehensive immigration reform. Instead of addressing any of these critical issues, House Republicans have decided that it's more important to vote one more time to repeal the Affordable Care Act—for the 40th time.

Mr. Speaker, New Mexicans and Americans want Congress to focus on jobs and economic growth.

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

Mr. Speaker, I want to respond to a number of points my friends have made about the issue of sequester. I simply want to remind them whose idea it was. If they have any doubt, they should read the Bob Woodward book, ''The Price of Politics,'' or follow the lively correspondence that came after the book was published.

The reality is that the idea of sequester was the President's proposal. He proposed it; he advocated for it; he signed it into law. Now we hear from our friends, gosh, the Republicans won't undo it or we didn't really mean that it would actually ever happen.

We've had this discussion before. The simple truth is that we are willing to renegotiate where the cuts come from. We actually agree with our friends on that. What they're not willing to do is to actually reduce spending. That's essentially what the debate is about.

This is the method that the President recommended, signed and advocated for. If he wants to undo it—something, by the way, this House twice in the last term did, but our friends in the Senate never picked it up, and the President never came up with a counteroffer, so we're sort of still waiting over here—and if the President would like to redistribute the cuts, I have no doubt the Speaker would like to talk to him. But the idea that we're just going to simply undo it and lose all the savings, I think, is also unlikely to occur.

So let's sit down. We all know there are better ways to do this. We're willing to do that on our side, but we are not willing to raise taxes, and we are not willing to lose savings.

With that, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Nevada (Ms. TITUS), a member of the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

Ms. TITUS. I thank the gentlelady for yielding me the time.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in opposition to this rule and the underlying bills. I am especially disappointed that my amendment to H.R. 367, the REINS Act, wasn't made in order.

My amendment would have protected women and children from the delay and obstructionism in this bill by exempting the Family Medical Leave Act, the Healthy, Hunger-Free Kids Act, the Individuals With Disabilities Education Act, and the Lilly Ledbetter Fair Pay Act from the bill's intrusive provisions.

These four laws safeguard the economic, social, and physical well-being of women and children in Nevada and across the country. They give mothers the chance to care for a new child, ensure that our students have access to nutritious food, protect the rights of students with disabilities, and help women fight for equal pay for equal work.

My amendment would have offered the Republicans a chance to be reasonable and to dial back their war on the most vulnerable in our country.

H.R. 367, like the other bills being considered under this rule, would hinder our government's ability to serve the people, and it is simply a waste of valuable time. I urge my colleagues to reject it.

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

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Illinois (Ms. DUCKWORTH), a member of the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

Ms. DUCKWORTH. I thank the gentlelady from New York for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, instead of bickering over partisan pieces of legislation that will go nowhere, we should be working to fix the sequester and hammer out a budget that creates jobs, grows our middle class, and responsibly reduces the deficit.

We should be taking up a well-funded Transportation and Housing appropriations bill rather than the draconian measure that drastically underfunded projects like those in my home district, such as the Elgin-O'Hare and the Barrington Road and Interstate 90 interchange. We need to make investments to rebuild our bridges, to improve our infrastructure, and to keep our children safe. We should be working on comprehensive immigration reform that is practical, fair, and humane. Reform with a pathway to citizenship will expand our workforce, secure our borders, and bring in new revenue to help us balance our budget.

I was sent to Washington to work on legislation that creates jobs and tackles the deficit. I don't want to leave for a 5-week district work period without taking some action on our critical, unfinished business.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, if we defeat the previous question, we will offer on our side an amendment to the rule that allows the House to consider the SAFE Bridges Act, which funds emergency repairs and creates countless American jobs. We are about to go into a 5-week break; and so far, the Congress has done nothing to end sequestration or to create jobs for the country. My amendment will prevent the House from going home until we have done the job we were sent here to do.

To discuss our proposal, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Washington State (Mr. LARSEN), a member of the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

Mr. LARSEN of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to support Ranking Member SLAUGHTER's motion to call up the SAFE Bridges Act.

In May, a portion of a bridge on Interstate 5 in my district collapsed into the Skagit River. Like most of my constituents, I've driven over that bridge hundreds of times. The fact that no one died when it collapsed was a blessing, but not everyone has been so lucky. My colleagues will remember in 2007 when a bridge spanning the Mississippi River in Minneapolis crashed down during rush hour, killing 13 people and injuring 145.

So, today, I want to ask my colleagues a very simple question: Should not Americans be able to drive across a highway bridge with the reasonable expectation that it will not crumble away from underneath them?

There are 67,000 bridges in our country that are rated structurally deficient—67,000 bridges. When those bridges fall, it isn't just the unlucky few on those bridges who suffer. Whole economies that rely on safe and efficient transportation suffer. The I–5 bridge across the Skagit River doesn't just connect Burlington and Mount Vernon. It connects the entire west coast and carries millions of dollars' worth of trade every day between Canada and the U.S.

□ 1345

Here's the good news: we know how to build safe bridges. There are thousands of civil engineers devoting their lives today to building good structures that don't fall down, but we need to pay for them. We need to maintain our bridges until they're old and replace them when we need to. We can't wait for them to crumble into the water below.

In light of this obvious need, how much has this Congress done to improve bridge safety or invest in infrastructure?

Mr. Speaker, that was the sound of how much congressional action has been taken—nothing.

Just yesterday, house leadership pulled the Transportation appropriations bill because they couldn't find enough Republicans to support its draconian cuts. Instead of rushing home, we should take up the SAFE Bridges Act introduced by Mr. RAHALL to immediately invest in bridges. Rather than repealing ObamaCare for the 40th time this Congress, we should invest in our infrastructure for the first time.

If you think your constituents should be able to drive over a bridge without wondering whether it will crumble beneath them, then this Congress must act on robust transportation funding.

Mr. Speaker, I enter into the RECORD a State-by-State funding table under the SAFE Bridges Act.

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION
FEDERAL HIGHWAY ADMINISTRATION

ESTIMATED DISTRIBUTION OF $2,750,000,000 FOR EACH OF FISCAL YEARS 2013 AND 2014 BASED ON THE DRAFT BILL, STRENGTHEN AND FORTIFY EXISTING BRIDGES ACT OF 2013

State	Estimated FY 2013	Estimated FY 2014	Estimated Total
ALABAMA	34,528,552	34,528,552	69,057,105
ALASKA	10,150,614	10,150,614	20,301,227
ARIZONA	14,438,937	14,438,937	28,877,874
ARKANSAS	28,254,401	28,254,401	56,508,803
CALIFORNIA	232,052,224	232,052,224	464,104,449
COLORADO	15,902,404	15,902,404	31,804,807
CONNECTICUT	126,132,725	126,132,725	252,265,450
DELAWARE	8,962,416	8,962,416	17,924,832
DIST. OF COL.	20,403,500	20,403,500	40,806,999
FLORIDA	46,328,630	46,328,630	92,657,259
GEORGIA	24,586,058	24,586,058	49,172,116
HAWAII	17,770,494	17,770,494	35,540,988
IDAHO	7,397,016	7,397,016	14,794,031
ILLINOIS	88,159,721	88,159,721	176,319,441
INDIANA	37,906,433	37,906,433	75,812,866
IOWA	31,283,878	31,283,878	62,567,756
KANSAS	22,117,236	22,117,236	44,234,472
KENTUCKY	38,179,080	38,179,080	76,358,160
LOUISIANA	123,906,912	123,906,912	247,813,824
MAINE	18,533,603	18,533,603	37,067,205
MARYLAND	63,577,346	63,577,346	127,154,692
MASSACHUSETTS	137,288,383	137,288,383	274,576,767
MICHIGAN	49,782,579	49,782,579	99,565,158
MINNESOTA	22,911,312	22,911,312	45,822,625
MISSISSIPPI	20,657,648	20,657,648	41,315,297
MISSOURI	63,319,326	63,319,326	126,638,651
MONTANA	7,815,085	7,815,085	15,630,171
NEBRASKA	15,165,106	15,165,106	30,330,212
NEVADA	2,891,304	2,891,304	5,782,609
NEW HAMPSHIRE	15,442,851	15,442,851	30,885,702
NEW JERSEY	137,486,038	137,486,038	274,972,076
NEW MEXICO	5,953,606	5,953,606	11,907,212
NEW YORK	341,675,601	341,675,601	683,351,202
NORTH CAROLINA	63,124,530	63,124,530	126,249,060
NORTH DAKOTA	3,830,998	3,830,998	7,661,997
OHIO	111,055,549	111,055,549	222,111,097
OKLAHOMA	39,269,408	39,269,408	78,538,816

ESTIMATED DISTRIBUTION OF $2,750,000,000 FOR EACH OF FISCAL YEARS 2013 AND 2014 BASED ON THE DRAFT BILL, STRENGTHEN AND FORTIFY EXISTING BRIDGES ACT OF 2013—Continued

State	Estimated FY 2013	Estimated FY 2014	Estimated Total
OREGON	54,382,275	54,382,275	108,764,549
PENNSYLVANIA	250,234,865	250,234,865	500,469,731
RHODE ISLAND	37,487,542	37,487,542	74,975,083
SOUTH CAROLINA	21,911,959	21,911,959	43,823,919
SOUTH DAKOTA	6,903,255	6,903,255	13,806,510
TENNESSEE	29,951,857	29,951,857	59,903,714
TEXAS	73,722,532	73,722,532	147,445,064
UTAH	6,055,018	6,055,018	12,110,037
VERMONT	9,894,077	9,894,077	19,788,153
VIRGINIA	84,581,236	84,581,236	169,162,472
WASHINGTON	79,795,827	79,795,827	159,591,654
WEST VIRGINIA	28,908,317	28,908,317	57,816,633
WISCONSIN	14,616,136	14,616,136	29,232,273
WYOMING	3,313,600	3,313,600	6,627,199
TOTAL	2,750,000,000	2,750,000,000	5,500,000,000

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

Ms. SLAUGHTER. May I inquire if my colleague has more speakers?

Mr. COLE. I do not have any more speakers, and I'm prepared to close whenever my friend is.

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

As we speak, sequestration is hitting very hard in communities all across the country. Federal employees are furloughed; important investments in science, technology, public health, and defense are being curtailed; children are being shut out of Head Start. Meanwhile, the majority has repeatedly refused to repeal the sequester and have failed to pass a single job bill creation into law.

The American people need us to stop these political games and get down to work creating jobs and rebuilding this economy. Now is not the time to adjourn Congress, and we should not leave here until we have produced real results for the American families that are truly struggling to get by.

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

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

There was no objection.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote ''no'' to defeat the previous question and to vote ''no'' on the rule.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

In closing, I want to begin by reminding my friends whose idea sequester was. It was the President of the United States.

The President likes to take some credit—and in some ways he deserves some—for our budget deficit coming down. Frankly, after four trillion-dollar deficits in a row, a Republican Congress came into office and that deficit is now moving down. It's about half of what it was. We've worked with the President to actually achieve something he said he wanted to, which is lower the deficit. He likes to take credit for it.

Second, I'd like to also remind my friends, Mr. Speaker, in closing, that I think these bills really are good bills. They provide important checks on the expanding power of the executive branch. How many times have all of us gone home and been regaled with tales of bureaucrats that are simply out of control or rules that make no sense or have an enormous economic impact? It happens all the time. That needs to change.

Senator Daniel Webster described the Federal Government as ''made by the people, made by the people, and answerable to the people.'' I would suggest we've forgotten the last of these three phases, ''answerable to the people.'' That's what these bills are about, trying to make the Federal Government more responsive and more answerable to the people. The underlying bills recognize just that and restore the power of governance to elected officials, not to unaccountable Washington bureaucrats.

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

Mr. COLE. Mr. Speaker, when the Committee on Rules filed its report (H. Rept. 113–187) to accompany House Resolution 322 the Committee was unaware that the waiver of all points of order against consideration of H.R. 2879 included:

A waiver of clause 9(a)(2) of rule XXI , prohibiting consideration of a bill or joint resolution not reported by a committee, unless the chair of each committee of initial referral has caused a list of congressional earmarks, limited tax benefits, and limited tariff benefits in the bill or a statement that the proposition contains no congressional earmarks, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits to be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD prior to its consideration. The required statement from the chair of the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, the primary committee of jurisdiction, was printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD dated July 31, 2013. However, the required statement from the chair of the Committee on the Judiciary, which also received an additional referral, was submitted for printing on August 1, 2013. Both statements provide that H.R. 2879 does not contain any congressional earmarks, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits.

A waiver of clause 11 of rule XXI, prohibiting the consideration of a bill or joint resolution which has not been reported by a committee until the third calendar day (excluding Saturdays, Sundays, or legal holidays except when the House is in session on such a day) on which such measure has been available to Members, Delegates, and the Resident Commissioner. While the text of the bill is substantially identical to the three bills previously debated in the House on July 31, 2013, H.R. 2879 was not introduced until later that day.

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

AN AMENDMENT TO H. RES. 322 OFFERED BY MS. SLAUGHTER OF NEW YORK

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

SEC. 10. Immediately upon adoption of this resolution the Speaker shall, pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule XVIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the bill (H.R. 2428) to direct the Secretary of Transportation to assist States to rehabilitate or replace certain bridges, and for other purposes. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. General debate shall be confined to the bill and shall not exceed one hour equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. All points of order against provisions in the bill are waived. At the conclusion of consideration of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions. If the Committee of the Whole rises and reports that it has come to no resolution on the bill, then on the next legislative day the House shall, immediately after the third daily order of business under clause 1 of rule XIV, resolve into the Committee of the Whole for further consideration of the bill

SEC. 11. Clause 1(c) of rule XIX shall not apply to the consideration of the bill specified in section 10 of this resolution.

SEC. 12. It shall not be in order to consider a concurrent resolution providing for adjournment or adjournment sine die unless the House has been notified that the President has signed legislation to provide for the creation of American jobs.

THE VOTE ON THE PREVIOUS QUESTION: WHAT IT REALLY MEANS

This vote, the vote on whether to order the previous question on a special rule, is not merely a procedural vote. A vote against ordering the previous question is a vote against the Republican majority agenda and a vote to allow the Democratic minority to

offer an alternative plan. It is a vote about what the House should be debating.

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

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

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

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

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HOLDING). The question is on ordering the previous question.

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

ENERGY CONSUMERS RELIEF ACT OF 2013

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. CASSIDY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on the bill, H.R. 1582.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 315 and rule XVIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill, H.R. 1582.

Will the gentleman from Kansas (Mr. YODER) kindly take the chair.

□ 1353

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H.R. 1582) 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 Mr. YODER (Acting Chair) in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Acting CHAIR. When the Committee of the Whole rose on Wednesday, July 31, 2013, a request for a recorded vote on amendment No. 3 printed in part B of House Report 113–174 offered by the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. CONNOLLY) had been postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 4 OFFERED BY MR. WOODALL

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 4 printed in part B of House Report 113–174.

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 2, lines 11 through 17, amend subparagraph (D) to read as follows:

(D)(i) an estimate of the total benefits of the rule and when such benefits are expected to be realized;

(ii) a description of the modeling, the calculations, the assumptions, and the limitations due to uncertainty, speculation, or lack of information associated with the estimates under this subparagraph; and

(iii) a certification that all data and documents relied upon by the Agency in developing such estimates—

(I) have been preserved; and

(II) are available for review by the public on the Agency's Web site, except to the extent to which publication of such data and documents would constitute disclosure of confidential information in violation of applicable Federal law;

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 315, the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. WOODALL) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume to talk about an amendment that recognizes that knowledge is power.

So often today, we've talked about what we can do to make the government more accountable to the people. One of those things is entailed in the underlying bill that says, for these big rules that make a big difference, tell us what it is that you did. How did you come to this decision that this is the rule that you want to implement? My amendment goes one step further and asks for the underlying data on which that decision was made. We want to know what those calculations were.

It's going to be a good step forward if we can get agencies to share with us their modeling, but one step further would be those calculations that went into the modeling and came out of the modeling. What about the underlying data, Mr. Chairman? How in the world can we be in a conversation with the American people as the Congress with the agencies if we don't have access to the underlying data?

This is not a trade secret. This is not private information. This is the information that the agency uses to promulgate these rules that will then govern the entire United States of America. We simply say, if the disclosure of that data won't violate any laws, if it won't violate any trade secrets, if it's not going to be in violation of any applicable Federal laws, share that with America, post that on your Web page so that anyone who is interested in understanding how it is that these decisions that often go on behind closed doors, that often go on without the oversight of the public, not just what did you decide, but how did you decide it.

It's very difficult, whether you're a Republican or whether you're a Democrat, to hold the considered experts at these agencies accountable if you can't see the underlying data that went into their calculations. It's a simple amendment that says please share that with us. We're not questioning your expertise. We simply want to be a part of that process.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. WAXMAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to this amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from California is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. WAXMAN. Mr. Chairman and my colleagues, as I rise in opposition to this amendment, the supporters would claim that it's about transparency. What it's really about is not transparency. It's about a way to block or delay critical EPA rules. That's what this whole bill is all about. The amendment does the same thing. They use

rhetoric about transparency to cloud the amendment's true impact.

The amendment would prevent EPA from using the best science available when implementing its public health laws. It accomplishes this by not allowing EPA to rely on any scientific study unless the agency can publish, on its Web site, all of the underlying data associated with that study.

Today, EPA prides itself on using the best science available. The Agency understands that ideology will not stand the test of time, but science will; and their rules and regulations have to be based on the science, so they gladly inform stakeholders and the public about the studies upon which they rely.

The underlying data to peer-reviewed studies is often not published. That's because the data sets underlying peer-reviewed scientific studies are the property of the scientists that spend their careers gathering that information. The EPA cannot require the scientists to give up their private information. Oftentimes, those studies involve going to a lot of people and trying to find out the impact of certain exposure to pollutants. Those people agree to the study on the basis that this information about them will not be made public. But this amendment would say it would be impossible for EPA to use gold-standard scientific studies available to them unless they post this other data on their Web site.

Why do we want to prevent EPA from using high-quality scientific studies to set new pollution standards?

□ 1400

This is an issue that came up many years ago. In 1997, EPA used a study conducted by researchers at Harvard to set a new air quality standard for particulate matter. They did a rigorous peer-reviewed study that was conducted over a period of 16 years. The Harvard people showed conclusively that exposure to particulate matter in the air can kill people, while polluters said: We don't want EPA to issue this rule, it's going to cost us money.

So they said that EPA should publish all of the Harvard scientists' data, claiming that the scientists were keeping a secret. Well, the data is the work product and property of the Harvard scientists, not EPA. The agency couldn't release that information. They're relying on the Harvard scientists to give independent scientists access to the data after the scientists signed a confidentiality agreement. So independent scientists spent the next 3 years reanalyzing the data, and came to exactly the same conclusion.

There should be no objection to EPA relying on studies like this one. It's a long-term study with a huge sample. This is exactly the kind of rigorous review we expect of EPA. I urge opposition to this amendment.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 15 seconds to say nothing can be further from the truth. There is a specific provision in this amendment that says you shall not disclose anything for which the disclosure would violate your commitments under Federal law. All we're asking is for whatever EPA saw, whatever the agency saw to make their decision. If it was good enough for the agency, shouldn't it be good enough for Congress as well?

With that, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. CASSIDY).

Mr. CASSIDY. Mr. Chairman, I cannot understand why somebody would object to this. The bill is about transparency, and this amplifies that transparency. EPA can impose rules which cost tens or even hundreds of billions of dollars on the U.S. economy. Those expenses translate into jobs lost.

Having access to the underlying information, and the estimates of cost and benefits, is critical to know why that is. And as my colleague said, there is no reason to have to reveal information about individuals. And let me just point to the medical literature. In the medical literature, there is a push that when the Federal Government funds research, that that underlying data is made subject, is made available to the general public. When the FDA reviews drugs, FDA will look at underlying data. So why would we require it for medications, which obviously affect many people, but not for the EPA. Having methodology which is transparent is absolutely essential in modern scientific literature. I don't see why there is an objection to it unless the hope is that EPA can satisfy an ideological bent without having to justify it.

This amendment will provide more transparency for EPA's billion-dollar rules. I urge my colleagues to vote ''yes'' on the amendment and ''yes'' on the underlying bill. The American people cannot afford to have jobs shipped overseas or have their economy otherwise wrecked. More rationality, transparency, and accountability must be brought to the EPA and its rulemaking process.

Mr. WAXMAN. Mr. Chairman, the fact of the matter is that EPA does not have this underlying data. It doesn't belong to EPA. It belongs to the scientists who did the study.

Consider this issue in a different context. If a pharmaceutical manufacturer wants to bring a new product to market, they would never be required to post all of their underlying data on the public Web site in order for FDA to rely on it. There's no other agency that would be held to such an unreasonable requirement as this amendment would impose on EPA. They review the data, but they don't put it on their Web site. EPA does not have the underlying data, and they can't require that the owners of the underlying data who did the study, often based on confidential agreements for those who participate in the study, they can't require that study be given to them. They are relying on the scientific data and the study results.

I think all this would do is make it more difficult for EPA to protect the public health.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Chairman, how much time remains?

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Georgia has 1¼ minutes remaining.

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself the balance of my time to say that I think I speak for most of America that says I understand the government has to make decisions, but since the government is making those decisions on my behalf, shouldn't the government share with me the data that it uses to make those decisions?

The gentleman says this is going to hold EPA to a higher standard than the other agencies. I would say to the gentleman, you can look forward to me being back with this same amendment for absolutely every agency.

All we're saying is if you've seen the data, if you've utilized the data, if you believe this is sound enough science on which to base a regulation that is going to cost not $1, not $100, not $1,000, not $1 million, but more than $1 billion, isn't it worth sharing with the American people how you reached that conclusion?

Mr. Chairman, the work that we do here, we should be proud enough of to share with absolutely anyone who asks. This is about transparency. And even if you don't support the underlying bill—I'm a strong supporter, but even if you don't—you should support in the context of transparency providing the underlying materials to the American public that went into this decisionmaking process.

Mr. Chairman, this is a great step forward as a transparency tool for the American public to restore that faith in government that has been lost.

I rise in strong support of the underlying bill and ask my colleagues to support the amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR (Mr. FORTENBERRY). The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. WOODALL).

The amendment was agreed to.

The Acting CHAIR. The Chair understands that amendment No. 5 will not be offered.

AMENDMENT NO. 6 OFFERED BY MR. MURPHY OF PENNSYLVANIA

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 6 printed in part B of House Report 113–174.

Mr. MURPHY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of the committee print, add the following section:

SEC. 5. PROHIBITION ON USE OF SOCIAL COST OF CARBON IN ANALYSIS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law or any executive

order, the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency may not use the social cost of carbon in order to incorporate social benefits of reducing carbon dioxide emissions, or for any other reason, in any cost-benefit analysis relating to an energy-related rule that is estimated to cost more than $1 billion unless and until a Federal law is enacted authorizing such use.

(b) DEFINITION.—In this section, the term ''social cost of carbon'' means the social cost of carbon as described in the technical support document entitled ''Technical Support Document: Technical Update of the Social Cost of Carbon for Regulatory Impact Analysis Under Executive Order 12866'', published by the Interagency Working Group on Social Cost of Carbon, United States Government, in May 2013, or any successor or substantially related document, or any other estimate of the monetized damages associated with an incremental increase in carbon dioxide emissions in a given year.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 315, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. MURPHY) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. MURPHY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 2 minutes.

I have an amendment in order that would prohibit the EPA from using ''social cost of carbon'' estimates for any energy-related rule that costs more than $1 billion unless and until a Federal law is enacted authorizing such use.

The administration slipped into a rule about microwave ovens a new prediction for the cost of carbon dioxide between now and the year 2300. Despite the profound implications to the economy and the families who make a living from coal, there was no public debate, no stakeholder comment, no vote in Congress on this new estimate.

In southwestern Pennsylvania, coal is our heritage. It fires the steel mills that built the Empire State Building, the St. Louis Arch, and the Golden Gate Bridge. But that heritage and prosperity is threatened by this new regulation. We've already seen what the social cost of the war on coal is today—the cost is jobs.

Three weeks ago, more than 380 workers at the Hatfield's Ferry and Mitchell power plants in Pennsylvania were told they are losing their jobs. The plants had to shut down under EPA regulations after they had spent hundreds of millions of dollars in new environmental modernizations.

More than 15 organizations representing workers and stakeholders endorse my amendment because these groups share my concern that this bypassed congressional oversight and will put hundreds of thousands of miners, boilermakers, factory workers, laborers, railroaders, electricians, operating engineers, steamfitters and machinists out of work.

My amendment says Congress, not the EPA, decides regulations by considering what this means to the families and workers. The EPA's policies have real-world consequences. Annual coal production in central Appalachia is dropping sharply—by more than half in just 5 years' time. There are towns where mines are shutting down, where a staggering 41 percent of the residents fall below the poverty line.

The social cost of carbon and the wider war on coal is a war on the American worker and their family.

Let me show you the real cost of the EPA's rules. Those who oppose this amendment ignore the health effects on those living in poverty, who are twice as likely to have a risk of depression, asthma, obesity, diabetes, heart attacks, and other health effects. Poverty leads to devastated communities, early death, and lost dreams of a generation of Americans and their children.

Many of us can remember Bobby Kennedy's walk through those broken Appalachian coal towns back in the 1960s to illustrate the abject poverty where families and children were living. I worked and volunteered in those towns, trying to help families hang on to some sort of semblance of hope in a hard-scrabble life.

The Acting CHAIR. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. MURPHY of Pennsylvania. I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Too often their hope failed, and now history is about to repeat itself. First, jobs are lost by the tens of thousands and, after that, the hundreds of thousands. And when people lose their jobs, we give them unemployment compensation. They go hungry; we give them food stamps. They lose unemployment; we give them welfare. They lose their homes; we give them public housing. They lose their dignity and pride, and the government has nothing left to give—nothing—when all these folks ever really wanted was a job—a job and a chance for the American dream not shattered by the EPA.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. WAXMAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from California is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. WAXMAN. The Murphy amendment denies that carbon pollution is harmful. It prohibits the Environmental Protection Agency from considering the costs of climate change when analyzing the impacts of its rules. According to this amendment, the cost of carbon pollution is zero. Well, that's science denial at its worst. We are telling EPA the cost of carbon pollution is zero. It's like waving a magic wand. We are going to decree that climate change imposes no costs at all.

The House Republicans can vote for this amendment. They can try to block EPA from recognizing the damage caused by climate change, but they cannot overturn the laws of nature. We should be heeding the warnings of the world's leading climate scientists, not denying reality.

In the real world, scientific instruments accurately measure the levels of carbon dioxide in the atmosphere and the levels trapped in ancient ice. Those measurements tell us that carbon dioxide levels just hit 400 parts per million this spring, and that's the highest levels in the last 3 million years. In the real world, higher levels of heat-trapping carbon pollution are warming the planet and changing the climate. We are experiencing more record-breaking temperatures, worse droughts, longer wildfire seasons with more intense wildfires, and an increased number of intense storms, more flooding, and rapidly rising sea levels. Pretend it doesn't happen. Pretend that's not the reality.

On the other hand, as the proponent of this amendment suggested, let's look at the impact on the family that may lose its job. Well, I think that ought to be under consideration, but let's not have an amendment that would ignore the cost of carbon pollution.

We are seeing the effect of climate change not some time in the future but right now. And we're being told it's not going to get better by itself; it's going to get worse. Scientists have been telling us for years. EPA and other Federal agencies have a responsibility to calculate the cost of climate change and take them into account when they issue new standards. That's common sense, and that was the clear message from the Government Accountability Office when it added climate change to its high-risk list earlier this year, and that's exactly what the Obama administration is doing.

□ 1415

They have an interagency task force that worked, over the course of several years, to estimate the cost of the harm from carbon pollution. It incorporated the latest scientific and technical information.

I'm sorry people lose their jobs, but they don't have to lose their jobs. If an industry is told to reduce carbon emissions, they don't have to fire people. They can develop and buy the technology that would reduce that pollution.

So to help those polluters not have to do that, we're going to pretend there's no cost. Mr. MURPHY's amendment would require the government to assume zero harm, zero cost from carbon pollution and climate change.

I urge my colleagues to reject this amendment. It's based on magical thinking. Don't be a science-denier. Vote against the amendment.

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

Mr. MURPHY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, how much time do we have left on our side?

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Pennsylvania has 2½ minutes remaining. The gentleman from California has 1 minute remaining.

Mr. MURPHY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I now yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from West Virginia (Mrs.

CAPITO), the number two coal-producing State in America.

Mrs. CAPITO. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of my colleague Mr. MURPHY's amendment and in opposition to the EPA's arbitrary, backdoor approach to regulating carbon dioxide emissions. These regulations would and are having a catastrophic effect on jobs and economic activity across the country, especially in our coal-producing States such as West Virginia and Pennsylvania.

The administration's new Social Cost of Carbon calculation is nothing more than a gimmick used to circumvent Congress so that job-killing regulations and an anti-domestic energy agenda can move forward.

Perhaps to no one's surprise, just as the administration is stepping up its efforts to issue regulations aimed at closing existing plants and stopping new ones, it decided, without public comment or transparency, to increase the cost of carbon by 44 percent. The fact is, U.S. carbon emissions from the energy sector have fallen in the last 4 of 5 years.

I am not willing to sacrifice West Virginia jobs to the administration's ideological efforts. I ask my colleagues to put jobs ahead of politics and pass the Murphy amendment.

Mr. WAXMAN. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MURPHY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BARTON).

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

Mr. BARTON. I want to thank the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of the Murphy amendment, and I also want to say we should vote for that in conjunction with the gentleman from Georgia's amendment that was just heard previously.

If you walk into a greenhouse anywhere in America, do you know what the average carbon concentration will be? It won't be 350 parts per million. It won't be 400 parts per million. It will be over 1,000 parts per million. We have records that indicate the CO_2 concentration in the upper atmosphere has been as high as 5,000 to 6,000 parts per million in the past.

The gentleman from California and those adherents of his philosophy would have you believe that having a carbon concentration between 350 and 400 parts per million is somehow cataclysmic. Nothing could be further from the truth.

And this new cost of carbon calculation that the EPA and the DOE have begun to include needs to be, at a minimum, made transparent. I think it's fine until we have the facts that it shouldn't be allowed at all.

So vote for the Murphy amendment.

Mr. WAXMAN. Mr. Chairman and my colleagues, this is not my philosophy that would lead me to urge that we reduce carbon emissions. It's based on the science. Thousands of peer-reviewed scientific studies have indicated that carbon causes problems. It causes health effects, and it threatens the climate.

The homeowners in Arizona, Texas, Colorado, and California who have seen their homes ravaged by drought-stoked wildfires know the cost of carbon pollution. The families of brave firefighters know the cost of carbon pollution.

The farmers and ranchers suffering the effects of prolonged drought, many of whom have lost entire crops or been forced to sell their livestock, know the cost of carbon pollution. And the thousands who lost businesses and homes after Hurricane Sandy slammed into the east coast know the cost of carbon pollution.

That cost is not based on a philosophy. It's based on the science and the reality.

Reject this magical-thinking amendment. Don't be a science-denier. Vote against the amendment and the underlying bill.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. MURPHY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, this isn't about denying science; this is about denying jobs and denying opportunity.

The underlying amendment here is supported by the boilermakers, the electrical workers, the operating engineers, the carpenters, and United Mine Workers, the American Energy Alliance, National Mining Association, National Taxpayers Union, and Chamber of Commerce because they want jobs and they don't want poverty.

And poverty, Mr. Chairman, is the number one threat to the environment. Poverty is the number one threat to public health. It's time Congress took charge of regulations and not unregulated divisions of the government.

Mr. Chairman, I ask Members to support this amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. MURPHY).

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

Mr. WAXMAN. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania will be postponed.

Mr. CASSIDY. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. WOODALL) having assumed the chair, Mr. FORTENBERRY, Acting Chair of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 1582) 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, had come to no resolution thereon.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess for a period of less than 15 minutes.

Accordingly (at 2 o'clock and 21 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1435

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. WOODALL) at 2 o'clock and 35 minutes p.m.

ENERGY CONSUMERS RELIEF ACT OF 2013

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 315 and rule XVIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill, H.R. 1582.

Will the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. FORTENBERRY) kindly resume the chair.

□ 1436

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H.R. 1582) 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 Mr. FORTENBERRY (Acting Chair) in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Acting CHAIR. When the Committee of the Whole rose earlier today, a request for a recorded vote on amendment No. 6 printed in part B of House Report 113–174, offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. MURPHY), had been postponed.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, proceedings will now resume on those amendments printed in part B of House Report 113–174 on which further proceedings were postponed, in the following order:

Amendment No. 1 by Mr. WAXMAN of California.

Amendment No. 3 by Mr. CONNOLLY of Virginia.

Amendment No. 6 by Mr. MURPHY of Pennsylvania.

The Chair will reduce to 2 minutes the time for any electronic vote after the first vote in this series.

AMENDMENT NO. 1 OFFERED BY MR. WAXMAN

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded

vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. WAXMAN) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 183, noes 230, not voting 20, as follows:

[Roll No. 428]

AYES—183

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

NOES—230

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

NOT VOTING—20

Campbell
Collins (GA)
Goodlatte
Herrera Beutler
Holt
Horsford
Hudson
King (IA)
Lewis
McCarthy (NY)
Miller (FL)
Miller, George
Pallone
Pelosi
Richmond
Rogers (MI)
Ruppersberger
Sensenbrenner
Wasserman Schultz
Young (FL)

□ 1502

Messrs. KINGSTON, POSEY, and CUELLAR changed their vote from ''aye'' to ''no.''

Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California, Mr. ANDREWS, Ms. JACKSON LEE, and Mr. O'ROURKE changed their vote from ''no'' to ''aye.''

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated against:

Mr. ROHRABACHER. Mr. Chair, on rollcall No. 428, I inadvertently voted "yes," when my intention was to vote "no."

AMENDMENT NO. 3 OFFERED BY MR. CONNOLLY

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. CONNOLLY) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This will be a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 182, noes 224, not voting 27, as follows:

[Roll No. 429]

AYES—182

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

NOES—224

Aderholt
Alexander
Amash
Amodei
Bachmann
Bachus
Barletta
Barr
Barrow (GA)
Barton
Benishek
Bentivolio
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Bonner
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Broun (GA)

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

NOT VOTING—27

Campbell
Carter
Collins (GA)
Delaney
Frelinghuysen
Goodlatte
Herrera Beutler
Holt
Horsford
Hudson
King (IA)
Lewis
Luetkemeyer
McCarthy (NY)
Miller (FL)
Miller, George
Nadler
Pallone
Pelosi
Richmond
Rogers (MI)
Ruppersberger
Rush
Schiff
Sensenbrenner
Wasserman Schultz
Young (FL)

□ 1508

Mr. LARSEN of Washington changed his vote from ''no'' to ''aye.''

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated for:

Mr. DELANEY. Mr. Chair, on rollcall No. 429, the Connolly/Kildee amendment 3, had I been present, I would have voted "yes."

Mr. SCHIFF. Mr. Chair, on rollcall No. 429, The Connolly/Kildee Amendment 3, had I been present, I would have voted "aye."

AMENDMENT NO. 6 OFFERED BY MR. MURPHY OF PENNSYLVANIA

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. MURPHY) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the ayes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This will be a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 234, noes 178, not voting 21, as follows:

[Roll No. 430]

AYES—234

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

NOES—178

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

NOT VOTING—21

Campbell
Carter
Collins (GA)
Goodlatte
Herrera Beutler
Holt
Horsford
Hudson
King (IA)
Lewis
McCarthy (NY)
Miller (FL)
Miller, George
Pallone
Pelosi
Richmond
Rogers (MI)
Ruppersberger
Sensenbrenner
Wasserman Schultz
Young (FL)

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR (Mr. HULTGREN) (during the vote). There is 1 minute remaining.

□ 1513

Messrs. ENGEL and GRIJALVA changed their vote from ''aye'' to ''no.''

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment in the nature of a substitute, as amended.

The amendment was agreed to.

The Acting CHAIR. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. FORTENBERRY) having assumed the chair, Mr. HULTGREN, Acting Chair of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 1582) 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, and, pursuant to House Resolution 315, he reported the bill back to the House with an amendment adopted in the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment to the amendment reported from the Committee of the Whole?

If not, the question is on the amendment in the nature of a substitute, as amended.

The amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

MOTION TO RECOMMIT

Mrs. CAPPS. Mr. Speaker, I have a motion to recommit at the desk.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is the gentlewoman opposed to the bill?

Mrs. CAPPS. Yes, I am opposed.

Mr. CASSIDY. Mr. Speaker, I reserve a point of order against the motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. A point of order is reserved.

The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mrs. Capps moves to recommit the bill H.R. 1582 to the Committee on Energy and Commerce with instructions to report the same back to the House forthwith, with the following amendment:

At the end, add the following section:

SEC. 5. PROTECTING THE HEALTH OF CHILDREN AND SENIORS.

This Act shall not apply with respect to rules that will result in reduced incidence of cancer, premature mortality, asthma attacks, or respiratory disease in children or seniors.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman from California is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mrs. CAPPS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to offer the final amendment to the bill, and I want to be clear—passage of this amendment will not prevent passage of the underlying bill. If it's adopted, my amendment will be incorporated into the bill, and the bill will immediately be voted upon.

As currently written, H.R. 1582 would cripple the ability of the Environmental Protection Agency to protect the water we drink and the air we breathe. My amendment simply ensures that the EPA can continue to protect children and seniors from the harmful impacts of pollution. My friends across the aisle claim this bill is about transparency, but let's call it what it is—just another attempt to block the EPA from doing its job.

This bill makes no sense on so many levels. It's redundant and it's unnecessary. It gives the Energy Secretary unprecedented authority to veto EPA rules, and it allows for the indefinite delays of EPA rulemaking. Our top priority should be the health of our children and of our families, not the bottom line of the polluting energy companies.

It's scary to think how many EPA protections that we now take for granted would have been delayed or derailed if this bill were law. Consider the recently finalized Mercury and Air Toxics Standards. Before these rules, there were no Federal standards limiting power plant emissions of toxic pollutants like mercury and arsenic. As we know, these toxic pollutants are really poisons. They cause a variety of serious health problems in people of all ages. They affect brain development in children, and they can cause serious birth defects when pregnant women are exposed. That's why EPA put restrictions on these toxic emissions—restrictions that protect future generations and set them up for success while also reducing preventable health care costs. If H.R. 1582 had been law, these rules could have been delayed indefinitely or could not have happened at all.

Mr. Speaker, my friends across the aisle talk frequently about the financial costs of these and other EPA actions, but what about the health care costs—costs that all of us pay when these preventable ailments occur—and what about the human costs of inaction?

Delaying the air toxics standards for just an additional 1 year would have resulted in more than 11,000 heart attacks, more than 120,000 asthma attacks, more than 12,000 more hospital and emergency room visits, and up to 25,300 lives lost due to smog, due to soot, due to toxic air pollution—and that's just in 1 year. Mr. Speaker, people should be more important than profit.

My amendment speaks to just this. It would simply shield the rules that protect the health of children and of seniors from this dangerous bill. If my colleagues are serious about protecting our children and our seniors, they should have no trouble supporting this amendment.

More than anyone, children and seniors rely on the EPA to do its job of protecting public health and the environment. The Mercury and Air Toxics rule and others like it are helping children and families across the Nation live healthier, longer lives. Perhaps polluters find these rules inconvenient, but the American people certainly don't. They want clean air to breathe. They want clean water to drink, and they want the peace of mind that comes from strong public health standards.

My amendment ensures that protecting the health of our children and seniors never takes a back seat to the financial interests of our polluters. So I urge my colleagues to support this amendment and make sure that the health and well-being of our children and seniors always come first.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. CASSIDY. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my point of order, and I claim the time in opposition to the motion.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The point of order is withdrawn.

The gentleman from Louisiana is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. CASSIDY. Mr. Speaker, this bill doesn't cripple anything. Laws that are currently on the books stay on the books. The problem is that the EPA uses bad science. I say that not as a Republican. I say that as quoting other scientists.

For example, a gentleman who is a former member of the Harvard School of Public Health testified: ''EPA's statistical approach is fraught with numerous assumptions and uncertainties.'' A physician from the Colorado School of Public Health said that the way that EPA uses statistics ''is also highly misleading to policymakers.''

I will make the point. You cannot be pro-family unless you are pro-environment, and you cannot be pro-environment unless you are pro-family, but you can't be either unless you first have a strong and healthy economy. Now, the Energy Consumers Relief Act simply puts a check on the billion-dollar energy rules that may hurt American families and cost American jobs.

If you support transparency and good government, you should support this bill. If you support protecting American families and consumers from higher energy costs, you should support H.R. 1582. If you support having the prosperity needed for families and for environmental health protections, you should support H.R. 1582. If you are pro-jobs, pro-economic growth and anti-poverty, you should support H.R. 1582.

I urge you to vote ''no'' on this motion to recommit. I urge you to support the Energy Consumers Relief Act.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the previous question is ordered.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to recommit.

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

RECORDED VOTE

Mrs. CAPPS. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 and clause 9 of rule XX, this 5-minute vote on the motion to recommit will be followed by 5-minute votes on the passage of H.R. 1582, if ordered; ordering the previous question on House Resolution 322; adoption of House Resolution 322, if ordered; and the motion to suspend the rules on H.R. 1897.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 188, noes 221, not voting 24, as follows:

[Roll No. 431]

AYES—188

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

NOES—221

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

NOT VOTING—24

Blumenauer
Campbell
Collins (GA)
Goodlatte
Herrera Beutler
Holt
Horsford
Hudson
King (IA)
Lankford
Lewis
McCarthy (NY)
Miller (FL)
Miller, George
Pallone
Pelosi
Rahall
Richmond
Rogers (MI)
Ruppersberger
Sensenbrenner
Wasserman Schultz
Woodall
Young (FL)

□ 1532

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the bill.

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

RECORDED VOTE

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

A recorded vote was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 232, noes 181, not voting 20, as follows:

[Roll No. 432]

AYES—232

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

NOES—181

Andrews
Barber
Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Bera (CA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Bustos
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Cárdenas
Carney
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu
Cicilline
Clarke
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Courtney
Crowley
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
Deutch
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle

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

NOT VOTING—20

Campbell
Collins (GA)
Goodlatte
Herrera Beutler
Holt
Horsford
Hudson
King (IA)
Lewis
McCarthy (NY)
Miller (FL)
Miller, George
Pallone
Pelosi
Richmond
Rogers (MI)
Ruppersberger
Sensenbrenner
Wasserman Schultz
Young (FL)

□ 1539

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 367, REGULATIONS FROM THE EXECUTIVE IN NEED OF SCRUTINY ACT OF 2013; PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 2009, KEEP THE IRS OFF YOUR HEALTH CARE ACT OF 2013; PROVIDING FOR PROCEEDINGS DURING THE PERIOD FROM AUGUST 3, 2013, THROUGH SEPTEMBER 6, 2013; AND PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 2879, STOP GOVERNMENT ABUSE ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on ordering the previous question on the resolution (H. Res. 322) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 367) to amend chapter 8 of title 5, United States Code, to provide that major rules of the executive branch shall have no force or effect unless a joint resolution of approval is enacted into law; providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 2009) to prohibit the Secretary of the Treasury from enforcing the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act and the Health Care and Education Reconciliation Act of 2010; providing for proceedings during the period from August 3, 2013, through September 6, 2013; and providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 2879) to provide limitations on bonuses for Federal employees during sequestration, to provide for investigative leave requirements for members of the Senior Executive Service, to establish certain procedures for conducting in-person or telephonic interactions by executive branch employees with individuals, and for other purposes, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

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

This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 222, nays 191, not voting 20, as follows:

[Roll No. 433]

YEAS—222

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

NAYS—191

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

NOT VOTING—20

Campbell
Collins (GA)
Goodlatte
Herrera Beutler
Holt
Horsford
Hudson
King (IA)
Lewis
McCarthy (NY)
Miller (FL)
Miller, George
Pallone
Pelosi
Richmond
Rogers (MI)
Ruppersberger
Sensenbrenner
Wasserman Schultz
Young (FL)

□ 1547

So the previous question was ordered.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the resolution.

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 223, nays 189, not voting 21, as follows:

[Roll No. 434]

YEAS—223

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

NAYS—189

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

NOT VOTING—21

Campbell
Collins (GA)
Goodlatte
Herrera Beutler
Holt
Horsford
Hudson
Huffman
King (IA)
Lewis
McCarthy (NY)
Miller (FL)
Miller, George
Pallone
Pelosi
Richmond
Rogers (MI)
Ruppersberger
Sensenbrenner
Wasserman Schultz
Young (FL)

□ 1554

So the resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

FAREWELL REMARKS BY THE HONORABLE JO BONNER

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

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Speaker, as many of our colleagues know, tomorrow will mark my last day to walk onto this House floor as a Member of the United States House of Representatives.

Since I announced my plans to leave this place in late May, a place where I have been so privileged and honored to work for the last 28 years—18 as a staffer and the last 10½ as a Representative—the past few days and weeks, as you might imagine, have been rather poignant.

So many of you, my friends and colleagues on both sides of the aisle, have been so very kind to offer an encouraging word, or to extend heartfelt good wishes as I begin a new chapter in my life as the vice chancellor of government relations and economic development for the University of Alabama system. To each and every one of you who have been so generous with your words, thoughts, and even a few prayers, I want to thank you from the bottom of my heart.

A few of you have even asked if I have any parting wisdom to offer, and I won't share these with my colleagues, I wouldn't do that to you, but I would like to speak for just one minute to the American people.

You know, one of the reasons I so rarely come to the House floor and speak is because my father, who died when I was 13, always told me, my brother, and sister that if you listen to the words of others instead of listening to your own words, you'll learn a lot more. So I've tried to follow my father's advice.

The other reason I so rarely take your time to listen to my thoughts is because of my very first speech on the House floor. With your indulgence, I will share it briefly with you.

Everyone remembers your first House speech, I'm sure, when you were a newly minted Member of Congress. Mine was unforgettable for a different reason. It was back in early 2003 when the House was debating the Healthy Forests bill. I remember it as though it were yesterday.

Like most freshmen, I served on several committees, and I was actually in a Budget Committee hearing all day long when I got a call from the chairman of the Ag Committee, BOB GOODLATTE. He said:

> Joe, you need to get over on the House floor because you're getting ready to make your first speech.

One of our colleagues, who's still here and will remain anonymous, was about to offer an amendment to the Healthy Forests bill that would have stripped the $250,000 provision that I had inserted to do research on insects, on pine beetles that we don't care for in south Alabama and throughout the country, and he was going to strip it and take it for a project that was near and dear to him in his district.

□ 1600

As I was running over to the Capitol, I did what you would have done: I called my wife and told her to get the kids in front of the TV set, turn on the VCR, and I said to my daughter, Lee, who was 7 at the time, and my son, Robins, who was 5, I said, ''Daddy is about to make his first speech on the House floor.''

My staff had given me some beautiful words that day. They were somewhere

between the Gettysburg Address and the Kennedy inauguration.

But as so often is the case here on the floor, instead of having 5 or 10 minutes to speak, Chairman GOODLATTE gave me 90 seconds. So I put aside my prepared remarks; and, instead, I spoke from the heart, or from the top of my head.

I said, ''Mr. Speaker, I rise to oppose the amendment from the gentleman from California and to urge support for the underlying bill.''

I went on to say, ''Now, if I represented pine beetles, I would actually support the gentleman's amendment, because, if I were a pine beetle, I would like it. He would take the money we've put in there and redirect it to a program out in his district in California.

''But I don't represent pine beetles. I represent hardworking men and women who own a few acres and they grow pine trees. And pine beetles are a real threat to a healthy forest.''

You know, if I'd only stopped there, I would have made a good first impression. But like so many new politicians who didn't know when to stop, I said, ''You know, we have a real problem with incest in south Alabama.''

I said, ''In fact, I would venture a guess that we have more problems with incest in my district in Alabama than in any other congressional district in America.''

Chairman GOODLATTE was going like that, and I thought he was saying preach on, brother, preach on. Instead, he was urging me to shut up.

So I got back to my office, thinking I'd delivered one of the best speeches on insects ever made, and my staff said, ''Jo, in about 2 minutes you just reinforced in the minds of all Americans what we have a problem with in south Alabama.''

That's the other reason that I don't often speak on the House floor. But, fortunately for me, these wonderful people who work here taking note of every word knew what I meant to say, not what I did say.

I tell that story, Mr. Speaker, in closing, for this one reason: you all laughed at that story, as so many others have over the years. And a little laughter from time to time is good medicine, as the doctor says.

Perhaps our country needs to laugh a little more often, as well, and stop yelling at each other and work closer together.

For sure, our great country has many daunting challenges facing us. Sadly, all across our land, there's anger, there's frustration and concern on both sides of the political spectrum about what's going on or what's not going on.

Public approval of this body which we are all so honored to serve in is at or near an all-time record low.

But if I could say one parting word to the American people, it would be this: the men and women that you've elected to represent you in this, the people's House, have different views and positions on the very issues that you have different views and positions on.

And, by and large, and with rare exception, these are men and women of courage, of integrity, of decency, and they serve, along with many, many men and women, as staff, who work here, oftentimes in the shadows of the spotlight. They serve for the same reason, a common love of country.

Make no mistake. SAM JOHNSON loved America when he was being brutally beaten and held against his will as a prisoner of war for over 7 years in Vietnam, often wondering whether he would ever see his family again.

And JOHN LEWIS loved his country when he was beaten and bloodied, fighting for the civil rights of all Americans as he was crossing the Edmund Pettus Bridge in the city I was born in, Selma.

And just like Sam and John, every other Member here, Democrat, Republican, liberal, conservative, we all work for the American people with the singular goal of making our country a better, more perfect Union, even though sometimes, as humans, we fail to meet your expectations.

This is especially true of our leadership, on both sides of the aisle, who often have one of the toughest jobs, trying to corral the strong will of 435 Members of Congress who come from all parts of America to try to do the right things. To my committee chairmen and ranking members, and all of the people I've served with, I owe you my debt of gratitude.

In closing, I want to express my last expression to the wonderful people of south Alabama for giving me the opportunity to work for you for the last 10½ years as your Congressman.

I came to this job having studied at the feet of two of the most outstanding men I know. Jack Edwards and Sonny Callahan, like me, came to office as a Representative from Alabama, but they left office as statesmen. And anything that my staff or I have ever been able to do for the people of my district, it's been to build on the legacy of those two great men.

Lastly, I would like to say this: the people of my district have afforded me a rare honor in Alabama, one of only 167 people, men and women, to ever serve in this body. The rest of us, only 10,000-plus, men and women, have ever had the privilege of being called a representative of the people.

I would be extremely remiss if I didn't say a special thank you to my wife, Janee, our daughter, Lee, and my son, Robins, who, like they were 10½ years ago, are back home in Alabama listening to your daddy talk about incest.

Thank you for your love and support. May God bless you, and may God bless America.

VIETNAM HUMAN RIGHTS ACT OF 2013

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, 5-minute voting will continue.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 1897) to promote freedom and democracy in Vietnam, as amended, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 405, nays 3, not voting 25, as follows:

[Roll No. 435]

YEAS—405

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

Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Lummis
Lynch
Maffei
Maloney, Carolyn
Maloney, Sean
Marchant
Marino
Massie
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul
McClintock
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McHenry
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
McNerney
Meadows
Meehan
Meng
Messer
Mica
Michaud
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Moore
Moran
Mullin
Mulvaney
Murphy (FL)
Murphy (PA)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Negrete McLeod
Neugebauer
Noem
Nolan
Nugent
Nunes
Nunnelee
O'Rourke
Olson
Palazzo
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
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
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rice (SC)
Rigell
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Ruiz
Runyan
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sanford
Sarbanes
Scalise
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Schock
Schrader
Schwartz
Schweikert
Scott (VA)
Scott, Austin
Scott, David
Serrano
Sessions
Sewell (AL)
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Sinema
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Southerland
Speier
Stewart
Stivers
Stockman
Stutzman
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Terry
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tierney
Tipton
Titus
Tonko
Tsongas
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walorski
Walz
Waters
Watt
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Welch
Wenstrup
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (FL)
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Woodall
Yarmuth
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (IN)

NAYS—3

Broun (GA)
Jones
Meeks

NOT VOTING—25

Butterfield
Campbell
Cleaver
Collins (GA)
Garrett
Goodlatte
Herrera Beutler
Holt
Horsford
Hudson
King (IA)
Lewis
McCarthy (NY)
Miller (FL)
Miller, George
Owens
Pallone
Pelosi
Richmond
Rogers (MI)
Ruppersberger
Sensenbrenner
Wasserman Schultz
Waxman
Young (FL)

□ 1612

MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico changed her vote from "nay" to "yea."

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

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

STOP GOVERNMENT ABUSE ACT

Mr. ISSA. Madam Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 322, I call up the bill (H.R. 2879) to provide limitations on bonuses for Federal employees during sequestration, to provide for investigative leave requirements for members of the Senior Executive Service, to establish certain procedures for conducting in-person or telephonic interactions by Executive branch employees with individuals, and for other purposes, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Ms. FOXX). Pursuant to House Resolution 322, the bill is considered read.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 2879

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE; TABLE OF CONTENTS.

(a) SHORT TITLE.—This Act may be cited as the "Stop Government Abuse Act".

(b) TABLE OF CONTENTS.—The table of contents is as follows:

Sec. 1. Short title; table of contents.

TITLE I—COMMON SENSE IN COMPENSATION

Sec. 101. Definitions.
Sec. 102. Limitations.
Sec. 103. Regulations.

TITLE II—GOVERNMENT EMPLOYEE ACCOUNTABILITY

Sec. 201. Suspension for 14 days or less for Senior Executive Service employees.
Sec. 202. Investigative leave and termination authority for Senior Executive Service employees.
Sec. 203. Suspension of Senior Executive Service employees.
Sec. 204. Misappropriation of funds amendments.

TITLE III—CITIZEN EMPOWERMENT

Sec. 301. Amendments.

TITLE I—COMMON SENSE IN COMPENSATION

SEC. 101. DEFINITIONS.

For purposes of this title—

(1) the term "employee" means an employee (as defined by section 2105(a) of title 5, United States Code) holding a position in or under an Executive agency;

(2) the term "Executive agency" has the meaning given such term by section 105 of title 5, United States Code;

(3) the term "discretionary monetary payment" means—

(A) any award or other monetary payment under chapter 45, or section 5753 or 5754, of title 5, United States Code; and

(B) any step-increase under section 5336 of title 5, United States Code;

(4) the term "covered compensation", as used with respect to an employee in connection with any period, means the sum of—

(A) the basic pay, and

(B) any discretionary monetary payments (excluding basic pay),

payable to such employee during such period;

(5) the term "basic pay" means basic pay for service as an employee; and

(6) the term "sequestration period" means a period beginning on the first day of a fiscal year in which a sequestration order with respect to discretionary spending or direct spending is issued under section 251A or section 254 of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 and ending on the last day of the fiscal year to which the sequestration order applies.

SEC. 102. LIMITATIONS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law—

(1) no discretionary monetary payment may be made to an employee during any sequestration period to the extent that such payment would cause in a fiscal year the total covered compensation of such employee for such fiscal year to exceed 105 percent of the total amount of basic pay payable to such individual (before the application of any step-increase in such fiscal year under section 5336 of title 5, United States Code) for such fiscal year; and

(2) except as provided in subsection (b), during any sequestration period, an agency may not pay a performance award under section 5384 of title 5, United States Code, to the extent that such payment would cause the number of employees in the agency receiving such award during such period to exceed 33 percent of the total number of employees in the agency eligible to receive such award during such period.

(b) WAIVERS.—For the purposes of any sequestration period—

(1) the head of any agency may, subject to approval by the Director of the Office of Personnel Management, waive the requirements of subsection (a)(2); and

(2) the head of any agency may waive the requirements of subsection (a)(1) with respect to any employee if the requirements of such subsection would violate the terms of a collective bargaining agreement covering such employee, except that this paragraph shall not apply to any employee covered by a collective bargaining agreement that is renewed on or after the date of enactment of this title.

(c) NOTIFICATION.—In the case of an agency for which the Director of the Office of Personnel Management grants a waiver under subsection (b)(1), the agency shall notify the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs of the Senate of the percentage of career appointees receiving performance awards under section 5384 of title 5, United States Code, and the dollar amount of each performance award.

(d) APPLICATION.—This section shall apply to any discretionary monetary payment or performance award under section 5384 of title 5, United States Code, made on or after the date of enactment of this title.

SEC. 103. REGULATIONS.

The Office of Personnel Management may prescribe regulations to carry out this title.

TITLE II—GOVERNMENT EMPLOYEE ACCOUNTABILITY

SEC. 201. SUSPENSION FOR 14 DAYS OR LESS FOR SENIOR EXECUTIVE SERVICE EMPLOYEES.

Paragraph (1) of section 7501 of title 5, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

"(1) 'employee' means—

"(A) an individual in the competitive service who is not serving a probationary or trial period under an initial appointment or who has completed 1 year of current continuous employment in the same or similar positions under other than a temporary appointment limited to 1 year or less; or

"(B) a career appointee in the Senior Executive Service who—

"(i) has completed the probationary period prescribed under section 3393(d); or

"(ii) was covered by the provisions of subchapter II of this chapter immediately before appointment to the Senior Executive Service;".

SEC. 202. INVESTIGATIVE LEAVE AND TERMINATION AUTHORITY FOR SENIOR EXECUTIVE SERVICE EMPLOYEES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Chapter 75 of title 5, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:

''SUBCHAPTER VI—INVESTIGATIVE LEAVE FOR SENIOR EXECUTIVE SERVICE EMPLOYEES

''§ 7551. Definitions

''For the purposes of this subchapter—

''(1) 'employee' has the meaning given such term in section 7541; and

''(2) 'investigative leave' means a temporary absence without duty for disciplinary reasons, of a period not greater than 90 days.

''§ 7552. Actions covered

''This subchapter applies to investigative leave.

''§ 7553. Cause and procedure

''(a)(1) Under regulations prescribed by the Office of Personnel Management, an agency may place an employee on investigative leave, without loss of pay and without charge to annual or sick leave, only for misconduct, neglect of duty, malfeasance, or misappropriation of funds.

''(2) If an agency determines, as prescribed in regulation by the Office of Personnel Management, that such employee's conduct is flagrant and that such employee intentionally engaged in such conduct, the agency may place such employee on investigative leave under this subchapter without pay.

''(b)(1) At the end of each 45-day period during a period of investigative leave implemented under this section, the relevant agency shall review the investigation into the employee with respect to the misconduct, neglect of duty, malfeasance, or misappropriation of funds.

''(2) Not later than 5 business days after the end of each such 45-day period, the agency shall submit a report describing such review to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs of the Senate.

''(3) At the end of a period of investigative leave implemented under this section, the agency shall—

''(A) remove an employee placed on investigative leave under this section;

''(B) suspend such employee without pay; or

''(C) reinstate or restore such employee to duty.

''(4) The agency may extend the period of investigative leave with respect to an action under this subchapter for an additional period not to exceed 90 days.

''(c) An employee against whom an action covered by this subchapter is proposed is entitled to, before being placed on investigative leave under this section—

''(1) at least 30 days' advance written notice, stating specific reasons for the proposed action, unless—

''(A) there is reasonable cause to believe that the employee has committed a crime for which a sentence of imprisonment can be imposed; or

''(B) the agency determines, as prescribed in regulation by the Office of Personnel Management, that the employee's conduct with respect to which an action covered by this subchapter is proposed is flagrant and that such employee intentionally engaged in such conduct;

''(2) a reasonable time, but not less than 7 days, to answer orally and in writing and to furnish affidavits and other documentary evidence in support of the answer;

''(3) be represented by an attorney or other representative; and

''(4) a written decision and specific reasons therefor at the earliest practicable date.

''(d) An agency may provide, by regulation, for a hearing which may be in lieu of or in addition to the opportunity to answer provided under subsection (c)(2).

''(e) An employee against whom an action is taken under this section is entitled to appeal to the Merit Systems Protection Board under section 7701.

''(f) Copies of the notice of proposed action, the answer of the employee when written, and a summary thereof when made orally, the notice of decision and reasons therefor, and any order effecting an action covered by this subchapter, together with any supporting material, shall be maintained by the agency and shall be furnished to the Merit Systems Protection Board upon its request and to the employee affected upon the employee's request.

''SUBCHAPTER VII—REMOVAL OF SENIOR EXECUTIVE SERVICE EMPLOYEES

''§ 7561. Definition

''For purposes of this subchapter, the term 'employee' has the meaning given such term in section 7541.

''§ 7562. Removal of Senior Executive Service employees

''(a) Notwithstanding any other provision of law and consistent with the requirements of subsection (b), the head of an agency may remove an employee for serious neglect of duty, misappropriation of funds, or malfeasance if the head of the agency—

''(1) determines that the employee knowingly acted in a manner that endangers the interest of the agency mission;

''(2) considers the removal to be necessary or advisable in the interests of the United States; and

''(3) determines that the procedures prescribed in other provisions of law that authorize the removal of such employee cannot be invoked in a manner that the head of an agency considers consistent with the efficiency of the Government.

''(b) An employee may not be removed under this section—

''(1) on any basis that would be prohibited under—

''(A) any provision of law referred to in section 2302(b)(1); or

''(B) paragraphs (8) or (9) of section 2302(b); or

''(2) on any basis, described in paragraph (1), as to which any administrative or judicial proceeding—

''(A) has been commenced by or on behalf of such employee; and

''(B) is pending.

''(c) An employee removed under this section shall be notified of the reasons for such removal. Within 30 days after the notification, the employee is entitled to submit to the official designated by the head of the agency statements or affidavits to show why the employee should be restored to duty. If such statements and affidavits are submitted, the head of the agency shall provide a written response, and may restore the employee's employment if the head of the agency chooses.

''(d) Whenever the head of the agency removes an employee under the authority of this section, the head of the agency shall notify Congress of such termination, and the specific reasons for the action.

''(e) An employee against whom an action is taken under this section is entitled to appeal to the Merit Systems Protection Board under section 7701 of this title.

''(f) Copies of the notice of proposed action, the answer of the employee when written, and a summary thereof when made orally, the notice of decision and reasons therefor, and any order effecting an action covered by this subchapter, together with any supporting material, shall be maintained by the agency and shall be furnished to the Merit Systems Protection Board upon its request and to the employee affected upon the employee's request.

''(g) A removal under this section does not affect the right of the employee affected to seek or accept employment with any other department or agency of the United States if that employee is declared eligible for such employment by the Director of the Office of Personnel Management.

''(h) The authority of the head of the agency under this section may not be delegated.''.

(b) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of sections at the beginning of chapter 75 of title 5, United States Code, is amended by adding after the item relating to section 7543 the following:

''SUBCHAPTER VI—INVESTIGATIVE LEAVE FOR SENIOR EXECUTIVE SERVICE EMPLOYEES

''7551. Definitions.
''7552. Actions covered.
''7553. Cause and procedure.

''SUBCHAPTER VII—REMOVAL OF SENIOR EXECUTIVE SERVICE EMPLOYEES

''7561. Definition.
''7562. Removal of Senior Executive Service employees.''.

SEC. 203. SUSPENSION OF SENIOR EXECUTIVE SERVICE EMPLOYEES.

Section 7543 of title 5, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in subsection (a), by inserting ''misappropriation of funds,'' after ''malfeasance,''; and

(2) in subsection (b), by amending paragraph (1) to read as follows:

''(1) at least 30 days' advance written notice, stating specific reasons for the proposed action, unless—

''(A) there is reasonable cause to believe that the employee has committed a crime for which a sentence of imprisonment can be imposed; or

''(B) the agency determines, as prescribed in regulation by the Office of Personnel Management, that the employee's conduct with respect to which an action covered by this subchapter is proposed is flagrant and that such employee intentionally engaged in such conduct;''.

SEC. 204. MISAPPROPRIATION OF FUNDS AMENDMENTS.

(a) REINSTATEMENT IN THE SENIOR EXECUTIVE SERVICE.—Section 3593 of title 5, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in subsection (a)(2), by inserting ''misappropriation of funds,'' after ''malfeasance,''; and

(2) in subsection (b), by striking ''or malfeasance'' and inserting ''malfeasance, or misappropriation of funds''.

(b) PLACEMENT IN OTHER PERSONNEL SYSTEMS.—Section 3594(a) of title 5, United States Code, is amended by striking ''or malfeasance'' and inserting ''malfeasance, or misappropriation of funds''.

TITLE III—CITIZEN EMPOWERMENT

SEC. 301. AMENDMENTS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Part III of title 5, United States Code, is amended by inserting after chapter 79 the following:

''CHAPTER 79A—SERVICES TO MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC

''Sec.
''7921. Procedure for in-person and telephonic interactions conducted by Executive Branch employees.

''§ 7921. Procedure for in-person and telephonic interactions conducted by Executive Branch employees

''(a) PURPOSE.—The purpose of this section is to ensure that individuals have the right to record in-person and telephonic interactions with Executive agency employees and to ensure that individuals who are the target of enforcement actions conducted by

Executive agency employees are notified of such right.

''(b) DEFINITIONS.—For purposes of this section—

''(1) the term 'telephonic' means by telephone or other similar electronic device; and

''(2) the term 'employee' means an employee of an Executive agency.

''(c) CONSENT OF EXECUTIVE AGENCY EMPLOYEES.—Participation by an employee, acting in an official capacity, in an in-person or telephonic interaction shall constitute consent by the employee to a recording of that interaction by any participant in the interaction.

''(d) NOTICE OF RIGHTS WHEN FEDERAL EMPLOYEES ENGAGED IN CERTAIN ACTIONS.—A notice of an individual's right to record conversations with employees shall be included in any written material provided by an Executive agency to the individual concerning an audit, investigation, inspection, or enforcement action that could result in the imposition of a fine, forfeiture of property, civil monetary penalty, or criminal penalty against, or the collection of an unpaid tax, fine, or penalty from, such individual or a business owned or operated by such individual.

''(e) OFFICIAL REPRESENTATIVE.—Any person who is permitted to represent before an Executive agency an individual under this section shall receive the same notice as required under subsection (d) with respect to such individual.

''(f) NO CAUSE OF ACTION.—This section does not create any express or implied private right of action.

''(g) DISCIPLINARY ACTION.—An employee who violates this section shall be subject to appropriate disciplinary action in accordance with otherwise applicable provisions of law.

''(h) PUBLIC INFORMATION CONCERNING RIGHT TO RECORD.—

''(1) POSTING ON AGENCY WEB SITES.—Within 180 days after the date of the enactment of this section, each Executive agency shall post prominently on its Web site information explaining the right of individuals to record interactions with employees.

''(2) OMB GUIDANCE.—Within 90 days after the date of the enactment of this section, the Office of Management and Budget shall issue guidance to Executive agencies concerning implementation of paragraph (1).''.

(b) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The analysis for part III of title 5, United States Code, is amended by inserting after the item relating to chapter 79 the following:

''79A. Services to members of the public ..... 7921''.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from California (Mr. ISSA) and the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. CUMMINGS) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California (Mr. ISSA).

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. ISSA. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on H.R. 2879 and include extraneous materials thereon.

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

There was no objection.

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

Madam Speaker, H.R. 2879, the Stop Government Abuse Act, combines three bills that were each voice voted out of my committee. They are H.R. 1541, the Common Sense in Compensation Act; H.R. 2579, the Government Employee Accountability Act; and H.R. 2711, the Citizen Empowerment Act.

The Common Sense in Compensation title of this bill brings common sense to the policies of governing employee bonuses while still providing agencies flexibility to recognize outstanding performance.

Madam Speaker, 75 percent of senior executives will receive bonuses of at least $6,000 while more than 650,000 defense employees are in the midst of 11 furlough days. This sends the wrong message to our Federal workforce. The men and women of the Federal workforce work hard—all of them.

Some of them do exceptional work, and bonuses are not only an incentive but a recognition. But these bonuses come on top of annual salaries ranging from $119,554 to over $179,000. Going in the range of $30,000 or more sends a message to many of our Federal workforce—in fact, Madam Speaker, most of our Federal workforce—that people at the top get even more.

Following the President's decision to impose a 2-year pay freeze, the administration issued a memo limiting the amount available to pay bonuses for fiscal years 2011 and 2012. Moreover, this past February, the administration issued a memo limiting bonuses to those legally required. In June, the administration suspended rank awards for senior leaders. H.R. 1541 builds on the President's initiatives.

The Government Employee Accountability title of the bill helps ensure Senior Executive Service employees are held accountable for their actions while maintaining due process rights. From Jeff Neely at GSA to Lois Lerner at the IRS, the Oversight and Government Reform Committee has uncovered numerous examples of high-ranking government officials engaging in behavior that certainly seems to be contrary to the principles of public service.

When people come before Congress and cannot even answer questions as to what they have done in their official capacity by ''taking the Fifth'' and find themselves fully paid for not working, it sends the wrong message to the vast majority of Federal workers. In some cases, these employees could face civil or criminal penalties.

In the private sector, these behaviors would be grounds for serious disciplinary action and, likely, termination. But in the Federal bureaucracy, that isn't what happened. Only in Washington could these employees be not terminated but, instead, placed on administrative leave with full pay, full benefits, and accruing additional retirement.

This bill provides agencies with additional tools to use when senior managers behave badly. It does not require these tools be used, but it makes them available. A similar version of this bill was passed by the House by a vote of 402–2 in the last Congress.

The final title of the bill before us today consists of the text of House Resolution 2711, the Citizen Empowerment Act, as reported from my committee. This legislation protects individual citizens from harassment, intimidation, and inappropriate behavior by a few Federal officials representing agencies such as the IRS, EPA, and the SEC.

Unfortunately, these few bad actors at agencies have, from time to time, threatened, intimidated, coerced, lied, or violated the public trust. And yet, in 12 out of our 50 States, citizens are not empowered to unilaterally record these conversations for their own protection. In 38 States, they may. We simply seek, in this bill, to harmonize across the government a predictability. When intimidation and wrong behavior happens, we need to make sure that there is a simple solution that every American can avail themselves of.

This bill ensures individuals have a right to record in-person meetings and telephone calls with Federal employees, including regulatory officials engaged in enforcement activities that can lead to the imposition of fines and penalties. In essence, what this bill does is provide consistency on behalf of the Federal employees acting in their official capacity. I want to make that very clear, Madam Speaker.

Federal employees today don't have an easy answer. In some States—38 of them—they can be recorded; in one State, they may be recorded; and in 11 States, they are likely not to be recorded because, in fact, it requires their advance permission. Uniformity across the Federal workforce is a good thing. We believe that it also will tell every member to treat people the same, whether they live in a State where they may be recorded or not.

I encourage all Members to support these three bills and remind all that these passed on a voice vote out of our committee and were not considered controversial in the previous Congress.

I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Madam Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to H.R. 2879 and to the failure of this House to address the issues of real concern to the American people and the people of my district.

Congress has been in session now for more than 200 days, and yet we have not passed a single bill to create a single job. The government must be funded by October, yet House Republicans have refused to appoint conferees to resolve a budget resolution after repeatedly calling for regular order.

After bringing to the floor a farm bill that gutted the SNAP program on which tens of millions of hungry Americans depend, including 17 million children, the majority brought a T-HUD appropriations measure that would have gutted the Community Development Block Grant program, the HOME

program, Amtrak, and the effort to modernize our Nation's air traffic control system. It became clear this week, however, that the majority did not have the votes to pass it.

We could be working today to end the damaging cuts imposed by the Ryan budget, which the Republican chairman of the Appropriations Committee called ''unrealistic and ill-conceived.'' That's the Republican chairman of the Appropriations Committee. Instead of working on any of these issues, we're wasting the last days remaining before a 5-week recess on a measure that threatens to impede our Nation's law enforcement efforts and continues senseless attacks on our Nation's civil servants.

H.R. 2879, the bill before us now, was thrown together last night from the ruins of three bills the majority did not have the votes to pass yesterday. The Rules Committee had to call an emergency meeting last night to push this bill through, and no amendments are being allowed.

So what would this legislation do? First and foremost, it would undermine our Nation's law enforcement activities. In fact, this bill should more appropriately be called the ''Ignoring the Concerns of Law Enforcement Act.'' It would allow individuals to record telephone calls and in-person conversations with Federal employees, including Federal law enforcement agents, without their knowledge. The Federal Law Enforcement Officers Association, the National Association of Assistant United States Attorneys, and the Federal Bureau of Investigation Agents Association have all written letters opposing these provisions.

The Federal Law Enforcement Officers Association wrote:

> This legislation puts law enforcement activities at risk and does a disservice to the brave men and women who are asked to put their lives on the line to protect us from terrorists and criminals.

The Federal Bureau of Investigation Agents Association wrote:

> This proposal risks undermining criminal investigations by reducing the willingness of individuals to cooperate with law enforcement, and would result in the creation of recordings of law enforcement conversations that could jeopardize sensitive and important criminal and counterterrorism investigations.

This morning, after listening to the debate we had here on this floor yesterday, and after this bill was filed last night, the National Association of Assistant United States Attorneys sent a letter to every Member of the House, opposing the bill. Their letter states:

> Section 301 of H.R. 2879 will undermine Federal civil enforcement activities and criminal prosecutions during the investigative, pretrial, trial, and enforcement phases of litigation involving the interests of the United States.

The fact is that we have held no hearings on this legislation before we marked it up in committee last week. We had no testimony from law enforcement officials about their concerns with the bill. Instead, the House Republicans rushed it to the floor without adequate consideration. In fact, in their rush to bring this bill to the floor, committee Republicans apparently did not even contact key law enforcement agencies to make sure this bill would not harm ongoing investigations.

This morning, I directed my staff to contact the Department of Justice, the FBI, and the Department of Homeland Security, including its operational components, the Secret Service and Immigration and Customs Enforcement. Officials from all of these entities have now reported that they have significant operational concerns with the bill.

Does that matter to the supporters of this bill? Don't you think it makes sense to hear from key stakeholders before changing Federal law in this extreme way?

The bill also would interfere with existing State laws prescribing the conditions under which conversations can be recorded. Thirty-six years ago, my home State of Maryland enacted a law that made it a felony to record a private conversation unless every party to the conversation consents to the recording or another exception applies. Maryland statute requires actual consent, not forced or assumed consent. The bill negates these protections—and the protections of 11 other States—by deeming Federal employees, including all law enforcement personnel, to have consented to the recording of their official conversations just by coming to work.

The bill has several other troubling provisions. It would remove due process protections from members of our Senior Executive Service by giving politically appointed agency heads broad discretion to fire these employees without providing advance notice, without conducting a proper investigation, and without giving employees an opportunity to respond to accusations against them.

Under this bill, employees could be fired and then forced to prove their innocence to seek reinstatement. This turns on its head the most basic protection guaranteed to all Americans by our Constitution: the right to be presumed innocent until proven guilty.

I urge Members to reject this senseless, ill-considered legislation that will impede law enforcement activities and eliminate constitutional protections for civil servants. I urge Members to vote ''no'' on H.R. 2879, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. ISSA. This is probably Groundhog Day, because these were the same statements made yesterday by the ranking member from Maryland, who implied that somehow what happens in 38 States would be draconian if it happened in 12 more.

I yield 5 minutes to the gentlelady from Kansas (Ms. JENKINS).

□ 1630

Ms. JENKINS. I thank the chairman for yielding.

We have seen too many examples of our Nation's bureaucracy making life harder for Americans and their families. Every weekend, when I return to Kansas, I hear story after story of Federal regulators abusing their power. But far too often, many of these people are afraid to tell their stories in public because they fear retribution. What country do we live in where Americans are afraid to tell the truth because they fear what their government might do to them?

The recent revelations that IRS officials targeted conservative organizations has shown light on the immense power Federal bureaucrats from hundreds of different agencies have over matters both large and small. When these officials abuse their power and waste taxpayer dollars, liberty is eroded, the economy is slowed, trust is lost, and the rule of law is betrayed.

The most troubling part is, when Americans are confronted by agency officials, they have few rights and insufficient resources to protect themselves. Not only do Federal agencies get to write rules, but they get to enforce them too. In fact, a citizen is 10 times more likely to be tried by a Federal agency than an actual court, and citizens have fewer rights during agency proceedings than in a courtroom.

I introduced the Stop Government Abuse Act to allow citizens to protect themselves or their small businesses when a government official comes calling. Among other things, this bill gives Americans a new tool to fight back by allowing them to record any conversation with most Federal agencies and finally have proof of what happens in these interactions.

Is it any wonder why Americans have lost faith and trust in our government when the Feds have allowed the IRS to target Americans based on their personal beliefs; allowed the Federal General Services Administration regional commissioner, Jeff Neely, to spend nearly $900,000 of taxpayer money on a conference in Las Vegas and then receive a bonus after being placed under investigation? And they have allowed high-ranking bureaucrats like Lois Lerner to still be on the government's payroll funded by taxpayers.

This stunning lack of accountability and transparency in our current system is unacceptable. And the Stop Government Abuse Act is a good first step to help level the playing field between the average American and Federal regulators.

The vast majority of Federal workers are good, patriotic people, but that doesn't mean that an additional check and balance can't help. This bill does not villainize Federal employees. And as long as they're doing their jobs properly, they have not a thing to worry about.

Unfortunately, with all the recent scandals, we have heard about far too many Federal employees who have had the luxury of playing by different rules than the rest of the hardworking men

and women in this country. This must end, and the Stop Government Abuse Act helps do just that.

Parts of this legislation already passed the House last year after news broke of the GSA scandal, but the Senate never acted on the legislation. It's time to do something about this, and today I demand action be taken.

While Americans are toiling across this country in factories, on farms, and elsewhere, to make ends meet, Lois Lerner is collecting her full paycheck. This bill would allow agencies to fire reckless employees on the spot and stop those under investigation from receiving salaries paid for by the very taxpayers they abused.

It's time to stand up against Big Government overreach and abuse. Americans deserve a government that expands their rights, not the rights of Big Government. Enacting the Stop Government Abuse Act will help restore trust in our government and get Big Government out of the way of our economy.

Mr. CUMMINGS. Madam Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentlelady from the District of Columbia (Ms. NORTON).

Ms. NORTON. I thank the gentleman for yielding and for the wise words of his opening statement. I also thank him for retrieving the views of law enforcement officials—inasmuch as we had no hearing on this bill. They were very informative.

Madam Speaker, with most of the business of the Nation languishing with no action in this House, Republicans have rushed to the floor with these so-called ''messaging'' bills. Let's make sure we get the message:

Republicans—the party that champions states' rights—want to preempt the States, to require Federal employees acting for the government to record conversations with clients. Republicans—the party that wants the Federal Government to operate like the private sector and pay people on the basis of merit—wants to deny bonuses to Federal employees who deserve them, regardless of merit. Perhaps worst of all, Madam Speaker, Republicans—who spent most of this term accusing IRS employees of denying due process to Republican organizations—now propose to fire SES employees without due process.

And get this: the Republican version of due process is to give the employee the right to apply for reinstatement to the political appointee who fired him. Then, after the fact, having never had a hearing, the dismissed employee can now appeal to the MSPB. This last one, of course, reverses the age-old principle of innocent until proven guilty, but it's much worse. Not only is there no due process, there's no process at all. You're fired. That one is embarrassingly unconstitutional.

These are messaging bills all right, Madam Speaker, and we get the message. Republican principles apply—except when they don't.

Mr. ISSA. Madam Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. MEADOWS).

Mr. MEADOWS. Madam Speaker, today I want to speak a little bit from the heart.

We've heard a lot of debate going back and forth about how we haven't talked about this and how we haven't debated it, but there have been a number of amendments. As this bill comes to the floor today, what it's about is about fairness; it's about fairness to employees; it's about fairness to those who manage. And what we're seeing is that there is a trend where we're not being fair with bonuses.

You know, I've had my colleagues opposite here talk about the fact that we need to continue to incentivize. But when 75 percent of senior executive employees receive bonuses at an average of $11,000, it's out of control. This little chart shows that the Veterans Administration, 74 percent of those employees received bonuses of over $11,000 apiece. Now, why is this a problem? Because back in my district, the veterans are having to wait over 600 days, Madam Speaker, to get a determination on benefits, and yet we continue to give bonuses. I find that appalling.

The other part of that is we talk about being for small businesses, and small businesses are hurting. So what do we do with the Small Business Administration? Ninety-two percent of those employees are getting over $13,000 a year in bonuses. It's appalling, Madam Speaker. We need to make sure that we bring it back.

We've got Mr. Spock there that was part of the ''Star Trek'' parody that received a bonus of almost $31,000 the same year that he spent over $5 million on a conference. Where is the sanity?

When we really talk about Federal employees, the rank and file, the blue collar Federal employees, are going with pay freezes while we pay out ridiculous bonuses. Madam Speaker, I think it's time that we really turn back the tide.

You know, if the Democrats are going to vote against this particular bill, the headline tomorrow should read that the Democrats have embraced the 1 percenters, because that's what it is. It is 1 percent getting all the bonuses while the rest of the Federal workers are not receiving the benefits that they deserve.

It is time that we bring some sanity to this situation. I strongly urge support of this bill.

Mr. CUMMINGS. Madam Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. LYNCH), a member of our committee.

Mr. LYNCH. I thank the gentleman from Maryland for yielding.

I rise in strong opposition to H.R. 2879, the so-called ''Stop Government Abuse Act.'' This legislation is simply a rehash of the three attacks on Federal workers that were incorporated in the bills that the Republican leadership abruptly pulled from the suspension calendar yesterday due to a lack of support from the required two-thirds majority of this House.

The fact that these anti-Federal worker suspension bills have now been reconstituted into a single anti-Federal worker bill does not make this legislation any less misguided or any less harmful to our Federal workers than it was yesterday. After all, H.R. 2879 is based on the same message that has been continually reflected in a series of Republican legislative attacks on our Federal workers throughout this Congress. That message from the Republican leadership has been that our hardworking Federal employees cannot be trusted, and they are the primary source of our deficit burden.

On the heels of repeated attempts to freeze Federal employee pay beyond the current 3 years, efforts to increase Federal pension contributions and slash our Federal workforce across the board, we are now considering legislation that would only add insult to injure by depriving Federal employees of their constitutional rights to due process of law.

In particular, I'm deeply concerned about the expedited termination provisions in H.R. 2879. These provisions would give agency heads broad discretion, without limitation, to immediately fire senior executives accused of misconduct without notifying the employees of the charges against them and without giving them a reasonable opportunity to defend themselves. Instead, it places the burden on the employee, after they fire them, to prove that their reinstatement is required. This ''ready, fire, aim'' approach by my Republican colleagues, where they fire the employee first and ask questions later, flies in the face of the rights guaranteed to all Americans under our Constitution.

The ''guilty until proven innocent'' framework violates the due process protections envisioned by James Madison and guaranteed under the Constitution. In 1985, in *Loudermill* v. *Cleveland Board of Education*, the United States Supreme Court held that public employees, Federal employees, who are facing discipline are entitled to certain due process rights. The U.S. Supreme Court held that public servants had a property right in the jobs that they held and in continued employment, and that such employment could not be denied to employees unless they were given a meaningful opportunity to have notice of the allegations against them, to have a fair hearing and an opportunity to respond against the charges against them. Notably, that must occur prior to being deprived of their right to employment. The court stated:

> An essential principle of due process is that a deprivation of life, liberty, or property be preceded by notice and opportunity for hearing appropriate to the nature of the case.

The court goes on further and it says:

> This principle requires some kind of a hearing prior to discharge of an employee

who has a constitutionally protected property interest in his employment.

Now, this is unconstitutional. This provision is flatly unconstitutional, and there's a long line of Federal cases under the Supreme Court that declares it so. The one saving grace, in my opinion, in this bill is that there's no severability clause, and that after this provision is struck down by the Supreme Court, these employees will all be reinstated with back pay. And the whole bill that they're offering will be struck down because of the lack of a severability clause in the bill.

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

Mr. CUMMINGS. I yield the gentleman an additional 30 seconds.

Mr. LYNCH. I thank the gentleman.

Look, this Nation was founded on the principle that every person, every man and woman is entitled to due process before he or she is deprived of life, liberty, or property. Our Supreme Court in the *Loudermill* case understood the injustice of depriving a person of their livelihood, and I hope that my colleagues understand that H.R. 2879 unfortunately would do just that.

Due process demands that we oppose H.R. 2879. I urge my colleagues to join me in voting ''no'' on this legislation.

I thank the ranking member for his advocacy and his courtesy.

Mr. ISSA. Madam Speaker, the gentleman is entitled to his opinion, but not his facts.

In the bill itself, which I read yesterday, it says:

> An employee removed under this section shall be notified of the reasons for such removal within 30 days.

□ 1645

I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. KELLY).

Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania. Madam Speaker, I rise today to explain a little bit about what's going on.

The other day we talked a little bit about the dizzying effects of being on this floor, and somehow things get twisted around, so when you see people bumping off the walls you know it's because of the spin.

Let me tell you what I'm talking about here today. When I walked on the floor today—and some of my friends did also—we passed the Capitol Police, passed all these people on the dais, we passed so many people on the way, and you would think that we are talking about every single person that works for the government.

Now, the truth of the matter is that there are over 2.1 million people working for the government. That doesn't include the Army. It doesn't include the post office. That includes people who are out there. So the people that we are talking about that we want to hold accountable—and, my goodness, what an unusual effort for Congress to try and hold people accountable. Why in the world would you do that? Half of us wouldn't be back here.

So we are talking about four-tenths of 1 percent. And as the President is fond of saying: ''Just do the arithmetic. Just do the arithmetic.'' It isn't everybody that you talked about. It's not all these folks that are sitting here tonight. It's not the Capitol Police that we walk by. It's not the people that clean our offices every night. It's none of those folks. It's the senior executives.

Now, these poor people are going to be under such great duress by this that they're probably going to get their resumes together and that loud ''whoosh'' you hear is them running away from $199,000 a year jobs. Are you kidding me? You can't say that with a straight face about how are we ever going to keep qualified people here.

I got to tell you something. I've got a lot of unemployed people back in northwest Pennsylvania that will line up for these jobs. Now, the $199,000, of course, is the top of it. But the real kicker is they can't go over $230,000 with their bonuses. These are people that are going to walk away from these jobs because we have the unmitigated gall to hold them accountable to the people who pay those wages, and that's the American taxpayers. That's who we are talking about. My goodness, have we fallen that far away from what this country was supposed to be?

Now, here's all we are saying to them—and we came about this because in a hearing on the GSA we asked about why is Mr. Neely on leave with pay. The people at the GSA say: ''Well, you see, you don't understand, Congress. We don't have any mechanism to put them on leave without pay.'' I said: ''I have never heard anything like that.'' Of course I haven't heard it because I come from the private sector. We don't do that in the private sector. But what I did find out was they would love to have that.

The people we put in charge of these agencies would actually love to be able to hold those that work for them accountable and responsible. So what did we give them? We gave them the ability to do that. They can fire somebody on the spot. But we didn't do anything about their due process. That person is still entitled to come back and any protections under the law he or she still gets.

We can create an investigation on a leave without pay, but we also require that the agencies report to Congress every 45 days to let us know where the investigation is. My goodness, there's nothing harder in this body than trying to get information when there's an investigation under way. I just think that we've seen that the last couple of months, of: ''You want to get the information? Well, we can't talk about it now because there's an investigation going on.'' It doesn't make sense to me. It doesn't make sense to the people I represent.

Now, you know when we talk about protecting American workers and we talk about what our duty is here, we were elected by a group of people from districts all over this country to come and represent them. According to the IRS, there are 145 million Americans who pay taxes. They file their taxes every year. There's 300 million out there, but 145 million pay taxes.

That's who it is that we are trying to protect. They're the ones that pay for every single thing that happens here. Or they cosign the note on the loan to keep this place floating.

So I want you to look at this now. There are ''total Federal employees''—2.1 million. Now, this little red sliver—and it's really hard to see—remember, this represents four-tenths of 1 percent. As the President would say: ''It's all about the arithmetic. It's all about the arithmetic.'' I would say to my colleagues on both sides, it's all about the people we represent.

I appreciate the spin. I appreciate the fact that you like to make every Capitol policeman think that he's unappreciated or she's unappreciated, or that everyone that works in our office is unappreciated, or that everybody from the private sector that works for this great Nation is unappreciated, but you know it's not true and you know what you are saying is not true.

What I would love to see is for you to stand up on this floor and look at people and say, this is what's going on, and you know it's not true. You absolutely know it's not true, but you say it anyway. And why? Because it wears well.

Thank you for bringing this legislation up, and thank you for protecting the American taxpayer.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Members are reminded that they are to address their remarks to the Chair and not to other Members in the second person.

Mr. CUMMINGS. Madam Speaker, may I inquire as to how much time both sides have remaining?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Maryland has 15½ minutes remaining. The gentleman from California has 10½ minutes remaining.

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

The Supreme Court Loudermill case, which Mr. LYNCH cited, says that the employee must be given notice before they are fired and an opportunity to respond. This bill, basically you're fired and then you appeal trying to get your job back, so you don't really truly have notice.

I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. CONNOLLY).

Mr. CONNOLLY. I thank my friend from Maryland.

Madam Speaker, the distinguished manager on the other side of this bill says you are entitled to your own opinion, but not your own facts, in taking to task my friend from Massachusetts (Mr. LYNCH) in his reading of this bill. And I've got the bill in front of me. It says that ''at least 30 days' advance written notice stating specific reasons for the proposed action''—that is to

say, the removal or suspension of an employee—''unless there's a reasonable cause to believe the employee has committed a crime or the agency determines, as prescribed in regulation, that the employee's conduct with respect to an action covered by the subchapters proposed is flagrant and such employee intends to engage in such contact,'' and then you can be removed without that notice.

So Mr. LYNCH was right: facts are stubborn things.

If we really wanted to understand the motivation behind the legislation in front of us, it is a cynical political ploy before this Congress goes out on recess to allow one whole party and its Members to go home and avoid discussing the tough issues of the day and make the Federal employee the bogeyman. That Federal employee, whoever he or she is, vaguely abuses you, and you need to be protected against them.

So we are going to pass a bunch of bills that had no hearings, that are flawed in their drafting, that had to be removed from the floor yesterday and redrafted in order to come back today to qualify for a vote, because they otherwise wouldn't have passed on a suspension rule, and it is all part of this consistent and flagrant and, in my opinion, reckless campaign to demonize the public servants who serve us. And the loser ultimately in this game, this political game, will be the constituents they serve and we are supposed to serve.

It is not right to demonize Federal employees, and we've done that. We've cut their pay. We've frozen their pay for 3 years. We've raided their pensions to try to finance things that have no relationship whatsoever to Federal employment per se, and we've characterized them in disparaging and negative ways that are not worthy of this body.

So it's all right. Go home, campaign against the Federal employee, and maybe you will make some headway. Maybe, in fact, it's a brilliant move short term, in terms of short-term political gain. But it's at long-term expense—expense at the truth and expense of the men and women who serve this country ably every day and who deserve better from their elected representatives.

Mr. ISSA. Madam Speaker, I wonder if the gentleman from Virginia would have kept this person on for how long—weeks, months, more than a year? This individual received a bonus after more than a year.

When this bill came through our committee, the amendment to say ''in all cases 30 days'' could have been offered; it wasn't. This came through in regular order of the committee. The language was published. There was every opportunity.

When the gentleman from Virginia said ''redrafted,'' with all due respect, not a word was changed in any of these three bills from the time it left our committee until today when it's being considered.

I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. BENTIVOLIO).

Mr. BENTIVOLIO. I thank the gentleman from California.

Madam Speaker, Federal agencies not only get to write rules, they get to enforce them. It was recently noted that a citizen is ten times more likely to be tried by an agency than by an actual court. In any given year, Federal judges conduct roughly 95,000 adjudicatory proceedings, including trials, while Federal agencies complete more than 939,000—939,000.

In these agency proceedings, citizens have fewer rights than in a courtroom. And unfortunately, there are some bad actors who intimidate, coerce, or even lie, violating public trust and potentially breaking laws. Far too often, the public is left without evidence to help prove Federal employees mistreated them.

For example, the SEC bowing to political pressure to scrutinize donations to tax-exempt groups; IRS employees targeting Tea Party groups applying for tax-exempt status; and other agencies that are writing and enforcing rules and regulations written in legalese to confuse and frustrate the public.

Title III of this bill ensures that individuals have the right to record their meetings and telephone exchanges with Federal regulatory officials engaged in enforcement activities.

The manager's amendment adopted in committee ensures that law enforcement would not be impacted adversely. Undercover investigations and wiretap surveillance would not be interfered with.

This legislation does not supersede any State laws, and it has no impact on citizen interactions with non-Federal officials such as State and local police officers.

Madam Speaker, it is the duty of Congress to protect rights, not take them away. This legislation is just another step in protecting the rights of our citizens.

Mr. CUMMINGS. Madam Speaker, I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. CONNOLLY).

Mr. CONNOLLY. I thank my friend.

Madam Speaker, the distinguished chairman of this committee throws a picture up on the floor and, of course, doesn't allow me to respond when he demands ''is this what the gentleman from Virginia is talking about.''

It is wrong for the chairman of the distinguished committee to suggest or allow the inference to be drawn that somehow that picture represents all Federal employees. And the gentleman who just spoke, talking about rights, what about the rights of the employees who serve our country, what about their rights that are being trampled on in this legislation?

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

Mr. CUMMINGS. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER).

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Madam Speaker, I was not going to speak. I was constrained to speak, to come to the floor, when we had this chart about 2 million employees.

But only adversely affecting just a small sliver. The premise seems to be you can undermine—as long as they're a small minority—the rights of people.

And those Capitol policemen of which the gentleman spoke, and the people at the desk of whom the gentleman spoke, people who serve in our committees of whom the gentleman spoke, people who serve as nurses—not necessarily in VA hospitals because they're exempt—zero COLA 4 years in a row. All 2 million have been affected.

□ 1700

Every new employee has been affected—everyone—not just that small, little sliver that apparently the SES is. They don't get rights. If it were 1.98 million, well, then, that's a different story, but as long as it's only a small sliver, undermine their rights.

I came to the floor to say that, if we undermine the rights of one, frankly, the rights of all are soon at risk. We have learned that throughout history. So I would hope that we would reject this bill, which was seven or eight bills to start out with, which were put up here in a way that you could not amend them—suspension—in this transparent, open, ''let the House work its will'' process, and we now come back with a closed rule, putting all the bills in one—a rule covering all seven bills—and the chairman shakes his head and shows pictures and believes those are facts.

My friends, we ought to reject these bills because they are about all employees. They may affect only a small few at this juncture, but they are about all employees; and it's about undermining their rights and the respect we ought to accord to them for the service they give to the people of the United States of America.

Mr. ISSA. At this time, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. MEADOWS).

Mr. MEADOWS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to address the gentleman from Maryland as he talks about its being about all employees. Indeed, it is, because, if we allow this continued behavior to go on, it will tarnish the good reputation of Federal workers who day in and day out serve this country and the citizens so well.

What we are talking about is giving a tool, a management tool, to let managers manage. We are talking about not giving bonuses to those who are of the very highest—the 1 percent—while the rank and file goes so many times without being recognized or compensated for what it deserves. We are talking about employees who make an average salary of $168,000 a year, and yet we are talking about a privileged few whom we need to make sure we address. So, Mr. Speaker, it is about all

of the employees, and it is about being fair.

Mr. CUMMINGS. I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER).

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, there is so much I would like to say, particularly as to the extraordinary discrepancy between those folks who make far less than their counterparts in the private sector and those who work in the private sector, who, perhaps, have less responsibility on their shoulders. Look it up. See the statistics. That's the case.

The other thing I want to say to my friend is that the law now provides for procedures to remove bad actors. Do we have some bad actors in the Federal service? We do. That's human life. That's the human experience.

Mr. MEADOWS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOYER. I don't have anymore time, but if the gentleman from California will yield you some time, I will be glad to yield you some time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HULTGREN). The time of the gentleman has expired.

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

Mr. Speaker, the distinguished minority whip presumes to tell me about the private sector and how much people make. The problem is that I came from the private sector. I know the difference between management and labor, and I know the difference between people who elect to be the top-paid management of entities and who typically serve at will in the private sector. Those of the Senior Executive Service are, in fact, people who choose to get additional pay for these special responsibilities, and they know what they're doing when they get into it. We are proud of most of them, the vast majority of them.

The fact is that Mr. HOYER has people who serve at will. He fires them without notice if he chooses to. Yet he cannot understand the fact by that picture I held up—I won't hold it up again; it's reprehensible even though it has been well seen—that that man continued to work and get a bonus during the 10 months in which the GSA Administrator knew wrongdoing had occurred on his watch. It wasn't until he decided to retire—to be honest, my understanding is with criminal allegations—that he even left and stopped getting his pay, and, today, he enjoys a very comfortable retirement.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CUMMINGS. Mr. Speaker, may I ask how much time we have remaining.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Maryland has 9 minutes remaining, and the gentleman from California has 5 minutes remaining.

Mr. CUMMINGS. I yield 2 minutes to the gentlelady from California (Ms. SPEIER).

Ms. SPEIER. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, this bill is truly astonishing. We have serious issues before us. We should be focused on job creation, on comprehensive immigration reform, on providing nutrition assistance to children and seniors, on postal reform or on funding the government; but we are again debating partisan bills that stand no chance of becoming law, including the 40th vote to defund or to repeal the Affordable Care Act.

Now, as kids, we are told that people in glass houses shouldn't throw stones, so I sure hope that my colleagues on the other side of the aisle have not given one bonus to one of their senior staff members.

I hope that that is the case, that you have not given one bonus to a senior staff member. I hope, furthermore, that each of you is recording all of your staff members when they answer the phones because you want to know how they are treating your constituents.

This particular bill is the height of hypocrisy. It is a blatant attack on Federal employees that reinforces the fact that current leadership is only interested in political messaging, including through repeated attacks on hard-working Federal employees. It is simply shameful to say that we will belittle public service like that. I am a public servant, and I am proud to be a public servant. Every Federal employee who works in this building and virtually every Federal employee who is out there in our communities is doing so because he believes in public service. I think that a Federal employee today is pretty crazy to be doing this job. He basically is being told, You're not worth very much. His integrity is constantly being questioned. He has had 3 years of pay freezes and furloughs, and he is supposed to continue to do public service.

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

Mr. CUMMINGS. I yield the gentlelady an additional 30 seconds.

Ms. SPEIER. I thank the gentleman.

I want to address one section of this bill that would now allow individuals to record telephone and in-person conversations with Federal employees. This would preempt the law in my State of California and in the chairman's State of California and in 11 other States that require the consent of all parties to a conversation. It contains no exceptions for law enforcement, sensitive communications, the military or anything else.

The FBI has already indicated to us that it strongly opposes this bill because, in its words, ''this proposal risks undermining criminal investigations by reducing the willingness of individuals to cooperate with law enforcement and would result in the creation of recordings of law enforcement conversations that could jeopardize sensitive and important criminal and counterterrorism investigations.''

I think this is ill-founded.

Even the ACLU, which strongly supports the principle of allowing citizens to record law enforcement interactions, does not support the provision in this bill because it ''threatens to impermissibly interfere with government workers' constitutional liberties.''

So this is a bill in search of a problem that actually makes it harder to go after real criminals, and this bill does not apply to this body, to Members of Congress. Maybe it's time for this bill's authors to look a little closer to home.

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

Mr. CUMMINGS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Illinois (Mr. DANNY DAVIS), a member of the committee.

Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois. I thank the gentleman from Maryland for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to this legislation, the Stop Government Abuse Act. I would feel much better about it if it were labeled the Promotion of Government Abuse Act, because it encourages government to roll back the clock and take away rights that workers have earned from working hard.

Can you imagine being fired after you've worked up to the ranks of the SES, which is very difficult to get to, and being told that you've been let go on the basis of an IG report? Where is the equal protection under the law there? There is none. I think that it's unfortunate that we would treat our Federal workforce this way. They work hard, deserve better; and I oppose this legislation.

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

Mr. CUMMINGS. I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. MORAN).

Mr. MORAN. Mr. Speaker, this is one more bill designed to punish the Federal workforce and to discourage the very people whom we need to join the Federal workforce. It's singling it out for harsher treatment than we would apply to ourselves or to our workforces, frankly. You need to be able to reward your best workers. If this were a private sector corporation, our revenue would have dried up; our stock value would have imploded; and our employees would have left.

Federal employees stick with it because they believe in this government. They hope that, one day, the legislative branch will appreciate what they do. I worked for the Federal Government 40 years ago; and while I worked 10 or 12 hours a day, there were people working longer than that. They did that for about 40 years, and they worked very hard and in a dedicated way.

This legislation isn't even properly thought through. No congressional hearing has been held on this measure that, in fact, jeopardizes law enforcement. It would intrude upon and disrupt sensitive phases of many Federal civil and criminal investigations and law enforcement efforts, as well as litigation involving the government. We

hear that from the National Association of Assistant United States Attorneys. We hear from the FBI employees that this proposal risks undermining criminal investigations by reducing the willingness of individuals to cooperate with law enforcement. It would result in the creation of recordings of law enforcement conversations that could jeopardize sensitive and important criminal counterterrorism investigations. We hear from Federal law enforcement officers that it puts law enforcement activities at risk and does a disservice to the brave men and women who are asked to put their lives on the line to protect us from terrorists and criminals.

This is bad legislation. We know why it is being offered. We also trust that it's not going to become law. So you have to ask, Why are we doing it? We are doing it to send a message.

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

Mr. CUMMINGS. I yield the gentleman an additional 30 seconds.

Mr. MORAN. The message it's sending is that our Federal employees are not to be valued, that our managers are not to reward people for good work, that, in fact, we want the government to shrink, that we don't want it to be able to carry out its necessary activities. When we do that, we do a disservice to our constituents and to this country. This stuff has got to stop.

FEDERAL LAW ENFORCEMENT OFFICERS ASSOCIATION,
Washington, DC, July 29, 2013.

Hon. DARRELL ISSA,
Chairman, Committee on Oversight & Government Reform, Washington, DC.

Hon. ELIJAH CUMMINGS,
Ranking Member, Committee on Oversight & Government Reform, Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN ISSA AND RANKING MEMBER CUMMINGS: On behalf of the membership of the Federal Law Enforcement Officers Association (FLEOA), I am writing to oppose H.R. 2711—the ''Citizen Empowerment Act,'' as amended by the Committee and urge you to further amend the bill to ensure that law enforcement and other public safety activities are not covered by its provisions.

As originally written, the legislation contained general exceptions for situations where classified information, public safety or an on-going law enforcement investigation would be at risk. This language was necessary to ensure that federal law enforcement officers and the critical work they perform are not adversely impacted by this bill. In fact, the original language should have gone even farther to make clear that law enforcement activities would not be jeopardized in any way.

For incomprehensible reasons the committee approved an amended bill that removed even basic exceptions.

When a federal law enforcement officer is conducting a criminal investigation via telephone, i.e. on a suspect of terrorism, the officer should not have to notify the suspect of the right to record the conversation and whether the officer is recording the conversation. Obviously, conventional wisdom tells us that any thought of conducting a successful investigation after disclosure of this type is impossible. There is no logical reason why criminal investigations shouldn't be exempted from the proposal.

This legislation puts law enforcement activities at risk and does a disservice to the brave men and women who are asked to put their lives on the line to protect us from terrorists and criminals. FLEOA opposes any actions by Congress that lessens the ability of our Citizenship to remain safe and secure and jeopardizes the ability of federal law enforcement officers to continue to perform their sworn duties to protect them.

As the Chair and Ranking Member with jurisdiction over H.R. 2711, we urge you to ensure that the bill is not considered on the Floor unless it is amended to exempt law enforcement from its provisions. Until that time, FLEOA will continue to strongly oppose this legislation.

Respectfully,

FRANK TERRERI,
National Vice President for Legislative Affairs.

NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF ASSISTANT UNITED STATES ATTORNEYS,
Lake Ridge, VA.

VOTE ''NO'' ON H.R. 2879, ''THE STOP GOVERNMENT ABUSE ACT''

THE NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF ASSISTANT UNITED STATES ATTORNEYS OPPOSES H.R. 2879, ''THE STOP GOVERNMENT ABUSE ACT,'' AND URGES HOUSE MEMBERS TO VOTE NO ON THIS LEGISLATION

Section 301 of H.R. 2879 will undermine federal civil enforcement activities and criminal prosecutions during the investigative, pretrial trial and enforcement phases of litigation involving the interests of the United States.

Section 301 is the former ''Citizen Empowerment Act'' (H.R. 2711), as amended by the House Oversight and Government Reform Committee on July 24. The provision contains no exemption for litigation involving the United States or the activities of federal law enforcement personnel. No Congressional hearing has been held on the measure.

Section 301 requires the Government broadly to inform an individual of the right to record in-person and telephonic interactions with Government employees—including law enforcement officers, investigative agents and Assistant United States Attorneys and other federal prosecutors—whenever an Executive Agency provides ''any written material . . . to the individual concerning an audit, investigation, inspection, or enforcement action that could result in the imposition of a fine, forfeiture of property, civil monetary penalty, or criminal penalty against, or the collection of an unpaid tax, fine, or penalty from, such individual or a business owned or operated by such individual.''

This notice requirement would reach to a myriad of legal and law enforcement-related documents regularly issued by the federal government, including subpoenas, search warrants, arrest complaints and forfeiture notices. This mandate is far more expansive than requiring the government to post notice of the right to record on agency websites, as also included in section 301.

The notice mandate of H.R. 2879 would intrude upon and disrupt sensitive phases of many federal civil and criminal investigations and law enforcement efforts, as well as litigation involving the government. The breadth of the ''written material'' trigger could undermine undercover investigations, given its potential to ''tip off'' witnesses, suspects and targets of investigations. The bill also would permit defense counsel to insist upon recording all interactions with federal prosecutors and law enforcement personnel in all phases of litigation with the government, including sensitive settlement and plea-bargain discussions. Even federal court proceedings, whose rules prohibit recording by individuals, could be impacted by this bill.

Citizens already may record their interactions with federal government officers and employees in most states within a carefully balanced set of legal and practical concerns. There is no compelling need for a measure like H.R. 2879, especially considering its incalculable damage on law enforcement efforts. At the very least, an exception should be included in the measure that exempts law enforcement-related activity involving government agents, investigators and Assistant United States Attorneys.

FEDERAL BUREAU OF INVESTIGATION AGENTS ASSOCIATION,
Alexandria, VA, July 31, 2013.

Hon. DARRELL ISSA,
Chairman, Comm. on Oversight & Government Reform, Washington, DC.

Hon. ELIJAH CUMMINGS,
Ranking Member, Comm. on Oversight & Government Reform, Washington, DC.

Re: H.R. 2711, the Citizen Empowerment Act

DEAR CHAIRMAN ISSA AND RANKING MEMBER CUMMINGS: On behalf of the FBI Agents Association (''FBIAA''), a voluntary professional association currently representing approximately 13,000 active duty and retired FBI Special Agents, I write to express the FBIAA's concerns about H.R. 2711, the Citizen Empowerment Act.

H.R. 2711 creates a broad right to record conversations with federal employees, and requires that notices of the right to record conversations be provided to individuals engaged in discussions with federal employees—without any exceptions related to criminal investigations. This proposal risks undermining criminal investigations by reducing the willingness of individuals to cooperate with law enforcement, and would result in the creation of recordings of law enforcement conversations that could jeopardize sensitive and important criminal and counterterrorism investigations.

Also, by requiring written notices under the threat of disciplinary action, H.R. 2711 would create new administrative and bureaucratic requirements for Agents conducting investigations. The time and resources available to Agents are already stretched too thin, and new administrative burdens make it more difficult for Agents to protect the public.

For these reasons, the FBIAA opposes H.R. 2711 as currently written, and hopes that the House will make significant changes to H.R. 2711 before considering the legislation.

Sincerely,

REV TARICHE,
President.

Mr. ISSA. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 seconds to the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. KELLY).

Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania. I thank the chairman.

Mr. Speaker, I've heard so much about pay being frozen that I've got to tell you: the people that I represent in the Third Congressional District of western Pennsylvania wish their pay had been frozen. It has gone down steadily since 2010.

We talk about the inability to get the economy going. I feel the same way—it's embarrassing—but at the end of the day, we are not benevolent monarchs. We are stewards of the taxpayers' moneys. All we are doing is talking about accountability. Only in Washington is ''accountability'' a bad word. In the private sector, ''accountability'' reigns. The market determines my accountability. That's what holds me accountable in coming from the private sector.

Why is that so foreign here to, all of a sudden, have bills—to have things in front of us—that will help us to say to people in charge to hold people responsible and to hold people accountable?

Mr. CUMMINGS. Mr. Speaker, how much time is remaining?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Maryland has 3 minutes remaining, and the gentleman from California has 4½ minutes remaining.

Mr. CUMMINGS. I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Speaker, as I've listened to all of these arguments, I cannot help but think about the many employees whom we see every day—the hardworking employees who give their blood, sweat, and tears to keep our country together.

When we talk about our senior executives, I will remind this body of something that Mr. HOYER talked about and, that is, under current law, senior executives may be disciplined for misconduct, neglect of duty, malfeasance, or of the failure to accept reassignment or transfer. There is a current statutory list of reasons for which actions may be taken against senior executives that covers a broad variety of situations, and they are adequate to deal with the problems that we are addressing today.

□ 1715

Senior executives suspected of criminal activity may already be removed or placed on indefinite suspension without pay. We need to focus on improving agency implementation rather than passing legislation that would deprive employees of their due process.

I know Mr. MORAN is right. There has been a relentless attack on Federal employees. The fact is that they're in their third year of pay freezes. They've been asked to pay more for their pensions and get less. We constantly hear negative comments about them, still folks say, We love them; we appreciate them. They are often the ones that aren't seen, unnoticed, unappreciated, and unapplauded.

We have a bill here that takes away something very fundamental, and that is their due process rights. A lot of people may think about due process and say, Oh, it's no big deal. Later, we'll take a little bit of due process here and take a little bit there. It is that due process that is the basic foundation of our Constitution and of our democracy. What we're talking about here is making sure that employees are afforded that due process.

So you get somebody who says, Okay. Fine. Fire them, and then let them appeal to get their job back. That's not how it's supposed to work. They're to be given some type of notice and given an opportunity to simply address whatever the accusations are. A lot of times we may look at folks and say we don't like what they allegedly did, but the fact is that we still have that little document—which, to me, is a big document—that we must adhere to.

Mr. Speaker, I would urge all Members of the Congress to vote against this bill and give us a chance to come back, perhaps, and make the appropriate amendments so that it will be one that is suitable for the Congress to vote on.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. ISSA. Mr. Speaker, I yield 15 seconds to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. MEADOWS).

Mr. MEADOWS. Mr. Speaker, I want to clarify one thing.

When we talk about a freeze, when is a freeze not a freeze? Only in Washington, D.C.

Over the last 3 years, 99.4 percent of Federal employees got increases. Out of every 1,000 employees, only six were denied an increase. I think the record needed to be clarified.

Mr. ISSA. Mr. Speaker, how much time do I have remaining?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from California has 4¼ minutes remaining.

Mr. ISSA. Then I will close at this time and yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, controversy comes in all forms. Sometimes it's legitimate; sometimes there are differences that are unresolved; sometimes, though, you find yourself befuddled.

These three bills passed on a voice vote. It didn't mean that they would have been authored by any of my colleagues on the other side of the aisle or that they loved them. It meant that they were given a full opportunity to evaluate these, to offer amendments, to have up-or-down votes on them. Many of the suggestions they made were taken into account on many of the bills marked up during that long day. Many of the things being brought up here today simply were not brought up, and it's not because they didn't know about this.

When you have a version of this bill that's almost identical to that passed on December 19 of last year by a vote of 402–2, that means that you have people that today are vehemently opposed to provisions that they already voted for. I repeat, they're vehemently opposed to provisions they already voted for. I don't have the names of the two people that voted ''no.'' They certainly have a right to express why they voted ''no'' last December.

I can tell you that when you have to only terminate 4/100 of 1 percent of the workforce, if you do it at all, the head of the agency has to determine that the employee has done something seriously wrong in regards to negligence of duty or misappropriation of funds or malfeasance. They have to determine that the employee did it knowingly, and they have to consider it necessary and advisable to protect this enterprise.

On top of that, the employee does have to be told why they're being terminated. I think that's important, because the ranking member and I heard from a woman in a hearing who left me feeling absolutely shocked. She's been on leave without pay, and to this day, an investigation that is ongoing, months into it, she's never been told why she's on leave without pay. To be honest, she's a member of the Senior Executive Service.

Maybe she would fall under this bill. But in order to fall under this bill, some things would have to happen. First of all, the head of the agency would have to make a decision of wrongdoing, and it would be held by that decision being reasonable after the fact. They'd have to have told her why she's being removed, and she would already have had an opportunity in front of the Merit Systems Protection Board and the U.S. Court of Appeals, known as the Fed circuit. She already would have had all this due process, except months go by and she doesn't know and she's on administrative leave.

The fact is this is a tool. They don't have to use it. If they use it, they have to make sure that it's only for serious violations: neglect of duty, misappropriation of funds, or malfeasance. These are very serious. An extremely small part, highly compensated, respected people, and a few bad actors for neglect of duty, misappropriation of funds, or malfeasance can be removed. They still have their rights. We knew this was constitutional. To be honest, the complaint we seemed to have in committee for hours was something that I want to share with you, Mr. Speaker.

Members of my committee, when talking about the idea that only one-third without special exception of employees in any agency could receive bonuses rather than the 75 or 80 percent you heard about here today, they said, But this is their right. They've negotiated that. You're interfering with their contracts.

Mr. Speaker, the U.S. Government does not allow negotiation in collective bargaining or otherwise for wages. We have a standard scale. Bonuses were created for only one purpose, and that was, in fact, to reward good behavior as an incentive.

These bills are well thought out and are only controversial today because the minority wants to make them controversial to create a controversy.

I urge support, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. All time for debate has expired.

Pursuant to House Resolution 322, the previous question is ordered on the bill.

The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the bill.

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 239, nays 176, not voting 18, as follows:

[Roll No. 436]

YEAS—239

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

NAYS—176

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

NOT VOTING—18

Campbell
Cleaver
Collins (GA)
Conyers
Crowley
Herrera Beutler
Holt
Horsford
King (IA)
Lewis
McCarthy (NY)
Miller (FL)
Miller, George
Pallone
Pelosi
Radel
Richmond
Young (FL)

□ 1749

Ms. BROWN of Florida and Mr. PAYNE changed their vote from ''yea'' to ''nay.''

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

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated against:

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, this afternoon, I attended a meeting at the White House with the President of the United States. As such, I was unfortunately not able to be present for the following vote:

On final passage of H.R. 2879, had I been present, I would have voted "nay."

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, I regret that a meeting at the Whtie House caused me to miss the first vote series on August 1, 2013. Had I been present, my intention was to vote as follows on the amendments to H.R. 1582, the Energy Consumers Relief Act: "no" on the Waxman Amendment, "no" on the Connolly Amendment, and "yes" on the Murphy (PA) Amendment. I would have voted "no" on the Motion to Recommit H.R. 1582 and "yes" on Passage on H.R. 1582. Further I would have voted "yes" on the previous question, "yes" on the combined rule for the REINS Act, Keep IRS Off Health Care Act, and the Stop Government Abuse Act. Finally, I would have voted "yes" on the passage of H.R. 1897, the Vietnam Human Rights Act.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to section 9 of House Resolution 322, H.R. 1541, H.R. 2579, and H.R. 2711 are laid on the table.

REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBER AS COSPONSOR OF H. RES. 319

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to have my name removed as a cosponsor of H. Res. 319. It was put on that resolution inadvertently.

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

There was no objection.

REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBER AS COSPONSOR OF H.R. 2783

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to remove the name of the gentlewoman from California (Mrs. DAVIS) as a cosponsor from H.R. 2783.

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

There was no objection.

REGULATIONS FROM THE EXECUTIVE IN NEED OF SCRUTINY ACT OF 2013

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous materials on H.R. 367.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 322 and rule XVIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill, H.R. 367.

The Chair appoints the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HULTGREN) to preside over the Committee of the Whole.

□ 1757

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 367) to amend chapter 8 of title 5, United States Code, to provide that major rules of the executive branch shall have no force or effect unless a joint resolution of approval is enacted into law, with Mr. HULTGREN in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIR. Pursuant to the rule, the bill is considered read the first time.

The gentleman from Virginia (Mr. GOODLATTE) and the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. COHEN) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Earlier this month, President Obama announced that he would, once again, pivot to the economy. The bottom line of his speech, after 4½ years of the Obama administration: ''We're not there yet.''

The President is right: we're not there yet. Economic growth is the key to job creation and recovery, but America's growth rate is historically anemic. From 2010 through 2012, it averaged barely 2 percent. In the fourth quarter of 2012, growth was just four-tenths of one percent.

In the first two quarters of this year, growth averaged only 1.4 percent according to the most recent estimates. These dismal figures translate into deep economic pain for America's workers and families.

The June 2013 jobs report showed an increase of 240,000 in the number of discouraged workers, those who have simply quit looking for a job out of frustration or despair.

The number of people working part-time, but who really want full-time work, passed 8.2 million. That represents a jump of 322,000 in just 1 month.

Worst of all, the truest measure of unemployment, the rate that includes both discouraged workers and those who cannot find a full-time job, continues to exceed 20 million Americans. That rate rose from 13.8 percent back to 14.3 in June.

America's labor force participation rate has fallen to levels not seen since the Carter administration. Median real household income, meanwhile, is 5 percent lower than in June of 2009, when the recession officially ended.

□ 1800

Median incomes are supposed to rise during economic recoveries, not fall. The Obama administration, however, has managed to buck the historical trend. Worse, median incomes remain 9 percent below the peak they reached in January 2008, before the financial crisis. The President is indeed right: we're not there yet. But what the President missed in his speech is that it is his administration's policies that are responsible for America still remaining so deep in this economic hole. To see how true that is one only has to look at the historical record.

The current recovery is the weakest on record in the post-World War II era. The contrast with the recovery Ronald Reagan achieved is particularly stark. Four-and-a-half years after the recession began in 1981, the Reagan administration, through policies opposite to the Obama administration, had achieved a recovery that created 7.9 million more jobs than when the recession began. Real per capita gross domestic product rose by $3,091. Real median household income rose by 7.7 percent.

Surely, the administration knows this. But instead of fixing the problem by changing its policies, the Obama administration knows only one response: double down, increase taxes, increase spending, and increase regulation.

The number of new major regulations the Obama administration has issued and plans to issue—generally, regulations with more than $100 million in impacts—is without modern precedent. Testimony before the Judiciary Committee this term and during the 112th Congress has plainly shown the connection between skyrocketing levels of regulation and declining levels of jobs and growth.

To make matters worse, it is increasingly the case that, when Congress refuses to enable the administration's flawed policies through legislation, the administration unilaterally issues new regulations to achieve an end run around Congress.

The REINS Act is one of the most powerful measures we can adopt to put an end to regulation that wrongheadedly imposes the administration's flawed policies on the American people. It achieves that result in the simplest and clearest ways—by requiring an up-or-down vote by the people's representatives in Congress before any new major regulation can be imposed on our economy.

Some say the REINS Act will mean an end to new major regulation, even when regulation is needed. But the REINS Act does not prohibit new major regulation. It simply establishes the principle: no major regulation without representation.

By restoring to Members of Congress, who are accountable to the American people, the responsibility for America's costliest regulatory decisions, the REINS Act provides Congress and, ultimately, the people with a much-needed tool to check the one-way cost ratchet turned by the Obama administration and Washington's regulatory bureaucrats.

I want to thank the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. YOUNG) for introducing this legislation, and I urge my colleagues to vote for the REINS Act.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. COHEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong opposition to H.R. 367, the REINS Act of 2013.

As I noted during our extensive debate in the Judiciary Committee on this bill, it reminds me of the movie ''Groundhog Day.'' I feel like Bill Murray. It's that day over and over again. We come back to the same bill.

We extensively debated this bill in the last Congress; we debated bills very similar to it in this Congress; and, again, we're here debating this bill, which, by any sensible measure and probably a civics student in the 10th grade or less would know that this is a seriously flawed bill that will impede legislation and hurt the American public. It's based on a premise that regulations by themselves stifle job creation, a rather unique concept that we have come to debate in our committee and now on the floor.

H.R. 367 threatens to undermine vital protections that ensure the safety and soundness of the entire range of societal needs, from food safety to clean air and clean water, to workplace safety, to consumer product safety, to financial stability. It does this by bringing most important Federal rulemakings—including those that protect the public like the Affordable Care Act and the implementation thereof, as well as the Dodd-Frank Wall Street Reform Act aimed at keeping us back from the catastrophic days back in 2008 or 2009 when the world was coming to an end because of derivatives—it takes the implementation of these bills to a screeching halt, a result that will put at risk the well-being of millions of Americans, both from fiscal health and physical health.

The REINS Act would require that both Houses of Congress pass and the President sign a joint resolution of approval within 70 legislative days before a major rule can take effect. In the House, a committee of jurisdiction would have but 17 legislative days to consider a joint resolution of approval, after which it would automatically be discharged from the committee and sent to the full House—certainly not enough time to do a good job of reviewing the regulations. The House must consider such a resolution either on the second or fourth Thursday of every month, assuming that the House is even in session on that Thursday.

The bill also defines a ''major rule'' as one having at least a $100 million economic impact or having one of a number of other economic impacts. In all, Federal agencies issue about 50 to 100 major rules every year. That means that if the REINS Act had become law this year, there would only be 5 days left in 2013 for the House to consider 50 to 100 major rules. And while the other side loves gas, as we've seen with the farm bill and THUD, they can't pass it.

Given those traps set forth in the bill, no major rule would ever go into effect. This, in turn, threatens agencies' ability to protect Americans' health, safety, and well-being. It's a way of stifling the opportunity to protect Americans.

Another concern with the REINS Act is the influence of industry lobbyists over rulemaking would tremendously increase. K Street would love it. Given the complexity of the rules at issue and the expedited timeframe for congressional consideration, Members would instead be bombarded with visits, phone calls, and talking points from industry lobbyists, who would no doubt

take advantage of the REINS Act's short-circuited process to shape Members' views about a particular rule, probably within days of a major fundraiser.

On top of all the problems with this bill, it is simply unnecessary. First, to the extent that its proponents are concerned with Congress's accountability for agency rules, there are already numerous tools at our disposal to shape agency rulemaking. For example, Congress can rescind or limit its delegation authority to an agency if an agency acts beyond what we intended. Congress can also disapprove a rule under the Congressional Review Act process, defund enforcement of a rule or an agency through its appropriations and authorization power, overturn specific rules through legislation, and conduct regular oversight activity.

Second, to the extent that the REINS Act's proponents claim that the bill is necessary because the Obama administration has inundated the country with costly regulations, the facts simply do not bear this out. Just because you say ''Obama'' doesn't mean it's bad. Most Americans like Obama. He's been elected President twice.

In an op-ed that appeared in the Memphis Commercial Appeal, Doyle McManus cited Cass Sunstein, former director of OIRA, known as the Office of Information and Regulatory Affairs, who noted that in President Obama's ''first 4 years in office, he has issued fewer new Federal regulations than any of the four Presidents who came before him, including Ronald Reagan.''

Moreover, the op-ed noted that this President has revoked ''hundreds of outmoded rules that produced savings for government, business, and consumers that will add up to billions.''

Congress has already considered and rejected congressional approval schemes in the past. For instance, Chief Justice John Roberts—not exactly a flaming liberal—criticized legislation that was similar to the REINS Act back in 1983 when he was an associate White House counsel. In a memorandum, he objected that such legislation would ''hobble agency rulemaking by requiring affirmative congressional assent to all major rules'' and would ''seem to impose excessive burdens on the regulatory agencies.''

So before Chief Justice Roberts saved the ACA, he spoke out on this legislation as well in giving us wise counsel.

Finally, the broader premise underlying the REINS Act—that regulation stifles economic growth and job creation—is simply false.

It's pretty incredible that the proponents of antiregulatory bills like the REINS Act continue to make this claim in light of the fact there's absolutely no credible evidence establishing the fact that regulations have any substantive impact on job creation. But do not just take my word for it. Listen to some respected Republicans and conservatives.

Bruce Bartlett, a senior policy analyst in the Reagan and George H.W. Bush administrations, said:

> Republicans have a problem. People are increasingly concerned about unemployment, but Republicans have nothing to offer them. The GOP opposes additional government spending for jobs programs and, in fact, favors big cuts in spending that would likely lead to further layoffs at all levels of government. These constraints have led Republicans to embrace the idea that government regulation is the principal factor holding back employment. They assert that Barack Obama unleashed a tidal wave of new regulations, which has created uncertainty among businesses and prevents them from investing and hiring.

He concludes:

> No hard evidence is offered for this claim. It is simply asserted as self-evident and repeated throughout the conservative echo chamber.

It's as if you say it enough, people will believe it.

On the related argument that regulations create business uncertainty, Mr. Bartlett has said:

> Regulatory uncertainty is a canard invented by Republicans that allows them to use current economic problems to pursue an agenda supported by the business community year in and year out. In other words, it is a simple case of political opportunism, not a serious effort to deal with high unemployment.

That was Bruce Bartlett from the Reagan and George H.W. Bush days.

Susan Dudley, who headed the Office of Information and Regulatory Affairs during the administration of George W. Bush, has been quoted as saying that it is ''hard to know what the real impacts of regulation are.'' She also stated that she was unaware of any ''empirically sound way to assess the impact that proposed rules have on jobs.''

During one of the many hearings held on this issue in the last Congress, the majority's own witness clearly debunked the myth that regulations stymie job creation. Christopher DeMuth, with the conservative American Enterprise Institute, stated in his prepared testimony that ''the focus on jobs . . . can lead to confusion and regulatory debates'' and that ''the employment effects of regulation, while important, are indeterminate.''

The REINS Act is seriously flawed in its very conception and based on false premises that regulation kills jobs. Ultimately, it will only serve to needlessly heighten risks to the health and safety—financial and physical—of the American people. I strongly urge my colleagues to join me in opposition to H.R. 367, which I feel confident will pass this House and meet a timely death before it gets to see the light of day in the Senate.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Chairman, at this time it is my pleasure to yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. YOUNG), the sponsor of the legislation.

Mr. YOUNG of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of H.R. 367, the REINS Act.

Some of my Democrat friends want to characterize this bill as an antiregulation bill. But a vote for the REINS Act isn't a vote against regulations. It's a vote for better regulations. It's a vote in favor of a smarter regulatory system. It's a vote to balance broad economic interests against the narrow jurisdiction of individual Federal agencies. It's a vote to give the people most affected by regulations a louder voice in the democratic process.

Yesterday, the White House threatened to veto this bill if it passes. In their veto threat, they wrote:

> Maintaining an appropriate allocation of responsibility between the two branches is essential to ensuring that the Nation's regulatory system effectively protects public health, welfare, safety, and our environment, while also promoting economic growth, innovation, competitiveness, and job creation.

I couldn't agree more. That's exactly why I introduced this bill in January. For those, like me, who are truly concerned about maintaining an appropriate allocation of responsibility between the two branches, regardless of who occupies the White House, it's worth noting the executive branch only derives its power and only invokes its responsibility to issue a given legislation when the legislative branches authorize it to do so, and only in accordance with legislation passed by Congress.

However, this ''allocation of responsibility'' has been thrown out of whack because Congress has taken to the habit of passing sweeping, ambiguous laws that leave it to Federal agencies to sort out the details. This is typically done for the purpose of rushing bills through Congress in order to meet a political timetable or because certain Members would prefer to avoid working through the controversial details. It's much easier to leave such decisions to unaccountable rulemakers, after all.

ObamaCare is a great example of this phenomenon. As the minority leader said when she served as Speaker:

> We have to pass the bill so you can find out what is in it.

It turns out that's exactly the case. They had to pass the bill so HHS, the IRS, and our veritable alphabet soup of Federal agencies could tell us how the law would actually work. In fact, we still don't know exactly what's in the bill because we're still waiting on more regulations.

□ 1815

If the REINS Act were in place, none of the major regulations that are issued for ObamaCare or other sweeping laws would take effect until Congress approved them. This would make our regulatory process smarter for a number of reasons—chiefly, because we currently regulate in silos.

Now, when HHS employees are drafting a regulation about health insurance, for instance, they narrowly focus only on insurance. They aren't too worried about economic growth. If the IRS is drafting a regulation on tax collection, they are likely to focus narrowly on taxes. They don't take much

into account job losses and income effects.

We need a Congress that can comprehensively look at these things, a body that can, in the words of the White House, ''protect public health, welfare, safety, and our environment, while also promoting economic growth, innovation, competitiveness, and job creation,'' all at the same time.

So as we learn what's actually in ObamaCare and other laws, why is it such a bad idea to ensure that individual, rank-and-file Americans get to weigh in, through their elected representatives, on the important details that impact their pocketbooks, consume their time, and govern countless aspects of their daily lives?

The truth is it's not a bad idea. In fact, I predict Congress would take the time to more thoroughly and publicly deliberate about these large ambiguous bills if the regulators didn't get the final say. In the end, we would end up with better, clearer legislation in a diminished role for unelected rulemakers. More Americans could stay engaged in the entire lawmaking process and could voice their concerns in a meaningful way. And politicians would be unable to hide behind so-called ''unelected bureaucrats'' because the American people could ultimately hold Congress accountable for the rules coming out of Washington.

I implore my colleagues to join me in restoring a measure of accountability to the democratic process. Support this bill.

The CHAIR. The Committee will rise informally.

The Speaker pro tempore (Mr. ROTHFUS) assumed the chair.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Ms. Curtis, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate has agreed to a concurrent resolution of the following title in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. Con. Res. 22. Concurrent Resolution providing for a conditional adjournment or recess of the Senate and an adjournment of the House of Representatives.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Committee will resume its sitting.

REGULATIONS FROM THE EXECUTIVE IN NEED OF SCRUTINY ACT OF 2013

The Committee resumed its sitting.

Mr. COHEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 30 seconds to set the frame for where we are.

What we're asking is for all major rules and regulations to have to be approved by both the House and the Senate and signed by the President before they would ever go into effect. That message is one of the few things we can agree on—the Senate agreed on the time we can adjourn. That's about what we agree on. Seventeen bills have made it through here in 7 months, and we're talking about 50 to 100 major rules. Not gonna happen.

I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. CONNOLLY).

Mr. CONNOLLY. I thank my friend from Tennessee, and I thank him for his able leadership on this bill.

Listening to our friends on the other side of the aisle, I urge them all to reread Upton Sinclair's ''The Jungle,'' because that's where you would take us. You would take us to a world in which there was no Federal oversight of the food supply in America, there was no oversight of child labor in America, there was no oversight of workplace safety in America. And tragedies ensued.

America's water, America's air is cleaner, more breathable, and healthier today precisely because of regulation. The narrative that all regulation is burdensome—it only entails a cost, it never entails a benefit—is absolutely false and needs to be rejected by this body.

Sadly, Mr. Chairman, it is once again shaping up to be a lost summer for Congress as a number of issues ripe for debate—not this one—will be left to wither on the vine as Members leave town for the next 5 weeks. That's frustrating, after this year began with so much promise.

I was pleased to be part of a bipartisan coalition that voted for the New Year's Day deal to avert the fiscal cliff. A few weeks later, that same bipartisan coalition banded together to provide emergency aid to communities ravaged by Superstorm Sandy. Thankfully, our success didn't stop even there. We came together again on a bipartisan basis to reaffirm the strong support for the Violence Against Women Act after it had languished in this body because leadership refused to compromise.

At that point, people were actually beginning to wonder if the 113th Congress had finally gotten the message—that the American people want us to work together to get things done, not to just make cheap political points. But sadly, that progress was not sustained.

The first fissure appeared after the Senate's adoption of its first budget in nearly 4 years. I guess my friends on the other side of the aisle, the House Republicans, who had repeatedly beat up on the other Chamber for not doing its job with respect to the budget, are still dumbfounded that they in fact did pass one because it's been 4 months and they still have yet to appoint Members to the conference committee they claim they wanted.

Then the Senate managed to pass bipartisan comprehensive immigration reform. Our Republican colleagues may talk a good game on immigration, but that's all they've done so far here in the House. Not one of the bills in their piecemeal approach has come to this floor for consideration.

And just recently, House leaders allowed extreme partisanship to not only derail what was originally a bipartisan farm bill, but to also cast aside a critical safety net that was founded on a bipartisan basis in both the Senate and the House decades ago to protect families who need help putting food on the table.

The list of unfinished business continues to grow as we enter the final days of summer, but where is the urgency to resolve them? I was puzzled to see House Republicans bring up a so-called ''jobs'' bill that once again provided less infrastructure funding than we did the previous year in what was called the T-HUD appropriation bill. Of course it wasn't a surprise they had to pull it from the floor in the face of bipartisan opposition. Their parting shot of this week will be the 40th attempt to repeal part or all of ObamaCare. That's 40.

When we return from this ill-timed recess, Congress will have just 9 legislative days to reach a deal on keeping the government open for business beyond the end of the fiscal year, and by that time we're going to be bumping up against the debt ceiling. We actually managed a bipartisan accord to suspend that debt ceiling earlier this year, but we haven't been able to rekindle that spirit of cooperation.

Mr. Chairman, the American people aren't taking 5 weeks off like we are, and neither should this Congress. We can't afford another lost summer.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Chairman, at this time it's my pleasure to yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. BACHUS), the chairman of the Subcommittee on Regulatory Reform, Commercial and Antitrust Law.

Mr. BACHUS. The gentleman from Fairfax, Virginia, has just told us that we have avoided the fiscal cliff. I wonder if our children and grandchildren can take any comfort in that. I had no idea that the deficit and the debt had gone away. I had been told they were increasing by billions of dollars every day.

We have another difference of opinion across the aisle. Our colleagues are saying we need more Federal regulations—those that are covered by this bill that cost $100 million or more. We on this side of the aisle think that we could do well with a few less more regulations. Yes, every President has added regulations, every administration—and we're supposed to say that that is a good thing?

Regulations today cost $11,000 per American worker. Now, that's not taxes; that's not your Social Security; that's not their expense. That is just the Federal regulations. Fourteen percent of our national income, according to Dr. Douglas Holtz-Eakin, our former Congressional Budget Office director, 14 percent of our national income is being absorbed by Federal regulations.

Now, the gentleman from Tennessee says there were all these regulations before, and the Obama administration, they passed very few regulations. Well, not according to Dr. Holtz-Eakin. He

actually says that in the last 4 years, the Obama administration has added over a half-trillion dollars worth of new regulations. Boy, so it may be Groundhog Day, but we're another half-trillion dollars deeper in Federal regulations.

But let's talk about one family. Let's talk about one family and what regulations mean to them. One regulation caused American families to pay $20 more for a bronchial dilator. That was despite the fact that in 1987, in Montreal, there was an accord. And the reason is, the FDA said we're not going to allow an ozone-depleting substance to come out of these bronchial dilators, so they banned it. And immediately, in 2008, the cost of these bronchial dilators went from $6 and $8 up to as much as $30. Well, you know what the effect of that was? Let me tell you what The New York Times said. The New York Times described this as a rough transition to new asthma inhalers because several million Americans suddenly were paying $20 more and some couldn't afford it.

The CHAIR. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 additional minute to the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. BACHUS. Some couldn't afford it, I'll say to the gentleman from Virginia, the gentleman from Georgia, and the gentleman from Tennessee. Several million Americans were suddenly being forced—some elderly, some children—to pay $20 more for what had been a $7 or $10 item. And you know what happened? A lot of them couldn't afford it, and there were more asthma attacks and there was more bronchitis, and emphysema increased. That was despite the fact that in Montreal, in 1987, there was an accord that said, number one, that substance in a medical inhaler was essential and was excepted from the accord because the ozone was improving, number one. But number two, even if you banned all non-industrial discharges of ozone-depleting substances—all of them—it wouldn't do any good; it would have an insignificant effect. And of the non-industrial discharges, the amount from medical inhalers was infinitesimal. We denied millions of Americans an essential health item.

Mr. COHEN. Before I yield to Mr. JOHNSON, I would say that I could respond to some of the statements that the gentleman from Alabama made, but I won't do it because I have the highest respect for him. He's one of the finest Members of this House.

I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. JOHNSON).

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to H.R. 367, the REINS Act.

I have profound concerns with the REINS Act. This bill would undermine the ability of agencies to protect the public interest. It is a continuation of the majority's obstructionist approach that led to sequestration.

This deregulatory train wreck threatens to send us back to the days before the Wall Street collapse, a financial catastrophe that could have been avoided by responsible policies. This bill comes from the same brain trust that pulled the bill for transportation funding yesterday. Apparently, $4.4 billion in budget cuts is not good enough for these Republicans.

And now we consider the REINS Act, a bill that would require Congress to have the final say on regulations. Stop and think about that. The same House Republicans that could not vote to fund transportation now want to have the final say on all major rules. Never mind that Congress already has that power under the Congressional Review Act. Never mind that House Republican leadership tried this same maneuver in 2011.

□ 1830

If Republican leadership truly believed in growing the economy and creating jobs, we would have come together with a grand bargain long ago. We could even vote on job-creating legislation to strengthen the middle class. But instead, this Republican Congress insists on voting on a messaging bill that will go absolutely nowhere. Few Americans are surprised by yet another Republican leadership failure that has become par for the course.

Mr. Chairman, millions of Americans are still out of work. As we go back to our districts over the recess, I hope my Republican colleagues can look into the eyes of the poor and the unemployed in their communities and say: ''Don't worry, I voted for a messaging bill to deregulate America.''

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Chairman, at this time, it's my pleasure to yield 2 minutes on this job-creating legislation to the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. SMITH), a great new member of the House Judiciary Committee,

Mr. SMITH of Missouri. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 367, the REINS Act of 2013.

As a member of the Subcommittee on Regulatory Reform and a cosponsor, I am pleased to see a good reform bill like REINS come to the floor. Regulations impose hundreds of billions of dollars—in fact, trillions of dollars—on family farmers and small businesses, which significantly affect our economy and job creation in southeast Missouri.

Businesses and individuals face an uncertain regulatory future, and this gives them pause as they seek to start or grow their businesses to encourage economic growth and create jobs. The REINS bill adds just a little more certainty to the process. It allows these individuals to hear about regulations and give input to Congress before they vote up or down on an agency rule.

As I travel across Missouri, I always run into business owners, family farmers, and individuals who have felt the sting of government and their overreach, with the over 170,000 pages of rules and regulations affecting their lives. The ''pie in the sky'' regulations here in D.C. have real effects back home. The voice of the American people through their elected representatives should be the determining factor in government regulation, not that of a beltway bureaucrat.

I urge adoption of the REINS Act.

Mr. COHEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes and 53 seconds to the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. COURTNEY).

Mr. COURTNEY. Mr. Chairman, I rise today to oppose this misguided piece of legislation, which would erect new obstacles and red tape to protecting American lives.

At the outset, let me just reiterate what Mr. COHEN said earlier in his opening remarks, which is that Congress already has the power to disapprove any rule through the Congressional Review Act, through the appropriations process, and through other authorizing legislation.

H.R. 367, let's face it, is essentially an attempt to impose a procedural chokehold on protecting American citizens. I want to talk about one of those proposed rules, which is now pending at OSHA, the Occupational Safety and Health Administration, which is a rule to prevent the continuing litany of workplace fire and explosions from combustible dust.

Unfortunately, the Rules Committee didn't see fit to allow an amendment offered by Representative GEORGE MILLER to exclude that rule from the underlying bill. It has been abundantly clear for a decade that Federal regulatory action is needed to prevent combustible dust explosions and fires.

In 2003, the Chemical Safety Board found that protections to stop these explosions were grossly inadequate. The Board identified hundreds of other combustible dust fires and explosions, causing at least 119 fatalities and 715 injuries over the last 15 years.

The investigators themselves are not alone in demanding action. Tammy Miser of Kentucky testified before Congress recently about how her brother Shawn was killed in a metal dust fire at an aluminum wheel plant in Huntington, Indiana, in 2003. She told us how he was left lying on a smoldering floor after the explosion while aluminum dust burned through his flesh and muscle tissue. And each breath caused his internal organs to be burned even more.

Shawn wasn't the first to die at work this way, and he hasn't been the last. It has been more than 5 years since the Imperial Sugar explosion in Georgia, an explosion that killed 14 workers. It caused hundreds of millions of dollars in damage because an unchecked accumulation of sugar dust ignited and caused a chain of explosions, leveling the plant.

These workplace explosions have not stopped. There have been 49 major combustible dust fires or explosions that have killed 18 and injured 131 workers since Imperial Sugar.

More recently, five workers were killed in three separate events at a factory north of Nashville because an iron powder processing plant failed to abate repeated dust hazards. Each of the five left behind a wife and child; one had four children under 11, another became a grandfather the day before he was killed.

Widows have called on their government to protect them, and that's where OSHA comes in. In 2009, OSHA finally started work on a rule to reduce the risk of these explosions. There will be small business panels, risk assessments, public hearings, and plenty of opportunities for comments.

Despite the clear need to move forward, this bill would give special interests a new way to block needed protections, and they are already lining up to kill a rule they dislike.

The sad truth is that the underlying bill is nothing more than an effort to put the powerful above the lives and limbs of working families and their widows.

I urge my colleagues to vote down this bill.

If I have another few seconds, I just want to say we are now hours away from a 5-week recess. 640,000 DOD civilian employees are looking at Congress, asking why they should be furloughed for the next 8 weeks, losing 20 percent of their pay, some of whom are doing critical work for our national security, and yet not once in the over 200 days since this Congress was sworn in, has the governing majority brought a bill to this floor to turn off sequester and make sure that these people who are doing critical work for our national security can do their job. That's what we should be focused on. We should cancel the recess, turn off sequester, and end the endless debate about bills that are headed nowhere.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Chairman, at this time, it is my pleasure to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. ROTHFUS).

Mr. ROTHFUS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of the REINS Act.

The REINS Act is needed, frankly, because for decades now Congress has abdicated its responsibility for lawmaking to unelected Federal elites in the executive branch. They often create overbearing regulations that stifle innovation, reduce productivity, prevent businesses from growing and adding jobs, and increase prices on everything from gasoline to groceries. Don't get me wrong; some regulations are good and necessary, but they come with substantial cost, and there is not enough accountability for them.

I would look forward to voting for good regulations, and I would think my colleagues across the aisle would also look forward to voting for good regulations and taking credit for them. At this moment, however, the Obama administration has regulations in the pipeline that could cost the American people more than $50 billion. The Competitive Enterprise Institute estimates the regulatory burden to be almost $15,000 a year per family. Another study estimates that just six EPA regulations will cause the loss of almost 10 million jobs.

These rules are written by unelected elites with very little accountability to individual citizens across my district in western Pennsylvania, from Ellwood City to Lower Burrell to Somerset.

The REINS Act requires your elected representatives to be more accountable for regulations. Very simply, if the regulations will cost Americans more than $100 million, then Congress has to vote on it. Good regulations will be approved, and others will not. But your representative will have to declare a position, and you can hold them accountable for their votes.

Mr. Chairman, the REINS Act makes sense to me, it makes sense to my constituents in western Pennsylvania, and I encourage my colleagues to support the bill.

Mr. COHEN. Mr. Chairman, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Chairman, may I ask how much time is remaining on each side?

The CHAIR. The gentleman from Virginia has 11½ minutes. The gentleman from Tennessee has 10½ minutes.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Chairman, at this time, it is my pleasure to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. ROKITA).

Mr. ROKITA. I thank the chair for yielding me time.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the REINS Act, and I rise in support of the man who introduced it, my friend and colleague from Indiana, Mr. YOUNG.

I want to start out by addressing something the gentleman from Tennessee debated and talked about just a little bit earlier. He said that ''we don't get anything done here.'' I would like to take some opposition to that.

Just this week, we solved in a permanent fashion, Mr. Chairman, the student loan situation. We didn't do it with Democratic-inspired price fixing; we tied it to the market. Now, it's true it was very much a Republican bill when it left this House, then it was wisely adopted by the Senate in agreement last week, and it came back over here for a final vote 99 percent the same as it left. That's getting something done. That is real.

But let's take the gentleman's point a little bit further. Let's say sometimes we don't get something done; let's say sometimes we don't agree. The gentleman's solution is to let the unelected, unaccountable, nameless, faceless bureaucrats handle it, who aren't directly elected by anybody.

That is an abdication of the constitutional duty of this House, of this branch of government. It is our duty to make the laws; it is our duty to make the rules. And not only is it our duty to debate and pass legislation—hopefully not every time with our names on it—but it's also our constitutional duty to oversight the executive branch. That's exactly what the REINS Act acts to do.

How dare we decide we don't want to address, we don't want to tackle the big issues, Mr. Chairman, because they're too controversial; let the bureaucrats do it. That's not the way to run a government, that's not a way to run this branch of government, and that's not the way to run this House.

It's time this body starts doing its second and equally important constitutional duty, and that is oversight of the executive branch. The REINS Act, again, helps us do that in large measure. For that reason, I urge my colleagues to support this bill.

Mr. COHEN. I would like to yield 5 minutes to the gentlewoman from Houston, Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE), home of Archie Bell and the Drells.

(Ms. JACKSON LEE asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. JACKSON LEE. I thank the gentleman from Tennessee for his distinguished leadership and friendship, and the chairman of the full committee, because I believe that it is fair to have a difference of opinion. It is also fair to say that there are times when we have a great opportunity to work together.

I believe the gentleman mentioned my tenure on the Judiciary Committee, so let me document for my colleagues: the REINS Act goes around and around and around and around. It is constantly repeated and reintroduced, and it constantly fails.

For the new Members, my friends on the other side of the aisle who are standing up and talking about what a great impact this would have, they are using old data and misinterpretation, for there is no real documentation that the REINS Act is going to stop $1.5 trillion in excess cost. In fact, the authors of the study that my friends are using—the study was assessed by the Congressional Research Service.

I know when I speak to the American people and my colleagues they want to debunk all of this procedure and say ''enough is enough.'' But the CRS showed that the study was flawed, but more importantly, the author said: ''We never intended for this to determine benefits to regulation. Our studies have nothing to do with it.''

We cannot document the $1.5 trillion or the billions of dollars that our friends say that they're going to lose. They know full well that there is a procedure of disapproval that Congress can respond to the needs and the questions of the American public.

□ 1845

What they do not tell you is that this procedure—oh, I hate to talk about it. Please let me apologize. If you hear it, your eyes will roll back in your head, for what has to happen now is that the agency is doing its work. The DOD, Health and Human Services, the Department of Education are doing their work under existing law. They are trying to work on clean air and clean

water, safe toys, safe cars, and safe workplaces.

By the way, I offered an amendment to exempt children's regulations for babies who are 2 and under, and I was denied by the majority, by the Republican Rules Committee, so that babies who need safe cribs and toys now have to have this happen. Unless both Houses of Congress pass a joint resolution—let me tell you how long that might take—2 years, 3 years, five sessions, who knows—and then such rule within a fixed 70-legislative-day period, it kicks over into the next Congress. In the meantime, babies' heads are driven through cribs.

Those of us who are mothers know that era. It hasn't stopped. Each time, you have to look at the technology of cribs—or of toys that they choke on—and be able to discern how newborns are impacted. The Consumer Product Safety Commission can't effectively put a regulation in. Mothers understand that. Can you imagine a resolution of two Houses of Congress? Right now, we can't even get a budget resolution going forward.

I will tell you what the American people want us to do. It's not the REINS Act, which goes around and around. I think it was in the 112th Congress and in the 111th Congress. We are now in the 113th, and we will do it in the 114th. It does not save money. The American people want a solution-based budgeting process. They want us to go back to the budget reconciliation. They want us to stop laying off, as my good friend from Connecticut said, hardworking Defense workers, hardworking Homeland Security workers, hardworking Department of Education workers, who are trying to help this country be better. They want us to reduce the deficit. I will raise my hand for that. That is a good thing. They want us to create jobs, and they want us to be fair to the middle class.

I come from Texas. One of the worst disasters ever to occur was in West, Texas—the tragedy and the devastation of the loss of our fellow Americans in an explosion that should not have happened. What was the cry? What was the Federal Government doing? What was the regulatory scheme in order to prevent whatever ignited that terrible tragedy to see the loss of first responders?

The Federal Government is an umbrella on a rainy day. Fix the problems of regulation one by one. If there is one that is undermining small businesses, we are happy to do the disapproval process, and you can be assured that the voices of the American people will cry out. I can tell you that there is no proof—no legitimacy, no documentation—but anecdotal stories of, I hate the Federal Government. I don't hate the Federal Government. I pledge allegiance to this great flag and to this great Nation. I love my country. Therefore, I understand that it is the umbrella on a rainy day.

The Acting CHAIR. The time of the gentlewoman has expired.

Mr. COHEN. I yield such time as she may consume to the gentlelady in order to explain the fallacies of this bill.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. I thank the distinguished gentleman for his kindness.

Mr. Chairman, the reason we had to reassess the Army Corps of Engineers and have a regulatory scheme is that we lost almost 1,000-plus individuals in Hurricane Katrina. It wasn't the hurricane that had come through; it was the dam that broke. I know it well because I walked those streets of the Ninth Ward, and I saw the babies' shoes and the clothing hanging on closets and the whole area that was literally destroyed and that killed 1,000 people.

It's the regulatory structure of what kind of oversight was given, what regulatory structure the Army Corps was working under, what oversight they gave, what the regulation period was in which they had to review these kinds of structures around America. Then people wanted us to get in and get something accomplished. So I am just perplexed that there is no evidence whatsoever that this will create jobs, and it does not answer, by any means, how this government can work better.

I started to say to the gentleman from Tennessee that we all love this country—we pledge allegiance to the flag in our schools and in this body—and I wish my friends on the other side of the aisle would find some other way that we could work together. They talk about Obama administration regulations. My friends, they have been submitting this over and over again. These regulations have been carried forward from the Bush administration. This is not from the Obama administration.

Let me close by saying that I want clean air, that I want clean water, that I want our babies to be safe in their cribs and playpens. I am appalled that they put this legislation on the floor as something new when this is as old as Methuselah and, I might say, has limited value. As we would say in Texas, it's something that would be very doubtful. I'll leave it at that because we usually talk Texan in Texas, and I'm not there now.

What I will tell you is that we have ways of explaining how things are not relevant. This is not relevant, and it does not equate to a State legislature at all. This is for the United States of America. You cannot put the REINS Act in place and talk about jobs. I simply ask that we defeat this bill and pass these amendments that have been offered by Democrats, who want to make sure that we address the question of the American people.

I leave this podium by saying to the gentleman from Tennessee: Is it ludicrous to place as a responsibility of the Congress a 70-day window for two Houses to pass a resolution when we did not and were not able to pass a student loan effort for months and months, which, by the way, was made better by Senate Democrats? Is it reasonable?

Mr. COHEN. It is not reasonable.

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

Mr. GOODLATTE. I yield myself 30 seconds.

Mr. Chairman, since 1996, the disapproval process described by the gentlewoman from Texas has succeeded just one time. During that time, tens of thousands of regulations have been passed; and if people think that all but one of them were just fine, I would suggest it's just the opposite. It's the process right now—the inability of the Congress to rein in regulations that are out of control—which is lacking, and that's why we need the REINS Act, so that regulations that cost more than $100 million come back to the Congress for approval.

It is now my pleasure to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. FARENTHOLD), a distinguished member of the Judiciary Committee and the vice chairman of the Subcommittee on Regulatory Reform, Commercial and Antitrust Law.

Mr. FARENTHOLD. Mr. Chairman, I want to address, too, what my colleague from Houston, Texas, just said.

I love clean air, clean water, safe working places as much as she does; but we've got a government now that, instead of working with the people and with industry, is working against them. The trust in our government is at an all-time low. Scandal after scandal is plaguing the government. We have got to get people who are accountable in charge of those regulations, not unelected bureaucrats who are writing regulations that only in the history of the Review Act have been overturned one time. Ergonomic furniture was the only time that was able to work.

What I want to talk about is the Constitution.

The Constitution granted this body—the House of Representatives—and our colleagues across the Capitol, the Senate, the legislative power in this country to write laws and make rules that the American people must abide by. Now, for a variety of reasons, past Congresses have delegated this part. I mean, it makes sense. I don't know how many parts per billion of whatever substance in water is safe and what isn't. I don't know how many feet high a barrier needs to be to keep our workers safe. We've given this authority to our regulatory agencies. Yet, under this President in particular—and even under past Presidents—these agencies have seized that power and have written more and more burdensome regulations that go beyond the intent of this body.

Before we burden the American people with expensive, burdensome and intrusive regulations, the American people have a right to have their elected officials vote on it. This is how we are starting to reclaim some of the power that past Congresses have given away and are bringing it back to where our Founding Fathers rightfully intended—

into the Halls of Congress. This is a rational way to do it.

Washington works best under pressure. We give ourselves a deadline. If there is a bad rule that comes up under the REINS Act, we will get to it. We will approve it if it's good, and we will disapprove it if it's bad. That's our job. That's what we were sent here to do and, with our salaries, what we are paid to do.

The Acting CHAIR (Mr. CONAWAY). The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. GOODLATTE. It is my pleasure to yield an additional minute to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. FARENTHOLD. Thank you very much.

Mr. Chairman, I just want to wrap up by saying that this really is a problem. Elected officials are not making the rules. There is no accountability, and it's going to be hard for us to do it. This is the first step in bringing the power back to the people and to their elected Representatives. The REINS Act is a commonsense way to hold government accountable and to start to rebuild that trust that the American people have lost in Washington, D.C. That is what is good for America, and I urge my colleagues to support the REINS Act.

Mr. COHEN. Mr. Chairman, I would reserve what few precious minutes and seconds I may have left, and I would like to be informed of how many precious minutes and seconds I have.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Tennessee has 2 minutes remaining.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Chairman, it is my pleasure to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. SCALISE).

Mr. SCALISE. I thank the gentleman from Virginia for yielding and for bringing this bill forward.

Mr. Chairman, I am a strong supporter of the REINS Act. If you look at why we are bringing this bill forward, it is because of the onslaught of radical regulations that have been coming from this Obama administration for the last 4½ years.

Every time I go back home and talk to small business owners in my district, the biggest impediment that they tell me they have to creating more jobs—the biggest impediment—is the rules and regulations coming down from the Federal Government. If you look at what the REINS Act does, it doesn't stop those rules and regulations. It just says, if these rules and regulations are so important and have a $100 million impact on our economy, shouldn't they come before Congress and have to state their cases? I mean, what are you so afraid of in coming before the public body and having transparency?

President Obama said he was going to be the most transparent President ever. Yet he has got these bureaucrats who want to go behind closed doors and come up with rules and regulations. We have had hearings on some of this stuff, by the way, and they talk about things that are going to save kids' lives and things that are going to improve the quality of our air. We have had hearing after hearing in which the rules that they come up with have absolutely nothing to do with improving the quality of people's health.

What it has to do with is ramming through a radical agenda that they can't pass through Congress, and if Congress can't pass it—the publicly elected body of the United States Government—then you shouldn't go through the back door and have some unelected bureaucrat try to ram that through on this country and cause a devastating impact on jobs.

There have been over 130 different major rules under the Obama administration having a $70 billion impact on families in this country. With that $70 billion of impact that's going to cost families more money for food, for energy—for everything they do—shouldn't they have to come before the public bodies here in Congress and state the case? If it's such a good rule, what are they afraid of? Why don't they want that transparency?

It's because they don't want the transparency. They want to ram through the radical agenda, and the REINS Act just puts a stop to the unelected bureaucrats from doing it.

Mr. COHEN. I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Chairman, I believe all of the speakers on our side have spoken. I reserve the right to close, and at this time, I await the gentleman's actions. Then I will be happy to close.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. COHEN. I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Chairman, we have had a good discussion on this bill. Indeed, it is ''Groundhog Day'' as we have had it so many times. We've just gone around and around.

It is amazing that this body, which I am so proud to serve in, has popularity ratings amongst the American public of less than 10 percent because of the ineffectiveness of the House to work with the Senate and get anything done. Yet here we are, trying to give this body more power over the safety and health—fiscal and physical—of the American public.

One of the gentlemen spoke and said, I don't know how tall something has to be—a dam. I don't know.

Of course he doesn't know. You leave it to the experts. We pass laws. We instruct the agencies to come up with reasonable rules and regulations because they know how to build dams and know how to have airplanes that you can get off of in case of a crash and save people's lives and how to have fire-retardant seats and deal with other safety issues. There are abundant safety issues for the American public.

This is a bad idea. It is an idea that will not create jobs. It will hurt the American public. It will hurt safety and possibly our financial safety as well because it could impede Dodd-Frank from going in to protect the American public from future financial doom like we almost saw in 2008 with derivatives here in this Congress.

So I would ask that we vote ''no,'' that we protect the American public, and that we respect the system that we have had for so many years for safety and health.

I yield back the balance of my time.

□ 1900

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

A year and a half ago, the President of the United States came to give his State of the Union address here in the House Chamber and stood at the podium just below where you're standing right now. He had a long list of legislative items he wanted the Congress to pass. At the conclusion of it he said, If you don't do it, I will. I'm paraphrasing, of course. The question that many of us had was: By what authority in the United States Constitution does the President of the United States have the ability to do something that he has come to the Congress to ask to be passed legislatively and to tell us, if we don't do it, he's going to do it himself in the executive branch?

Well, the way he does it, when he's not stopped by lawsuits and other means, is he simply has regulations passed to accomplish those objectives. You know what? Thousands of regulations are passed every Congress compared to a few hundred laws that are passed. All we're asking here today is that for those regulations that cost the American people $100 million or more, that they have to come back here and be approved by the Congress rather than have executive fiat control that.

This is the representative democracy here in the House of Representatives and in the United States Senate. This is the people's House. We have the authority to pass laws, and we definitely are concerned about the welfare and well-being of our American people. But when we add trillions of dollars in costs to the expenses of American families, $11,000 per family, that's a stunning thing to think about what money could have been spent on other things. Yes, of course, some of those regulations are necessary, but many of them are not. Many of them needlessly add cost and create an ever-growing bureaucracy in the executive branch. We need to have ways to rein that in.

The most effective way to do that is to start with the largest regulation. Many people would say, well, we should do it for all regulations. That ought to be our objective, to make it very clear that we do not want to see regulations passed that are ineffective, that are needless, that add costs. Starting with those that cost more than $100 million, it is absolutely appropriate for the elected representatives of the people to have the final say on whether those

regulations are, indeed, what the Congress intended when they passed the underlying laws upon which those regulations are based. That's all we ask in this legislation. It is reasonable. The American people want it. This Congress should pass it.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Mr. Chair, I strongly support of the REINS Act.

The American people today face an onslaught of unnecessary Federal regulations. From the President's health care law to the never-ending list of EPA rules, government regulation has become a barrier to economic growth and job creation.

Congress hears from employers daily about the threat of Federal regulations to their businesses. These employers are rightly concerned about the cost of compliance that regulations impose on their businesses. Overly burdensome regulation diverts limited money and resources away from business investment and expansion to meet the government's demands. This harms the ability of business owners to create more jobs and boost local economies. That should motivate us to take action today.

Rather than halt its efforts to expand government, the administration seeks to use the regulatory agencies to accomplish what it cannot get approved by Congress. The REINS Act ensures that Congress has the final say over whether Washington will impose major new regulations on the American economy. Specifically, the bill establishes a procedure for Congress to approve all new major regulations proposed by the administration.

The President himself has expressed the risks that excessive regulations pose to our economy. He has called for reviews of existing regulations to provide relief. He has also made a commitment to make the regulatory process more transparent. However, the President has failed to deliver on these promises. Instead, the Obama administration has proposed four times the number of major regulations than the previous administration over the same time period.

It is time for Congress to reverse this harmful trend in overregulation. The REINS Act holds the administration accountable for its unjustified regulatory assault on job creators. It guarantees that Congress, not unelected bureaucrats, will be the final arbiter of all new major regulatory costs.

The American people want job creation and economic growth, not more regulation. The REINS Act reins in out-of-control Federal regulations that burden the economy.

I thank Mr. YOUNG of Indiana for introducing this important legislation and I thank Chairman GOODLATTE for taking up the REINS Act.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Chair, as an administrator and policymaker at the local, state, and federal levels, I have often seen the value of common-sense regulations that save lives. I have also seen the challenges associated with cumbersome regulations that are difficult to navigate. However, in my experience, regulations tend to be less stringent than necessary rather than overly strict. There are ways to make regulation more efficient and easier to navigate, but we must do so in a way that protects public health, maintains our environmental protections, and ensures fair market interactions.

For the second time in less than two years, today Congress is considering H.R. 367, the Regulations from the Executive in Need of Scrutiny Act. I oppose this legislation, as I did in 2011, and urge my colleagues to vote against it. This bill is an attack on our government's basic ability to enforce laws that protect public health and the environment. Every major law requires enforcement by the executive branch of government, and enforcement requires agencies to write regulations that explain and make public how that agency is going to enforce the law. This is how legislation is implemented. This bill would require both the House and the Senate to vote on every major regulation before that regulation can be enforced, providing only seventy days to do so. This allows Congress to effectively veto any legislation we have already passed, simply by taking no action and keeping agencies from moving forward with implementation. Agencies will not be able to enforce new laws or complete updates to regulations as required by existing laws, such as the Clean Air Act.

We do not need to extend Congress's dysfunction to the rest of the federal government. I strongly oppose H.R. 367 and urge my colleagues to do the same.

Mr. GINGREY of Georgia. Mr. Chair, I rise today as a proud original cosponsor of H.R. 367, the Regulations from the Executive in Need of Scrutiny—or REINS—Act.

Far too much authority has been delegated to federal agencies, leading to a lack of accountability and massive Executive overreach through regulation. According to current procedure, major rules promulgated by agencies take effect unless Congress passes and the President signs a joint resolution disapproving them under the Congressional Review Act. The Obama Administration has abused this process time and time again to bypass the legislative branch to regulate what it cannot legislate, with $50 billion in new rules proposed this year alone and the overall cost of the current regulatory burden coming in at $1.8 trillion.

At a time when nearly 12 million Americans are searching for work, the Obama Administration continues to burden the economy with cumbersome, bureaucratic regulations that harm small businesses and hamper economic growth. To make matters worse, this Administration has made a habit out of ignoring the legal obligation to transparency in the regulatory process. The constant flow of regulations has led to uncertainty and a lack of oversight, and Americans deserve a government that is truly accountable to the people.

Mr. Chair, H.R. 367 would restore Congressional accountability by requiring Congress and the President to approve major rules—those with an impact on the economy of more than $100 million—before they can be enforced, thereby allowing a means to stem the flow of unnecessary, complex, and ineffective regulations. Congress has the right and responsibility to exercise rigorous oversight over the rulemaking process to ensure that we reduce needless and excessive regulatory burdens, protect current jobs, and promote future growth. I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 367.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Chair, I rise in strong opposition to H.R. 367, the ''Regulations from the Executive in Need of Need of Scrutiny Act.''

Without question, this bill will have dangerous consequences for all Americans by creating an unworkable approval process that will make it nearly impossible for many new regulations to go into effect.

It does this by imposing impossibly unrealistic deadlines by which Congress must consider and pass exceedingly complex and technical regulations in order for such regulations to take effect.

Under H.R. 367, Congress would have only 70 legislative days within which to act after it receives a major rule.

Now, let us put this in some perspective. Over the past few years, the average number of major rules promulgated each year is about 85.

In 2010, for instance, 94 major rules were issued. But keep in mind the following fact: there were just 116 legislative days in the House during 2010.

Worse yet, the bill restricts the days on which these major rules may be considered in the House, which—for last year—would have been just 10 days.

Assuming there is just an average number of major rules, the House would have to consider an average of 8 separate major rules on each of those days.

And, if the REINS Act were to become law today, there would be only 5 days left in 2013 on which the House could consider the merits of major rules.

Under H.R. 367, there is just no way Congress could possibly have the time to consider all the major rules issued during the year.

And, if Congress fails to act within this mandatory time frame, the regulation cannot be considered until the next Congress.

Even Chief Justice John Roberts criticized a prior iteration of the REINS Act back in 1983. He said that such legislation would ''hobbl[e] agency rulemaking by requiring affirmative Congressional assent to all major rules'' and would ''seem to impose excessive burdens on the regulatory agencies.''

The bottom line is that the bill would at least significantly delay rulemaking and at worst bring it to a halt.

Avoiding undue delay in rulemaking is important because strong regulation is vital to protecting Americans in nearly every aspect of their lives.

According to the Government Accountability Office, if the REINS Act were in effect now it would delay or possibly derail at least 32 major proposed regulations issued this year and 68 such rules issued last year.

Among other things, these proposed regulations pertain to:

reimbursement rates for end-stage renal disease Medicare providers;

payments to primary care physicians under the Vaccines for Children Program;

various Federal student loan programs;

the Justice Department's National Standards to prevent, detect, and respond to prison rape;

meal requirements for the National School Lunch Program under the Healthy, Hunger-Free Kids Act of 2010;

the Transportation Department's Certified Medical Examiners National Registry;

Labor Department Standards for H–2B Aliens in the United States;

the subsistence allowance for veterans under the Vocational Rehabilitation and Employment Program; and the Patent and Trademark Office's proposal setting and adjusting patent fees.

And, this is just a small sample of the many kinds of protections that the REINS Act would jeopardize. I could go on and on.

This explains why nearly 70 consumer groups, environmental organizations, labor unions, and other entities, strenuously oppose this bill.

Likewise, the Administration issued a strongly worded veto threat against this bill. It warns that H.R. 367 "would delay and, in many cases, thwart implementation of statutory mandates and execution of duly-enacted laws, create business uncertainty, undermine much-needed protections of the American public, and cause unnecessary confusion."

Finally, H.R. 367 will give anti-regulatory interests yet another opportunity to derail rulemaking.

Major rules are the product of an intensive, multi-year process, based on extensive input received from the public and affected entities through a notice and comment period.

Agencies often spend many months, if not years, to perfect theses rules based on feedback from these sources and their own expertise.

Under the bill's short-circuited process, however, Congress will not realistically be able to second-guess the merits of these rules.

Instead, we in Congress will be bombarded with visits, phone calls, and talking points from industry lobbyists and well-funded special interests that can use every resource available to persuade us of the validity of their views.

Superficially, it may seem like a good idea to make Congress the final arbiter of all significant regulatory decisions. After all, Members of Congress are elected and regulators are not.

But realistically, we simply lack the expertise and resources to make the requisite prudential decisions about the bona fides of these rules, particularly given the limited time frame we have to act under the bill.

An example of how this legislation would work:

I recently introduced H.R. 2480, the Nurse and Health Care Worker Protection Act of 2013, which would require the Occupational Safety and Health Administration to promulgate a regulation that protects our caretakers from debilitating injuries. Nursing professionals and health care aids have among the highest rates of back, neck, and shoulder injuries of any profession, due to the trauma of lifting, supporting, and repositioning patients. Through a straightforward regulation that promotes safe patient handling practices, including the use of mechanical devices, this regulation could save, millions of dollars each year, and countless years of experience.

Now even if the House and Senate pass H.R. 2480 and the experts with OSHA develop the proper standards to prevent these debilitating injuries, under the REINS Act, any resulting regulations would have to be assessed by Congress and voted on in a short time frame. Let's be honest, who in this body know about ergonomics and the technical aspects of a nurse's day to day job?

Accordingly, I strongly urge my colleagues to join me in opposing this seriously flawed bill.

Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas. Congress adopted the current system over a hundred years ago because it recognized the necessity of assigning the job of crafting appropriate regulations to the scientific, economic, legal, and other experts in agencies. The REINS Act is an extreme departure from current procedures designed only to stymie the development of regulations with which the industry does not want to comply.

The current system of administrative agencies of the federal government began more than 100 years ago, and developed through the 20th century. It was codified in its present form in the Administrative Procedures Act. The REINS Act guts this precedent, and replaces it with insurmountable hurdles.

Congress already has the power to stop regulations if extreme circumstances dictate under the Congressional Review Act. The REINS Act requires agencies to submit new final rules to Congress for review, delaying the effective date of those rules to permit Congress to block them, and establishes a fast-track process for legislation proposed to overrule a regulation.

The bill would make it virtually impossible for an approval resolution to pass because it does not entirely prohibit a filibuster. Since the bill does not clearly prohibit a filibuster in the Senate, more specifically it does not prohibit a filibuster on a motion to take up a matter, it would empower a few, or even one Senator, to block regulations.

The legislation gives Congress a short 70-day window to approve a regulation, and if either chamber fails to do so during that time period, the regulation is deemed to have been rejected, and Congress is barred from subsequently voting to approve the regulation or one "substantially similar" to it for the remainder of that Congress. The 70-day requirement will make it next to impossible for any regulations to be approved.

Resolutions approving regulations would first have to be cleared by committees. The vast majority of bills introduced in Congress die in committee, and there is no reason to believe that new regulations wouldn't suffer the same fate.

Claims about so-called "job-killing" regulations are a fabrication, a reiteration of the same doomsday rhetoric that has been used to oppose virtually every major step forward for health and safety. In actuality, the REINS Act is about giving representatives of industry more opportunities to kill regulations they find inconvenient, posing a great detriment to public safety and health.

The Acting CHAIR. All time for general debate has expired.

Pursuant to the rule, the bill shall be considered for amendment under the 5-minute rule.

The amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on the Judiciary, printed in the bill, as modified by the amendment printed in part A of House Report 113–187, shall be considered read.

The text of the amendment in the nature of a substitute is as follows:

H.R. 367

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 ''Regulations From the Executive in Need of Scrutiny Act of 2013''.

SEC. 2. PURPOSE.

The purpose of this Act is to increase accountability for and transparency in the Federal regulatory process. Section 1 of article I of the United States Constitution grants all legislative powers to Congress. Over time, Congress has excessively delegated its constitutional charge while failing to conduct appropriate oversight and retain accountability for the content of the laws it passes. By requiring a vote in Congress, the REINS Act will result in more carefully drafted and detailed legislation, an improved regulatory process, and a legislative branch that is truly accountable to the American people for the laws imposed upon them.

SEC. 3. CONGRESSIONAL REVIEW OF AGENCY RULEMAKING.

Chapter 8 of title 5, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

"CHAPTER 8—CONGRESSIONAL REVIEW OF AGENCY RULEMAKING

''Sec.
''801. Congressional review.
''802. Congressional approval procedure for major rules.
''803. Congressional disapproval procedure for nonmajor rules.
''804. Definitions.
''805. Judicial review.
''806. Exemption for monetary policy.
''807. Effective date of certain rules.

"§ 801. Congressional review

''(a)(1)(A) Before a rule may take effect, the Federal agency promulgating such rule shall submit to each House of the Congress and to the Comptroller General a report containing—

''(i) a copy of the rule;

''(ii) a concise general statement relating to the rule;

''(iii) a classification of the rule as a major or nonmajor rule, including an explanation of the classification specifically addressing each criteria for a major rule contained within sections 804(2)(A), 804(2)(B), and 804(2)(C);

''(iv) a list of any other related regulatory actions intended to implement the same statutory provision or regulatory objective as well as the individual and aggregate economic effects of those actions; and

''(v) the proposed effective date of the rule.

''(B) On the date of the submission of the report under subparagraph (A), the Federal agency promulgating the rule shall submit to the Comptroller General and make available to each House of Congress—

''(i) a complete copy of the cost-benefit analysis of the rule, if any;

''(ii) the agency's actions pursuant to sections 603, 604, 605, 607, and 609 of this title;

''(iii) the agency's actions pursuant to sections 202, 203, 204, and 205 of the Unfunded Mandates Reform Act of 1995; and

''(iv) any other relevant information or requirements under any other Act and any relevant Executive orders.

''(C) Upon receipt of a report submitted under subparagraph (A), each House shall provide copies of the report to the chairman and ranking member of each standing committee with jurisdiction under the rules of the House of Representatives or the Senate to report a bill to amend the provision of law under which the rule is issued.

''(2)(A) The Comptroller General shall provide a report on each major rule to the committees of jurisdiction by the end of 15 calendar days after the submission or publication date. The report of the Comptroller General shall include an assessment of the agency's compliance with procedural steps required by paragraph (1)(B) and an assessment of whether the major rule imposes any new limits or mandates on private-sector activity.

''(B) Federal agencies shall cooperate with the Comptroller General by providing information relevant to the Comptroller General's report under subparagraph (A).

''(3) A major rule relating to a report submitted under paragraph (1) shall take effect upon enactment of a joint resolution of approval described in section 802 or as provided for in the rule following enactment of a joint resolution of approval described in section 802, whichever is later.

''(4) A nonmajor rule shall take effect as provided by section 803 after submission to Congress under paragraph (1).

''(5) If a joint resolution of approval relating to a major rule is not enacted within the period provided in subsection (b)(2), then a joint resolution of approval relating to the same rule may not be considered under this chapter in the same Congress by either the House of Representatives or the Senate.

''(b)(1) A major rule shall not take effect unless the Congress enacts a joint resolution of approval described under section 802.

''(2) If a joint resolution described in subsection (a) is not enacted into law by the end of 70 session days or legislative days, as applicable, beginning on the date on which the report referred to in section 801(a)(1)(A) is received by Congress (excluding days either House of Congress is adjourned for more than 3 days during a session of Congress), then the rule described in that resolution shall be deemed not to be approved and such rule shall not take effect.

''(c)(1) Notwithstanding any other provision of this section (except subject to paragraph (3)), a major rule may take effect for one 90-calendar-day period if the President makes a determination under paragraph (2) and submits written notice of such determination to the Congress.

''(2) Paragraph (1) applies to a determination made by the President by Executive order that the major rule should take effect because such rule is—

''(A) necessary because of an imminent threat to health or safety or other emergency;

''(B) necessary for the enforcement of criminal laws;

''(C) necessary for national security; or

''(D) issued pursuant to any statute implementing an international trade agreement.

''(3) An exercise by the President of the authority under this subsection shall have no effect on the procedures under section 802.

''(d)(1) In addition to the opportunity for review otherwise provided under this chapter, in the case of any rule for which a report was submitted in accordance with subsection (a)(1)(A) during the period beginning on the date occurring—

''(A) in the case of the Senate, 60 session days, or

''(B) in the case of the House of Representatives, 60 legislative days,

before the date the Congress is scheduled to adjourn a session of Congress through the date on which the same or succeeding Congress first convenes its next session, sections 802 and 803 shall apply to such rule in the succeeding session of Congress.

''(2)(A) In applying sections 802 and 803 for purposes of such additional review, a rule described under paragraph (1) shall be treated as though—

''(i) such rule were published in the Federal Register on—

''(I) in the case of the Senate, the 15th session day, or

''(II) in the case of the House of Representatives, the 15th legislative day,

after the succeeding session of Congress first convenes; and

''(ii) a report on such rule were submitted to Congress under subsection (a)(1) on such date.

''(B) Nothing in this paragraph shall be construed to affect the requirement under subsection (a)(1) that a report shall be submitted to Congress before a rule can take effect.

''(3) A rule described under paragraph (1) shall take effect as otherwise provided by law (including other subsections of this section).

''§ 802. Congressional approval procedure for major rules

''(a)(1) For purposes of this section, the term 'joint resolution' means only a joint resolution addressing a report classifying a rule as major pursuant to section 801(a)(1)(A)(iii) that—

''(A) bears no preamble;

''(B) bears the following title (with blanks filled as appropriate): 'Approving the rule submitted by _____ relating to _____.';

''(C) includes after its resolving clause only the following (with blanks filled as appropriate): 'That Congress approves the rule submitted by _____ relating to _____.'; and

''(D) is introduced pursuant to paragraph (2).

''(2) After a House of Congress receives a report classifying a rule as major pursuant to section 801(a)(1)(A)(iii), the majority leader of that House (or his or her respective designee) shall introduce (by request, if appropriate) a joint resolution described in paragraph (1)—

''(A) in the case of the House of Representatives, within three legislative days; and

''(B) in the case of the Senate, within three session days.

''(3) A joint resolution described in paragraph (1) shall not be subject to amendment at any stage of proceeding.

''(b) A joint resolution described in subsection (a) shall be referred in each House of Congress to the committees having jurisdiction over the provision of law under which the rule is issued.

''(c) In the Senate, if the committee or committees to which a joint resolution described in subsection (a) has been referred have not reported it at the end of 15 session days after its introduction, such committee or committees shall be automatically discharged from further consideration of the resolution and it shall be placed on the calendar. A vote on final passage of the resolution shall be taken on or before the close of the 15th session day after the resolution is reported by the committee or committees to which it was referred, or after such committee or committees have been discharged from further consideration of the resolution.

''(d)(1) In the Senate, when the committee or committees to which a joint resolution is referred have reported, or when a committee or committees are discharged (under subsection (c)) from further consideration of a joint resolution described in subsection (a), it is at any time thereafter in order (even though a previous motion to the same effect has been disagreed to) for a motion to proceed to the consideration of the joint resolution, and all points of order against the joint resolution (and against consideration of the joint resolution) are waived. The motion is not subject to amendment, or to a motion to postpone, or to a motion to proceed to the consideration of other business. A motion to reconsider the vote by which the motion is agreed to or disagreed to shall not be in order. If a motion to proceed to the consideration of the joint resolution is agreed to, the joint resolution shall remain the unfinished business of the Senate until disposed of.

''(2) In the Senate, debate on the joint resolution, and on all debatable motions and appeals in connection therewith, shall be limited to not more than 2 hours, which shall be divided equally between those favoring and those opposing the joint resolution. A motion to further limit debate is in order and not debatable. An amendment to, or a motion to postpone, or a motion to proceed to the consideration of other business, or a motion to recommit the joint resolution is not in order.

''(3) In the Senate, immediately following the conclusion of the debate on a joint resolution described in subsection (a), and a single quorum call at the conclusion of the debate if requested in accordance with the rules of the Senate, the vote on final passage of the joint resolution shall occur.

''(4) Appeals from the decisions of the Chair relating to the application of the rules of the Senate to the procedure relating to a joint resolution described in subsection (a) shall be decided without debate.

''(e) In the House of Representatives, if any committee to which a joint resolution described in subsection (a) has been referred has not reported it to the House at the end of 15 legislative days after its introduction, such committee shall be discharged from further consideration of the joint resolution, and it shall be placed on the appropriate calendar. On the second and fourth Thursdays of each month it shall be in order at any time for the Speaker to recognize a Member who favors passage of a joint resolution that has appeared on the calendar for at least 5 legislative days to call up that joint resolution for immediate consideration in the House without intervention of any point of order. When so called up a joint resolution shall be considered as read and shall be debatable for 1 hour equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered to its passage without intervening motion. It shall not be in order to reconsider the vote on passage. If a vote on final passage of the joint resolution has not been taken by the third Thursday on which the Speaker may recognize a Member under this subsection, such vote shall be taken on that day.

''(f)(1) If, before passing a joint resolution described in subsection (a), one House receives from the other a joint resolution having the same text, then—

''(A) the joint resolution of the other House shall not be referred to a committee; and

''(B) the procedure in the receiving House shall be the same as if no joint resolution had been received from the other House until the vote on passage, when the joint resolution received from the other House shall supplant the joint resolution of the receiving House.

''(2) This subsection shall not apply to the House of Representatives if the joint resolution received from the Senate is a revenue measure.

''(g) If either House has not taken a vote on final passage of the joint resolution by the last day of the period described in section 801(b)(2), then such vote shall be taken on that day.

''(h) This section and section 803 are enacted by Congress—

''(1) as an exercise of the rulemaking power of the Senate and House of Representatives, respectively, and as such is deemed to be part of the rules of each House, respectively, but applicable only with respect to the procedure to be followed in that House in the case of a joint resolution described in subsection (a) and superseding other rules only where explicitly so; and

''(2) with full recognition of the Constitutional right of either House to change the rules (so far as they relate to the procedure of that House) at any time, in the same manner and to the same extent as in the case of any other rule of that House.

''§ 803. Congressional disapproval procedure for nonmajor rules

''(a) For purposes of this section, the term 'joint resolution' means only a joint resolution introduced in the period beginning on the date on which the report referred to in section 801(a)(1)(A) is received by Congress and ending 60 days thereafter (excluding days either House of Congress is adjourned for more than 3 days during a session of Congress), the matter after the resolving clause of which is as follows: 'That Congress disapproves the nonmajor rule submitted by the _____ relating to _____, and such rule shall have no force or effect.' (The blank spaces being appropriately filled in).

''(b) A joint resolution described in subsection (a) shall be referred to the committees in each House of Congress with jurisdiction.

''(c) In the Senate, if the committee to which is referred a joint resolution described in subsection (a) has not reported such joint resolution (or an identical joint resolution) at the end of 15 session days after the date of introduction of the joint resolution, such committee may be discharged from further consideration of such joint resolution upon a petition supported in writing by 30 Members of the Senate, and such joint resolution shall be placed on the calendar.

''(d)(1) In the Senate, when the committee to which a joint resolution is referred has reported,

or when a committee is discharged (under subsection (c)) from further consideration of a joint resolution described in subsection (a), it is at any time thereafter in order (even though a previous motion to the same effect has been disagreed to) for a motion to proceed to the consideration of the joint resolution, and all points of order against the joint resolution (and against consideration of the joint resolution) are waived. The motion is not subject to amendment, or to a motion to postpone, or to a motion to proceed to the consideration of other business. A motion to reconsider the vote by which the motion is agreed to or disagreed to shall not be in order. If a motion to proceed to the consideration of the joint resolution is agreed to, the joint resolution shall remain the unfinished business of the Senate until disposed of.

''(2) In the Senate, debate on the joint resolution, and on all debatable motions and appeals in connection therewith, shall be limited to not more than 10 hours, which shall be divided equally between those favoring and those opposing the joint resolution. A motion to further limit debate is in order and not debatable. An amendment to, or a motion to postpone, or a motion to proceed to the consideration of other business, or a motion to recommit the joint resolution is not in order.

''(3) In the Senate, immediately following the conclusion of the debate on a joint resolution described in subsection (a), and a single quorum call at the conclusion of the debate if requested in accordance with the rules of the Senate, the vote on final passage of the joint resolution shall occur.

''(4) Appeals from the decisions of the Chair relating to the application of the rules of the Senate to the procedure relating to a joint resolution described in subsection (a) shall be decided without debate.

''(e) In the Senate the procedure specified in subsection (c) or (d) shall not apply to the consideration of a joint resolution respecting a nonmajor rule—

''(1) after the expiration of the 60 session days beginning with the applicable submission or publication date, or

''(2) if the report under section 801(a)(1)(A) was submitted during the period referred to in section 801(d)(1), after the expiration of the 60 session days beginning on the 15th session day after the succeeding session of Congress first convenes.

''(f) If, before the passage by one House of a joint resolution of that House described in subsection (a), that House receives from the other House a joint resolution described in subsection (a), then the following procedures shall apply:

''(1) The joint resolution of the other House shall not be referred to a committee.

''(2) With respect to a joint resolution described in subsection (a) of the House receiving the joint resolution—

''(A) the procedure in that House shall be the same as if no joint resolution had been received from the other House; but

''(B) the vote on final passage shall be on the joint resolution of the other House.

''§ 804. Definitions

''For purposes of this chapter—

''(1) The term 'Federal agency' means any agency as that term is defined in section 551(1).

''(2) The term 'major rule' means any rule, including an interim final rule, that the Administrator of the Office of Information and Regulatory Affairs of the Office of Management and Budget finds has resulted in or is likely to result in—

''(A) an annual effect on the economy of $100,000,000 or more;

''(B) a major increase in costs or prices for consumers, individual industries, Federal, State, or local government agencies, or geographic regions; or

''(C) significant adverse effects on competition, employment, investment, productivity, innovation, or on the ability of United States-based enterprises to compete with foreign-based enterprises in domestic and export markets.

''(3) The term 'nonmajor rule' means any rule that is not a major rule.

''(4) The term 'rule' has the meaning given such term in section 551, except that such term does not include—

''(A) any rule of particular applicability, including a rule that approves or prescribes for the future rates, wages, prices, services, or allowances therefore, corporate or financial structures, reorganizations, mergers, or acquisitions thereof, or accounting practices or disclosures bearing on any of the foregoing;

''(B) any rule relating to agency management or personnel; or

''(C) any rule of agency organization, procedure, or practice that does not substantially affect the rights or obligations of non-agency parties.

''(5) The term 'submission date or publication date', except as otherwise provided in this chapter, means—

''(A) in the case of a major rule, the date on which the Congress receives the report submitted under section 801(a)(1); and

''(B) in the case of a nonmajor rule, the later of—

''(i) the date on which the Congress receives the report submitted under section 801(a)(1); and

''(ii) the date on which the nonmajor rule is published in the Federal Register, if so published.

''§ 805. Judicial review

''(a) No determination, finding, action, or omission under this chapter shall be subject to judicial review.

''(b) Notwithstanding subsection (a), a court may determine whether a Federal agency has completed the necessary requirements under this chapter for a rule to take effect.

''(c) The enactment of a joint resolution of approval under section 802 shall not be interpreted to serve as a grant or modification of statutory authority by Congress for the promulgation of a rule, shall not extinguish or affect any claim, whether substantive or procedural, against any alleged defect in a rule, and shall not form part of the record before the court in any judicial proceeding concerning a rule except for purposes of determining whether or not the rule is in effect.

''§ 806. Exemption for monetary policy

''Nothing in this chapter shall apply to rules that concern monetary policy proposed or implemented by the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System or the Federal Open Market Committee.

''§ 807. Effective date of certain rules

''Notwithstanding section 801—

''(1) any rule that establishes, modifies, opens, closes, or conducts a regulatory program for a commercial, recreational, or subsistence activity related to hunting, fishing, or camping; or

''(2) any rule other than a major rule which an agency for good cause finds (and incorporates the finding and a brief statement of reasons therefore in the rule issued) that notice and public procedure thereon are impracticable, unnecessary, or contrary to the public interest, shall take effect at such time as the Federal agency promulgating the rule determines.''.

SEC. 4. BUDGETARY EFFECTS OF RULES SUBJECT TO SECTION 802 OF TITLE 5, UNITED STATES CODE.

Section 257(b)(2) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 is amended by adding at the end the following new subparagraph:

''(E) BUDGETARY EFFECTS OF RULES SUBJECT TO SECTION 802 OF TITLE 5, UNITED STATES CODE.—Any rules subject to the congressional approval procedure set forth in section 802 of chapter 8 of title 5, United States Code, affecting budget authority, outlays, or receipts shall be assumed to be effective unless it is not approved in accordance with such section.''.

SEC. 5. GOVERNMENT ACCOUNTABILITY OFFICE STUDY OF RULES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Comptroller General of the United States shall conduct a study to determine, as of the date of the enactment of this Act—

(1) how many rules (as such term is defined in section 804 of title 5, United States Code) were in effect;

(2) how many major rules (as such term is defined in section 804 of title 5, United States Code) were in effect; and

(3) the total estimated economic cost imposed by all such rules.

(b) REPORT.—Not later than one year after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Comptroller General of the United States shall submit a report to Congress that contains the findings of the study conducted under subsection (a).

The Acting CHAIR. No amendment to that amendment in the nature of a substitute shall be in order except those printed in part B of the report. Each such amendment may be offered only in the order printed in the report, by a Member designated in the report, shall be considered read, shall be debatable for the time specified in the report equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question.

AMENDMENT NO. 1 OFFERED BY MR. SCALISE

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 1 printed in part B of House Report 113–187.

Mr. SCALISE. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 5, line 17, insert after the period the following: ''Moreover, as a tax on carbon emissions increases energy costs on consumers, reduces economic growth and is therefore detrimental to individuals, families and businesses, the REINS Act includes in the definition of a major rule, any rule that implements or provides for the imposition or collection of a tax on carbon emissions.''.

Page 20, strike lines 10 through 14, and insert the following:

''(2) The term 'major rule' means any rule, including an interim final rule, that the Administrator of the Office of Information and Regulatory Affairs of the Office of Management and Budget finds—

''(A) has resulted in or is likely to result

Page 20, line 15, redesignate subparagraph (A) as clause (i).

Page 20, line 17, redesignate subparagraph (B) as clause (ii).

Page 20, line 21, redesignate subparagraph (C) as clause (iii).

Page 20, line 25, strike the period and insert ''; or''. Page 20, insert after line 25 the following:

(B) is a rule that implements or provides for the imposition or collection of a carbon tax.

Page 22, insert after line 8 the following:

''(6) The term 'carbon tax' means a fee, levy, or price on—

''(A) emissions, including carbon dioxide emissions generated by the burning of coal, natural gas, or oil; or

''(B) coal, natural gas, or oil based on emissions, including carbon dioxide emissions that would be generated through the fuel's combustion.''.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 322, the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. SCALISE) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. SCALISE. Mr. Chairman, I bring this amendment forward on the REINS Act to simply prohibit the Obama administration from imposing a carbon tax on the United States. If they wanted to impose that kind of tax, they could not do it through regulation. Of course, we've heard the Obama administration, from President Obama to his EPA Administrator and others, talking about various forms of taxes on energy that they want to impose. Whether it's a carbon tax, whether it's a cap-and-trade-type scheme, they've continued to throw out that opportunity to impose that kind of radical regulation by themselves without action from Congress.

Clearly, as we talk about the REINS Act and we talk about any kind of regulation having over a $100 million impact on our economy, we want to make it very clear that any attempt to impose a carbon tax would fall under that same definition of ''major rule'' where they could not do it by regulation.

If you look at what's been studied on this issue—again, this idea of a carbon tax has been floating around for a while by the Obama administration. In fact, the National Association of Manufacturers, Mr. Chairman, did a study, and it's titled ''The Economic Outcomes of a U.S. Carbon Tax.'' Let me tell you, it's not pretty some of the things that they talk about in this study.

If the Obama administration had their way and imposed a tax on carbon, manufacturing output in energy-intensive sectors, for example, could drop by as much as 15 percent. We're talking real job losses that would come to this country.

What would it do to families in terms of energy costs? How would it affect them? In the same study, they say, just in the first year of a carbon tax, we would see an increase in the cost of natural gas by more than 40 percent, and the price of gasoline at the pump would go up by 20 cents a gallon. That's just in the first year of a carbon tax. It would have devastating impacts on our economy.

Clearly, if you look at what President Obama and his administration officials are doing and saying, they want to keep the door open to impose a carbon tax through regulation. This amendment says absolutely not.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. COHEN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Tennessee is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. COHEN. Mr. Chairman, this is a bad amendment to a bad bill, so it's doubly bad.

This would take almost anything that protects the air, the water, the public from carbon emissions away from the opportunity of the EPA to protect us. Many cities, such as Houston, Texas, and L.A. and other cities, have problems with smog. They have programs that they have to put a price on pollutants that cause urban smog, and these programs are part of the State-approved implementation plans through the EPA to protect the air. They are improving the air quality in Houston and Los Angeles, but under this amendment, if Texas or California ever needed to change these programs, they wouldn't be able to do so. Los Angeles has had enough smog, so has Houston and the rest of the country, and we have to be able to have laws that effectively protect our air.

Public health programs are important, and the amendment would risk the ability of EPA also to have its sanctions that they put into place. Right now, EPA, to ensure civil enforcement procedures, they change their penalties every 4 years to keep up with inflation so they're effective deterrents. This would stop this from happening, and eventually the deterrents would be less than necessary to stop bad actors from engaging in risky behavior that causes harm to the environment and harm to humans.

We just saw in January that Transocean agreed to pay $1 billion to resolve Federal Clean Water Act civil penalty claims for the 3-month-long oil spill in the Gulf of Mexico, the BP there. BP also has got the same risk. If we don't allow the penalties to be adjusted for inflation, they won't have an effect. The sanctions won't deter bad actors. We saw it in the BP Deepwater Horizon explosion, and we see it as it applies to the Clean Water Act, Safe Drinking Water Act, Resource Conservation and Recovery Act, and all those others.

The bottom line is this could have unintended consequences, but its intended consequence is to protect the oil industry from regulations and imperil the American public. This is a bad amendment to a bad bill, and I ask my colleagues to defeat it.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SCALISE. Mr. Chairman, if I could go back to that National Association of Manufacturers study on the impact of a carbon tax, the gentleman from Tennessee might be interested in knowing that in Tennessee alone, in the first year of a carbon tax, household utilities would go up by 14 percent, and, in fact, they could experience job losses of up to 40,000 lost jobs just in the State of Tennessee in year one, with a 40 percent increase in their natural gas prices.

I wanted to point that out, and then yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia, Chairman GOODLATTE.

Mr. GOODLATTE. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

This is a good amendment to a good bill, and I support it.

By requiring all new major regulations to be submitted to Congress for approval, the REINS Act provides a powerful check on overreaching executive action. This check could not come sooner. The Obama administration increasingly, and increasingly openly, is pursuing unilateral regulatory action to thwart Congress' decision not to pass legislation the administration desires. This includes legislation that would impose a carbon tax as part of the administration's climate agenda.

The amendment guarantees that no carbon tax can be imposed unless Congress consents to it, no matter how much the Obama administration would like to impose such a dramatic tax by executive fiat. This is the people's House. This is where new public policy should be established, and this amendment is a good one to assure that this is where policy related to carbon taxes is made, not in the administration.

I urge my colleagues to support the amendment.

Mr. COHEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I'll just reiterate that this is a bad amendment to a bad bill. It basically puts the interests of special industry—the gas and oil industry, particularly—above the American public's health, clean air, and the environment. If you want to have an Earth that we can give to the next generation that's in as good a shape so that their lungs can survive in it, you won't be for this type of regulation, this amendment, or for this bill.

I ask us to vote ''no,'' and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. SCALISE. Mr. Chairman, in closing, I yield myself the balance of my time.

I just want to point out that clearly the Obama administration must be very interested in imposing a tax on carbon through regulation. The fact that the opposition has objected to this and stated all of the reasons that they think a carbon tax should be imposed tells you that they are holding out for that opportunity.

Of course, if you look at the devastating impacts of a carbon tax—there are a lot of good studies out there. Again, I go back to the National Association of Manufacturers. It's a very respected national organization, people that stand up for American jobs. The report they did, entitled, ''Economic Outcomes of a U.S. Carbon Tax,'' is devastating.

Clearly, the administration wants to do this. If it's such a good idea, bring the idea to Congress; bring it through the House; bring it through the Senate. They could get their floor leaders in the Senate to bring it up tomorrow, but they don't want this kind of scrutiny.

Just the other day, the President was in Tennessee bragging about all these new jobs plans that he has; and while he was doing it, ironically, in another State, his new EPA Administrator was talking about climate change. In fact, she called climate change the ''opportunity of a lifetime,'' and that the EPA would continue to impose regulations

despite what we think here in Congress.

That's not the way the legislative process works. That's not the system of government our great Founders created. They said, if an idea is so good, bring it to the people's House; bring it to the Senate, and pass it that way. Don't try to impose it through radical regulation and devastate our economy.

I urge adoption, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. CAMP. Mr. Chair, I rise today in strong support of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Louisiana, Mr. SCALISE. This amendment would prevent the President and the EPA from bypassing Congress and imposing a devastating national energy tax that would affect every American.

Struggling Americans who have been unable to find a job or have not seen their paychecks grow would pay this national energy tax every time they pay their utility bills or fill up their gas tanks or go to the grocery store. It would also be another tax on manufacturers and another increased cost of doing business under the Obama administration.

House Republicans have been fighting to fix our broken tax code to make it simpler, fairer and flatter for American families and businesses. We cannot let the Obama Administration make an end run around the Congress' Constitutional responsibility for tax policy and use the regulatory process to impose a national energy tax that will cost trillions of dollars in economic growth and lost opportunities for hard-working Americans.

I urge my colleagues to support the Scalise amendment—to ensure tax policy starts where the Constitution's Framers intended—here in the people's House.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. SCALISE).

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

Mr. SCALISE. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Louisiana will be postponed.

□ 1915

AMENDMENT NO. 2 OFFERED BY MR. RODNEY DAVIS OF ILLINOIS

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 2 printed in part B of House Report 113–187.

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 6, beginning on line 12, strike ''sections 804(2)(A), 804(2)(B), and 804(2)(C)'' and insert ''clauses (i) through (iii) of section 804(2)(A) or within section 804(2)(B)''.

Page 20, beginning on line 11, strike ''the Administrator'', and insert ''—''

''(A) the Administrator''.

Page 20, line 15, by redesignating subparagraph (A) as clause (i).

Page 20, line 17, by redesignating subparagraph (B) as clause (ii).

Page 20, line 21, by redesignating subparagraph (C) as clause (iii).

Page 20, line 25, strike the period at the end and insert ''; or''.

Page 20, insert after line 25 the following:

''(B) is made by the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency and that would have a significant impact on a substantial number of agricultural entities, as determined by the Secretary of Agriculture (who shall publish such determination in the Federal Register).''.

Page 22, insert after line 8 the following:

''(6) The term 'agricultural entity' means any entity involved in or related to agricultural enterprise, including enterprises that are engaged in the business of production of food and fiber, ranching and raising of livestock, aquaculture, and all other farming and agricultural related industries.''.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 322, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. RODNEY DAVIS) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman.

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 2 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, I rise today to offer the bipartisan Davis-Peterson amendment, which helps address the disconnect between the EPA and the agricultural community. Under our amendment, EPA rules that have a significant impact on a substantial number of agricultural entities—as determined by the Secretary of Agriculture—would be considered ''major rules.''

Under the REINS Act, major rules need congressional approval. We view this as another way to give agriculture a stronger voice when it comes to EPA regulations. As I travel throughout the 13th District of Illinois and listen to farmers and producers, one of their top concerns is regulatory actions by EPA. Ag has been a bright spot in our economy. For every $1 billion in agriculture exports, more than 8,000 jobs are supported here at home. With USDA projecting $139.5 billion in ag exports for fiscal year 2013, American agriculture will support more than 1 million jobs.

This is a good story, and my colleagues and I on the House Agriculture Committee do our best to tell it. However, our farmers remain concerned that the EPA does not understand production agriculture. These are concerns we take very seriously. We aren't the only ones that see this problem; EPA recognizes it as well. Acting Administrator For Water, Nancy Stoner, told me when I asked her if her agency was aware of the disconnect between EPA and the agricultural community:

We are actively working with those groups to improve communication on issues as to which we have had some difficulties. And I will acknowledge that we have had some, and we are doing the very best we can to improve that situation.

This amendment provides a solution to the problem by allowing the Secretary of Agriculture to examine EPA regs and identify those that have a significant impact on a significant number of agricultural entities. The USDA must be included in these decisions and equipped with the authority to identify these rules. This agency understands farmers and works best with them on a daily basis. We believe this amendment would improve communication between EPA and the USDA.

The Acting CHAIR. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. I yield myself an additional 30 seconds.

It would improve communication between the EPA and USDA, give agriculture a place at the table during the process, and ultimately result in getting government out of the way to allow our family farmers to do what they do best. I urge support of this bipartisan amendment.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. COHEN. Mr. Chairman, I rise to oppose this amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Tennessee is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. COHEN. Mr. Chairman, again, this is just another amendment in another area in what's totally a bad concept. The basic concept is that any rule or regulation would have to go through a passage in both the House and the Senate and Presidential approval to become effective. And it would have to happen in committees only on Tuesdays or Thursday, and within 15 days they would have to pass it. Basically, this is creating a Rube Goldberg type of legislative mechanism that would thwart the creation of regulations and rules that protect the American public. That's just plumb wrong.

What this does is tries to gut the EPA, and I'm shocked that my good friends on the other side of the aisle would try to gut the work of one of their great Presidents, Richard Nixon. He served in this House, served in the Senate, and 4 years as vice president. I think he almost eked out 5 years, he had some kind of ethically challenged problem when he was President, but he did create the EPA. He did some good environmental things. I think those things should be standards for the Republican Party. They should hold up the EPA and remember Richard Nixon as one of their party standard bearers, one of the men who served probably the longest time in a major capacity as President and Vice President and Senate leader. And his work on the House Un-American Activities Committee—we can't forget that in this House. To forget Richard Nixon and to minimize his work, I am just amazed, because that's one of the great heroes on the other side of the aisle, I believe.

But the EPA is important. It was good work that he gave us, and it shouldn't be gutted. And to make these rules have to go through passage in the House and Senate, we know the House and the Senate don't get along. They mentioned we got the loan bill through. That's the first thing we've kind of done since we did the Violence Against Women and kind of saved the storm victims of Superstorm Sandy. We really haven't got much done. Oh, I forget, a couple of post offices, we

agreed on them. And maybe some coins for the Hall of Fame or something. But to get these major rules done, it wouldn't happen. And so we're jeopardizing the American public. I urge us to defeat this as a bad amendment to a bad bill. It is deleting the legacy of Richard Nixon.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I respect and thank the gentleman from Tennessee for his comments on Richard Nixon. However, I was not yet in kindergarten when Mr. Nixon served, so, therefore, I do not remember him creating the EPA, but I thank him for reminding me of that.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. GOODLATTE), the chairman of the Judiciary Committee.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Chairman, I want to thank the gentleman from Illinois for offering this amendment. It is another good amendment.

I also want to say to my good friend from Tennessee that I was a little older when Richard Nixon was in office. We are not minimizing what he did; we are going to maximize the amount of attention that Congress pays to the EPA when they get it wrong, particularly when the Secretary of Agriculture determines that any regulation issued by the EPA will have a significant impact on a substantial number of agricultural entities. We ought to take a look at that. As a result, it subjects such regulations to congressional approval before they can become effective.

This is an important step to rein in what is often regarded as the most overreaching of all Federal regulatory agencies. The EPA's actions and proposals have been particularly problematic for America's farmers, including small farmers. This includes, for example, the EPA actions aimed at farm dust.

The Secretary of Agriculture has a greater incentive than EPA to ensure that potential adverse impacts on agricultural entities have been adequately and accurately assessed. The amendment guarantees that regulation that should be characterized as major due to their impacts on agricultural entities will be so characterized and submitted to Congress for approval.

I urge my colleagues to support this very worthy amendment.

Mr. COHEN. Mr. Chairman, I, too, was alive when Richard Nixon was doing his service, and I remember him getting on that helicopter, waving good-bye. There were regulations that made sure that he was able to get away from Washington and get home to California, and we need to make sure those regulations that might be impeded by this REINS Act are still in effect so that Presidents like him can make their escape.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

I wonder, even though I don't remember Richard Nixon getting up and flying away, I wonder if the EPA would let that helicopter leave Washington, D.C., today.

But I have to tell you, this is a commonsense, bipartisan amendment that gives our farmers a stronger voice and a better place at the table when EPA is considering these regulations that impact the ag community.

And I want to thank Ranking Member PETERSON for supporting this effort as well. I urge my colleagues' support. I want to say thank you, Mr. Chairman, to my colleague from Tennessee for making this actually a lively debate tonight. And hopefully a few more viewers on C–SPAN are smiling this evening because of it.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. RODNEY DAVIS).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 3 OFFERED BY MR. SMITH OF MISSOURI

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 3 printed in part B of House Report 113–187.

Mr. SMITH of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 6, beginning on line 12, strike ''sections 804(2)(A), 804(2)(B), and 804(2)(C)'' and insert ''clauses (i) through (iii) of section 804(2)(A) or within section 804(2)(B)''.

Page 20, beginning on line 11, strike ''the Administrator'', and insert ''—''

''(A) the Administrator''.

Page 20, line 15, by redesignating subparagraph (A) as clause (i).

Page 20, line 17, by redesignating subparagraph (B) as clause (ii).

Page 20, line 21, by redesignating subparagraph (C) as clause (iii).

Page 20, line 25, strike the period at the end and insert ''; or''.

Page 20, insert after line 25 the following:

''(B) is made under the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act (Pub. Law 11–148).''.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 322, the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. SMITH) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman.

Mr. SMITH of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, as I have traveled across the Eighth Congressional District of Missouri from my hometown of Salem to the Ozark Hills in Wright County, Douglas, Howell County, to the banks of the Mississippi River, one of the largest concerns that my constituents have is the uncertainty surrounding the Affordable Care Act.

Individuals are concerned about the relationship with their doctor and what their costs are going to be. Businesses are left with a tremendous uncertainty. They are understaffed because they are afraid to hire additional employees, and they're also firing employees just to fall below the 50 individual threshold.

The effects of the Affordable Care Act are adversely affecting health care and the jobs of folks all across this great country. That is why I'm offering my amendment to revise the definition of major regulations to include any regulation under the Affordable Care Act. With over 3,000 pages of Federal regulations already issued, and many more to follow, Congress must prevent this widely unsupported law from causing further damage to our health care system.

Mr. Chairman, there is broad bipartisan opposition to the Affordable Care Act. The administration has demonstrated its own certainty through the delays to several key provisions of the bill. Congress must assert its role in oversight and give the American people their voice back in government, away from the bureaucrats. My amendment does just that. I urge adoption of the amendment.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. COHEN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Tennessee is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. COHEN. Mr. Chairman, this is a microcosm of this 113th Congress; the macro has been the 40th attempt coming up to repeal ObamaCare. This is a microcosm to try to defeat ObamaCare through a little regulation. It seems like the preoccupation that the other side has with what is one of the most important social safety network provisions passed by this House in history, Social Security, Medicare and Medicaid, and then the Affordable Care Act, is amazing. We've had 40 bills, and now this rule and regulation, to try to repeal the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act.

The Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act means your child can stay on your insurance unless they are 26 years of age. It means you can't have lifetime caps on your health insurance. It means you can't be denied coverage because of a preexisting condition. It means that being a woman doesn't classify you as having a preexisting condition. It says that certain care comes to you, like colonoscopies or mammograms, without a copay, and it means yearly annual checkups, which can detect disease early and save people's lives. It is a way to provide health care for at least 40 million people in this country who don't have health care.

And it has already been shown to drive down the cost of health care. For those States that have worked with us and that have exchanges, we have seen reductions in what was expected to be the cost of insurance from 25 to 30 to even 50 percent in different States. Health care costs are not rising at the rates that they were otherwise because of the fact that we passed the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act.

It's important that individuals get more community health centers, which come with this provision. Lots of people, particularly in my district, they

don't live near hospitals and doctors. They need community health centers, and community health centers have been funded and created to give people access to health care otherwise denied.

We are the last industrialized country on the face of the Earth to provide health care for its people, the last industrialized country to do so. That is one of the shames that we have tried to cure with this bill.

And this provision, this amendment to this REINS Act, would deny people that health care coverage. It would say if you have a preexisting condition, too bad, you don't get insurance.

As President Obama said, the Affordable Care Act is insurance reform on steroids. Do you want to have the health insurance industry have total control without regulations, without controls, then you want to defeat it. But the American public doesn't want that. They want their health care costs to contained, and they don't want the insurance companies to have total control. They like the idea of their children having insurance up to the time they're 26, and to have preventive care come without copays, not have yearly caps on your insurance or lifetime caps on your insurance benefits that can be paid out.

So this is a sad state that we've spent so much time in this Congress trying to deny people health care and save their lives.

So this is a bad amendment. I would ask us to defeat it.

I reserve the balance of my time.

□ 1930

Mr. SMITH of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the fine gentleman from Virginia (Mr. GOODLATTE).

Mr. GOODLATTE. I thank the gentleman for yielding, and I commend him and support this important amendment.

The REINS Act restores to Congress the accountability for regulatory decisions that impose major burdens on our economy. This amendment strengthens congressional accountability for regulations under the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act. You know, ObamaCare? That legislation that has 400 new authorities, 400 new ways for the Secretary of Health and Human Services and other bureaucrats to regulate the American people, businesses, large and small, local governments, State governments, health care providers?

Yeah, that one. Imposed over the will of the American people, implementation of ObamaCare has demonstrated that the act imposes a detrimental and unworkable reform of the Nation's health care system. And one after another, promises made to the American people by the act's supporters when the law was passed have been broken.

Moreover, the Obama administration's own actions to waive or suspend ObamaCare requirements have made clear that regulatory actions to implement the act form a ''seamless web.''

Too often, actions to avoid one adverse effect of the act's implementation send ripple effects of unfairness or other harmful consequences throughout the ObamaCare web, requiring adjustments to other aspects of implementation.

This, too, justifies the amendment's requirement that Congress approve any new regulation promulgated under the act, and I urge my colleagues to support this excellent amendment.

Mr. COHEN. Mr. Chairman, what this shows is exactly what the situation is. You've got a majority in the House that's against the Affordable Care Act, and you've got a majority in the Senate that's for it.

To have any rules and regulations under it go into effect, the House and the Senate would both have to approve it, which means you could have one House, not both Houses, the way we work, it's a bicameral legislature and the House and the Senate have to work together and pass the bill to become law.

But one House, by not passing it, could kill it—one House veto. This Republican Congress could veto every single regulation under the Affordable Care Act.

And then preexisting conditions, no insurance. Lifetime caps, back in effect. Yearly caps, back in effect. Child's 23, nope, can't stay on dad and mom's policy anymore.

Get hurt, go broke. Too bad. That's just wrong.

And that's what this would do for any regulations. One House could veto and kill legislation. That's antithetical to the bicameral legislature.

That's just one of the many reasons why we should defeat this amendment, defeat the bill, and go on and try to pass a jobs bill, and kill sequester, and see that the National Institutes of Health, which is cut $1.6 billion by sequester, isn't cut.

That's our Department of Defense. They protect us from Alzheimer's, AIDS, heart disease, cancer, diabetes, Parkinson's. Those are the enemies. The National Institutes of Health is the Department of Defense, and we shouldn't be cutting $1.6 billion from them because we're all going to be victims.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. SMITH of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Chairman, this is truly a jobs bill. When you're looking at over 170,000 pages of Federal rules and regulations that affect jobs, this amendment will help alleviate that.

As I've traveled across the Eighth Congressional District, I've had businesses, one after the other, that said they had 56 employees. Well, they were going to reduce those employees because of one piece of legislation that was passed out of this Chamber that Congress never even took the time to read until after they passed it, and yet they've even passed it.

The problem with the Affordable Care Act is it affects more than one-sixth of our Nation's economy; and because of the burdensome regulations that are being promulgated from the Affordable Care Act, businesses are scared to death to hire additional employees, and they are firing additional employees.

I have had restaurant owners in our district that have sold restaurants because they want to fall below the 50-employee mark.

Folks, this is a jobs bill. Less government regulation that is breaking the backs of small businesses is what we need to do to turn this country around.

Mr. Chairman, I ask this body to adopt this amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. SMITH).

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

Mr. SMITH of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Missouri will be postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 4 OFFERED BY MR. LATHAM

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 4 printed in part B of House Report 113–187.

Mr. LATHAM. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 6, line 15, insert before ''intended to implement'' the following: ''taken by or that will be taken by the Federal agency promulgating the rule that are''.

Page 6, line 17, strike ''and'' at the end.

Page 6, after line 17, insert the following (and redesignate provisions accordingly):

''(v) a list of any other related regulatory actions taken by or that will be taken by any other Federal agency with authority to implement the same statutory provision or regulatory objective that are intended to implement such provision or objective, of which the Federal agency promulgating the rule is aware, as well as the individual and aggregate economic effects of those actions; and''.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 322, the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. LATHAM) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. LATHAM. Mr. Chairman, while my amendment is very simple, it's aimed at addressing a very complex problem, the problem of duplicative and conflicting Federal regulations.

In the underlying bill, Federal agencies are required to submit, along with the rule they want Congress to approve, a list of other regulatory actions to implement the same statute or regulatory objective, in other words, Mr. Chairman, to actually investigate whether the regulations may be redundant.

It's not clear whether the requirement to list other regulatory actions applies only to the promulgating agency or other agencies. The amendment clarifies that this list must include related regulatory actions by any other Federal agency.

Earlier this year, the GAO delivered to Congress its third annual report on duplication in government programs, identifying 17 specific areas of fragmentation, overlap, and duplication where multiple programs and activities are creating inefficiencies.

Unfortunately, these inefficiencies result in regulatory duplication, heaping needless costs and paperwork on businesses at a time when our economy continues to struggle enough already.

A group run by former CBO Director Douglas Holtz-Eakin recently compiled information on regulations in the specific problem areas identified by the GAO, using the government database contained by the Office of Information and Regulatory Affairs. This report found 470 related paperwork requirements, 642 million hours of regulatory duplication involving 990 Federal forms, and at least $20 billion in compliance costs to employees.

Take these examples:

We have three agencies issuing regulations on catfish inspections, at a cost of 2 million work hours and $146 million in compliance costs.

Ten different agencies handle Medicare forms submitted by health care providers, generating 486 million hours of paperwork and 281 different forms.

Nine different agencies administer higher education assistance programs, involving 66 Federal forms and duplication, resulting in 47 million hours of paperwork at a compliance cost of $3 billion.

Congress must act to eliminate or consolidate duplicate and inefficient programs; but in the meantime, agencies must at least acknowledge requirements imposed by other agencies working on the same issues and work to minimize burdens on our small businesses.

According to the Small Business Administration, it already costs American businesses at least $8,000 and often more than $10,000 per employee to comply with Federal regulations.

It's no wonder that the massive Federal regulatory regime is consistently cited as a roadblock to job growth and economic recovery. I believe this amendment will help clarify areas of overlap and highlight opportunities for reducing the compliance burden faced by American employers.

I ask my colleagues to support this amendment.

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

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I rise to claim the time in opposition to this amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I oppose this amendment because it would add yet another onerous and unnecessary burden on agencies and will further stifle agency rulemaking.

Among other things, the REINS Act requires that an agency issuing a rule submit reports to Congress and the GAO containing a list of related regulatory actions intended to implement the same statutory provision or regulatory objective as the rule at issue, together with the individual and aggregate economic effects of those actions.

This amendment would add to that list actions taken, or that will be taken, by Federal agencies other than the agency issuing the rule to meet the same objectives. Such a requirement means that an agency issuing a rule would now be obliged to survey the vast panoply of Federal agencies to determine what other actions are being taken by other agencies before it could issue a rule.

Congress did not create agencies, Mr. Chairman, to keep tabs on other agencies. This amendment would only serve to divert already limited agency resources away from protecting the American people.

This amendment is just a further effort to derail rulemaking. It's placing another burden on already limited agency resources and is really just busy work.

So for those reasons I rise in opposition.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LATHAM. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. GOODLATTE), the distinguished chairman of the Judiciary Committee.

Mr. GOODLATTE. I want to thank the gentleman from Iowa for yielding, and I support his amendment.

Mr. Chairman, interrelated Federal regulations are a common feature of the modern regulatory landscape. Numerous major regulations form part of a web of regulations agencies develop to implement one statutory division or one statutory goal.

In addition, numerous regulatory statutes entrust rulemaking authority over a given problem to more than one agency. This is the case, for example, with the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency's and the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers' joint authority over wetlands. It is also the case with the EPA's and the Department of Transportation's joint authority over fuel economy standards.

The amendment requires that agencies, when they submit new major regulations to Congress for approval, provide a list of related regulatory actions that the submitting agency or other agencies have taken or will take to implement the same statutory provision or regulatory objective. Seems pretty reasonable to me to have to find out what other regulations are impacting the same objective.

This helpful amendment will provide Congress with more complete information on the extent of regulations agencies have taken or plan to take to implement an authorizing statute or achieve a regulatory goal. That information will better enable Congress to determine whether to approve or disapprove the submitted regulation.

This can only improve congressional accountability and the regulatory process, and I urge my colleagues to support the amendment.

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, in response, I would point out that with respect to interrelated regulations, different regulatory authorities have different regulatory objectives. And so, to require that one agency survey the other to see whether or not there are any similar or the same objectives, with no power or authority to decide to do away with a particular regulation, based on an objective that is no longer suitable, I think, is not something that this amendment allows for; and it's also something that agencies themselves are not equipped to do.

I agree that we need to have some mechanism whereby regulatory regulations can be looked at, modified, strengthened or weakened or done away with at any particular time. But this anti-regulatory legislation and this amendment will not accomplish that.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LATHAM. Mr. Chairman, may I inquire as to how much time there is.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Iowa has 15 seconds remaining. The gentleman from Georgia has 1½ minutes remaining.

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

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. LATHAM. Mr. Chairman, I will just obviously be very brief. But the gentleman was talking earlier about opposing this amendment because it creates busy work for the agencies.

What about the busy work of the small businesses to comply with these mountains and mountains of regulations?

And the previous speakers have said the biggest reason that people are not hiring today is because of the cost of regulations.

I would ask for this amendment to be passed.

I yield back the balance of my time.

□ 1945

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. LATHAM).

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

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa will be postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 5 OFFERED BY MR. SESSIONS

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 5 printed in part B of House Report 113–187.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 6, line 24, insert before the semicolon the following: ''\, including an analysis of any jobs added or lost, differentiating between public and private sector jobs''.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 322, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. SESSIONS) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 1 minute.

Mr. Chairman, tonight we engage this House to talk about some commonsense legislation that would, in fact, allow the American people and this Congress to understand more about rules and regulations as they are presented that the American people have to live under.

My amendment requires that an agency submitting a report on any proposed Federal rule include an assessment of anticipated jobs gained or lost as a result of the implementation of any rules that fit within the REINS Act.

This is very important, Mr. Chairman, because many times rules and regulations are implemented without regard for what the impact would be on the people who have to live under them. We believe this is common sense. We believe this happens in businesses every day. We're asking for a cost-benefit analysis of the impact of the rules that are written, combined with the impact that they would have upon job losses, whether it be the government or the free enterprise system.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. I rise in opposition to this amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, this amendment presupposes that regulations depress job creation. To the contrary, there's no credible evidence that regulations depress job creation.

The majority's own witness at one of our hearings clearly debunked the myth that regulations stymie job creation. Christopher DeMuth of the American Enterprise Institute, a conservative think thank, stated in his prepared remarks that the ''focus on jobs . . . can lead to confusion in regulatory debates.'' Also, he stated that ''the employment effects of regulation, while important, are indeterminate.''

Nonetheless, I appreciate that this amendment recognizes that regulations could create jobs. I am, however, concerned about this amendment because it would add to the analytical burdens of agencies a speculative assessment of jobs added and lost and how many of those jobs would be added or lost to the public and private sectors.

To the extent that regulations have anything to do with jobs, H.R. 367 proponents should overwhelmingly support my amendment, which is upcoming, which simply exempts from H.R. 367's congressional approval mechanism all rules that OMB determines would result in net job creation. This way, job creating rules would not effectively be vetoed, which would be the precise result under H.R. 367.

Also, instead of trying to make Congress a superadministrative agency, what we should be doing is considering actual job creation legislation. We also should be talking about how to help middle class families who are struggling financially.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1¼ minutes to the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. BARR).

Mr. BARR. I thank the gentleman from Texas for the opportunity to rise in support of this important amendment and to rise in support overall of the REINS Act, a critical tool in the battle against overregulation, which is destroying jobs.

The gentleman from Georgia talked about whether or not regulations actually destroy jobs. Well, from my home State of Kentucky, I can tell you we've lost 5,700 coal mining jobs in east Kentucky as a result of this administration's overzealous overregulation of our coal industry.

Small business owners from across Kentucky continually tell me that they want to create more jobs and grow their businesses. They want to help put food on the table, gas in the tank, and more money in the pockets of Kentucky families, who are hurting under this administration's war on coal. But costly and burdensome regulations coming out of unaccountable Federal agencies are raising their cost of doing business, leading to higher prices for consumers, fewer jobs for workers, and weakened American competitiveness.

While Federal regulations wreak havoc on families in Kentucky, small businesses, and our overall economy, the unelected, unaccountable bureaucrats writing them are hiding behind the fact that they are not always required to fully analyze the impact their proposal will have on jobs.

If you want to know about the impact of these regulations on jobs, come to eastern Kentucky and see those lost jobs.

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. In response, Mr. Chairman, I would say that the old ways of creating or producing energy—those ways that foul up our environment and pollute our air and water and cause health concerns to the people of this great Nation—those types of jobs, fortunately, yield to a brighter day of new renewable and clean forms of energy. That's a growth industry that, if this legislature could only see the brightness of the future, I think we would have a whole lot more jobs created as the jobs of the past recede into history.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Chairman, we see 25 million people struggling in this country as a result of that same attitude that the Democrat Party and the President has about having jobs go off into the past and looking to the future.

Mr. Chairman, at this time I yield 1¼ minutes to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. RODNEY DAVIS).

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. I would like to thank my colleague from Texas.

Mr. Chairman, I'm a proud cosponsor of this amendment. This is a commonsense amendment that brings to mind the irony that, yesterday, the President of the United States came to the Capitol to brief certain Members of Congress on the other side of the aisle about another phony jobs plan that he's putting forth at the same time his signature legislation, ObamaCare, is killing jobs in America.

This amendment would make sure that we measured how many jobs his phony jobs plan is going to create versus how many jobs ObamaCare is going to kill in this country. It is essential.

And forgive me, Mr. Chairman, for not having compassion for the bureaucrats who are going to be burdened by analyzing this information, when we have millions of Americans—hardworking taxpayers of this country—worried about keeping their own jobs and getting a new job.

Mr. Chairman, I support this amendment wholeheartedly.

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, ObamaCare is resulting in 30 to 40 million people having access to the health care system, and that's not going to create any jobs? When you're bringing that many people into the health care system, that's going to kill jobs? How many more doctors will be needed? Maybe 20,000 will be needed to accommodate and treat those people. How many nurses and medical care practitioners will we need to train in order to accommodate the growth in the health industry that ObamaCare brings about?

We have to use our common sense. ObamaCare is not going to result in job loss.

Mr. COHEN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. COHEN. I find it interesting that today we're talking about the country is in such danger because of ObamaCare and regulations and rules and all these other things President Obama has done, and the Dow Jones Industrial average almost hit an all-time high of 15,600 and change.

So somewhere something must be working. Thank you, President Obama. Keep going.

The Acting CHAIR. The time of the gentleman is expired.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1¼ minutes to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. WENSTRUP).

Mr. WENSTRUP. I thank the gentleman from Texas for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, as a cosponsor, I rise in support of this important amendment to protect and promote job creation in both southern Ohio, where I'm from, and for this entire country.

Business owners and entrepreneurs currently live and work under an executive branch hostile to the free enterprise system and a President whose governing philosophy has been: You didn't build that.

Agencies like the EPA, Health and Human Services, and the Department of Education hand down new regulations with little regard for the real-world impacts. These bureaucrats do not care if jobs are lost, as long as their rules are enforced.

This amendment requires an analysis of how many jobs would be added or lost due to new regulations brought forth under this or any future administrations. This amendment also requires the distinction as to whether the jobs affected are government or private sector jobs.

This amendment further protects real-world businesses from bureaucrats who are often punitive rather than constructive and are often far removed from everyday economic realities.

I stand in support of this amendment.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Chairman, tonight, we've had three new first-term Members of Congress who have come on the floor to talk about things that are important to them, and it's a balance. It's making a difference so that people back home have confidence in the rules and regulations that are promulgated by the Federal Government and that Congress knows how we can react and act upon those.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. SESSIONS).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 6 OFFERED BY MR. NADLER

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 6 printed in part B of House Report 113–187.

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 20, line 10, insert after ''means any rule'' the following: ''(other than a special rule)''.

Page 21, line 2, insert before the period at the end the following: '', and includes any special rule''.

Page 22, after line 8, insert the following:

''(6) The term 'special rule' means any rule pertaining to nuclear reactor safety standards.''.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 322, the gentleman from New York (Mr. NADLER) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York.

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

Mr. Chairman, this amendment would exempt the Nuclear Regulatory Commission from the bill so that the NRC can continue to protect Americans from nuclear disasters under current law, rather than the bill's proposed system.

Today's bill, H.R. 367, in the name of so-called reform, adds over 60 new procedural and analytical hoops agencies and departments must go through before a regulation can be issued. The result is simply to impede, obstruct, and delay the attempt of government to accomplish one of it's most basic functions: protecting the health and welfare of its citizens.

Not surprisingly, groups who care about protecting public health, safety, and the environment, such as the Natural Resources Defense Counsel, Public Citizens, Defenders of Wildlife, and U.S. Public Interest Research Group, oppose this bill. According, to the Coalition for Sensible Safeguards, which represents a coalition of many such groups, this bill ''will grind to a halt the rulemaking process'' and ''is nothing less than an attempt to roll back our critical public safeguards and promote industry interests instead of protecting American citizens.''

□ 2000

Americans should rightfully be scared that this bill will put their health and safety at risk. One example that highlights this fact is the subject of this amendment—nuclear power.

The risks and dangers of nuclear power were made all the more real by the nuclear disaster in Japan at Fukushima 2 years ago. We all watched in horror when that country was devastated by the earthquake and resulting tsunami. That disaster then caused its own disaster—the meltdown of three reactors at the Fukushima nuclear power plant. That led to the release of radioactive isotopes, the creation of a 20-kilometer exclusion zone around the power plant, and displacement of 156,000 people. Inside the evacuation zone all farming has been abandoned.

In 2011, Virginia itself was struck by a relatively rare but strong earthquake felt up and down the eastern seaboard. It caused a nuclear power plant near the epicenter to have to go offline. For me, this concern hits close to home. A nuclear power plant, Indian Point, about which many people, myself included, have had concerns for years, lies just less than 40 miles away from my New York City district on an earthquake fault. There are 20 million people living within a 50-mile radius around the plant, the same radius used by the NRC as the basis for the evacuation zone recommended after the Fukushima disaster. Indian Point also sits near two fault lines and, according to the NRC, is the most likely nuclear power plant in the country to experience core damage due to an earthquake.

To keep my constituents, and indeed all Americans, safe, I am offering this amendment today. Because of the catastrophes that can result in disasters—be they natural or manmade—at nuclear power plants, prevention of meltdowns is the key. Since Fukushima, the NRC has issued new rules designed to upgrade plants to withstand severe events like earthquakes and to have enough backup power so as to avoid a meltdown for a significant period of time.

The NRC must have the ability and flexibility to issue new regulations to safeguard the health and well-being of all Americans and to prevent nuclear disasters. However, this bill is intentionally designed so new and vital regulations will likely never be put into place. We cannot permit the Nuclear Regulatory Commission to never be able to create new regulations ever again should the need arise.

Therefore, I urge my colleagues to support this amendment to exempt the Nuclear Regulatory Commission from the onerous new requirements for rulemaking imposed by this bill. In that way, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission would continue to have the ability to safeguard public health and safety, as it should.

We should not risk the lives of millions and millions of people. If a danger becomes evident and the experts in charge of protecting against that—the Nuclear Regulatory Commission—deem some new protection necessary, this bill would prevent those protections from going into effect. So my amendment would exempt the Nuclear Regulatory Commission with respect to safety regulations for nuclear power plants.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Chairman, I rise to claim the time in opposition to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Virginia is recognized for 5 minutes.

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

Mr. Chairman, the amendment carves out of the REINS Act Congressional Approval Procedures all regulations that pertain to nuclear reactor safety standards. REINS Act supporters believe in nuclear safety. We want to guarantee that regulatory decisions that pertain to nuclear reactor safety are the best decisions that can be made. That is precisely why I oppose the amendment.

By its terms, the amendment shields from the REINS Act Congressional Approval Procedures not only major regulations that would raise nuclear reactor safety standards, but also regulations that would lower them. All major regulations pertaining to nuclear reactor safety standards, whether they raise or lower standards, should fall within the REINS Act. That way, agencies with authority over nuclear reactor safety will know that Congress must approve their major regulations

before they go into effect. That provides a powerful incentive for the agencies to write the best possible regulations, ones that Congress can easily approve. It is a solution that everyone should support because it makes Congress more accountable and assures agencies will write better rules. All Americans will be safer for it.

I urge my colleagues to oppose the amendment, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Chairman, may I inquire as to how much time I have remaining?

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from New York has 1 minute remaining.

Mr. NADLER. I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Chairman, under current law, Congress can disapprove any proposed rule and regulation under the Congressional Review Act. Under this bill, no regulation could go into effect until Congress affirmatively approved the regulation. If the Nuclear Regulatory Commission were to approve some rule that reduces nuclear safety, Congress, under current law, could block that rule.

What this bill says, and what my amendment seeks to exempt the NRC from, is that no safety regulation can go into effect until Congress gets around to approving it. The Republican leadership took the appropriations bill for the Transportation and Housing and Urban Development Departments off the floor yesterday allegedly because they have no time to consider it. We've passed all of 12 bills this year for the President's signature, and we would have hundreds or thousands of regulations by all the different agencies that we would have to consider. Most would never be approved simply because we would not have time to consider them.

All this amendment says is, for regulations regarding nuclear disasters, to prevent nuclear disasters, let Congress veto them if necessary, but not kill them by not having the time to get to them.

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

Mr. GOODLATTE. I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Chairman, the fact of the matter is that, when it comes to regulatory safety, the gentleman cites the Congressional Review Act. I'll remind the House that, as I noted earlier, since 1996, it's been used one time for ergonomic furniture. That is not a very good track record when tens of thousands of regulations have been passed during that time that should be reviewed by this Congress. This legislation only asks that those regulations that cost more than $100 million should be reviewed. But it's especially true of the most important regulations related to, for example, the nuclear power industry where safety is a very important standard, as is efficiency and making sure that the American people have the electric power generation that they need. So the Congress has great incentive to reach quick agreement on regulations like that, and it's very important that we have that jurisdiction.

But many regulations are not needed; they cost jobs in our economy. I know those on the other side of the aisle have been citing academics who claim that that's not the case. But I want to call attention to one more academic who wrote just on January 18, 2011. He said:

> Sometimes, those rules have gotten out of balance, placing unreasonable burdens on business—burdens that have stifled innovation and have had a chilling effect on growth and jobs.

That academic's name is Barack Obama, and he is currently the President of the United States.

I urge my colleagues to oppose the amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York (Mr. NADLER).

The question was taken; and the Acting Chair announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York will be postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 7 OFFERED BY MR. JOHNSON OF GEORGIA

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 7 printed in part B of House Report 113–187.

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

> Page 20, line 10, insert after ''means any rule'' the following: ''(other than a special rule)''.
>
> Page 21, line 2, insert before the period at the end the following: '', and includes any special rule''.
>
> Page 22, after line 8, insert the following:
>
> ''(6) The term 'special rule' means any rule that the Administrator of the Office of Information and Regulatory Affairs of the Office of Management and Budget determines would result in net job growth.''.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 322, the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. JOHNSON) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of my amendment, which is very simple: it would exclude from this bill any rule that would result in net job growth.

I ask that my colleagues support this commonsense amendment to promote job growth and help to strengthen the middle class. After all, the stated purpose of the REINS Act is to grow the economy and create jobs, isn't that correct?

Although this bill purports to grow the economy and create jobs, nothing could be further from the truth. This bill's myopic focus on gumming up the regulatory process will not create a single job. It will, however, result in the loss of much-needed rules that protect the health, safety, and well-being of the men, women, and children of America.

I have profound concerns about the REINS Act. What would be its impact on air and water quality? This bill would undermine the ability of agencies to protect the public interest. It is a continuation of the majority's anti-middle class, pro-big business, anti-regulatory approach to governing.

The majority continues to rely on debunked partisan studies. Thee studies presuppose that regulations have harmful effects on job growth. Far from it. There is ample bipartisan evidence in support of the opposite conclusion.

Regulations ensure that the water we consume, the air that we breathe, the places where we work and where our kids go to school are safe. Regulations ensure fairness in the workplace and in the marketplace. Regulations are necessary to protect the have-nots from the haves; whereas the REINS Act protects the haves from the have-nots.

Nevertheless, the House Republican leadership continues like an out-of-control freight train to drive its reckless deregulatory agenda through Congress. This deregulatory train wreck threatens to send us back in time to the early 1900s, when there was no minimum wage, no workplace protections, and no limits on Wall Street.

If Republican leadership truly believed in growing the economy and creating jobs we would have come together with a grand bargain a long time ago. We could have agreed to a mix of spending cuts and tax reforms to address the government's long-term debt. We could have prevented the mindless austerity of sequestration which threatens our still-fragile economic recovery. Instead, this Tea Party Congress could not even muster the will to vote to fund the transportation bill yesterday. This is yet another example of a ''do-nothing'' Congress under the leadership of an anti-middle class Republican leadership.

Americans have a right to expect that their elected legislators will enact laws that help create jobs, like doing something about sequestration. My colleague, Mr. HAL ROGERS, chairman of the Appropriations Committee, hit the nail on the head yesterday when he said, and I quote:

''Sequestration—and its unrealistic and ill-conceived discretionary cuts—must be brought to an end.''

American workers continue to face hurdles to providing for their families, and I'm gravely concerned about the effects of sequestration on my home State of Georgia. Last month, furloughs began for most civilian Defense Department employees at Robins Air

Force Base and other military bases across Georgia. This won't just affect the hardworking people at the base, like firefighters; it will also have a substantial impact on the local economies.

As retired General Robert McMahon reports, the furloughs which began last week will take $50 million out of the economy around the Robins Air Force Base alone. Multiply that with the economic catastrophe across other military bases in Georgia and throughout the country, and you begin to understand the truly caustic effects of sequestration on small businesses and on the economy. But instead of working together to come to a bipartisan solution to the sequestration fiasco, this Congress is continuing an agenda to make life worse for American families.

I urge all of my colleagues to support this commonsense amendment to promote job creation, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Chairman, I rise to claim the time in opposition to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Virginia is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Chairman, the amendment carves out of the REINS Act Congressional Approval Procedures regulations that the Office of Management and Budget determined will lead to net job creation.

The danger in the amendment is the strong incentive it gives OMB to manipulate its analysis of a major regulations job impact. Far too often, OMB may be tempted to shave the analysis to skirt the bill's congressional approval requirement. In addition, regulations alleged to create new jobs often do so by destroying real existing jobs and creating new hoped-for jobs associated with regulatory compliance.

For example, some Environmental Protection Agency Clean Air Act rules will shut down existing power plants. EPA and OMB may attempt to justify that with claims that more new green jobs will be created as a result. In the end, that is just another way in which government picks the jobs winners and the jobs losers. And there's no guarantee that all of the new green jobs will ever actually exist. And I would cite Solyndra as perhaps the best evidence of promised jobs that don't exist and cost the taxpayers half a billion dollars.

The REINS Act is not intended to force any particular outcome. It does not choose between clean air and dirty air. It does not choose between new jobs and old jobs. Instead, the REINS Act chooses between two ways of making laws. It chooses the way the Framers intended, in which accountability for laws with major economic impacts rests with Congress. It rejects the way Washington has operated for far too long, where there is no accountability because decisions are made by unelected agency officials.

□ 2015

The amendment would undermine that fundamental choice. Let me give you a few examples of this:

Regulatory agencies routinely estimate the benefits and costs of regulatory changes under the assumption that any individuals that become unemployed are instantly and constantly reemployed in nearly identical jobs. But the EPA's employment impact analysis is frequently flawed because it fails to account for the cascading employment effects of regulation across interconnected industries and markets.

Using the proper full economy model, NERA Economic Consulting found that the EPA's Utility MACT Rule would have a negative impact equivalent to 180,000 to 215,000 lost jobs in 2015, versus the EPA's claim of 8,000 net new jobs, and which, therefore, wouldn't come to the Congress, even though private consultants say it would lose over 200,000 jobs. EPA claims it would create 8,000 jobs.

The EPA's Cross-State Air Pollution Rule would have had an economic impact equivalent to the annual—annual—loss of 34,300 jobs from 2013 through 2037 versus the EPA's claimed 700 jobs gained annually.

Finally, the EPA's industrial Boiler Maximum Achievable Control Technology—or MACT—Rule would have a negative impact equivalent to 27,585 jobs per year on average from 2013 through 2037, compared with the EPA's claim of 2,200 per year claim.

All of this goes to show that this would be a shell game allowing the executive branch to claim job increases when actually there are massive job losses and, therefore, avoid the scrutiny of the people's House and the entire United States Congress where these massive regulations should come back for review and approval before they're implemented, and before they cost those kind of jobs to Americans.

I urge my colleagues to oppose the amendment, and yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. JOHNSON).

The question was taken; and the Acting Chair announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Georgia will be postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 8 OFFERED BY MS. JACKSON LEE

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 8 printed in part B of House Report 113–187.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Chairman, I have a parliamentary inquiry.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentlewoman will state her parliamentary inquiry.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Who has the right to close?

The Acting CHAIR. The right to close will not be established until the time in opposition is claimed.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Is it the proponent or the author of the amendment?

The Acting CHAIR. Under clause 3(c) of rule XVII, a manager in opposition would have the right to close.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Thank you.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 20, line 10, insert after ''means any rule'' the following: ''(other than a special rule)''.

Page 21, line 2, insert before the period at the end the following: '', and includes any special rule''.

Page 22, after line 8, insert the following:

''(6) The term 'special rule' means any rule that is promulgated by the Department of Homeland Security.''.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 322, the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Texas.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Chairman, let me thank my colleagues. Whenever they engage in debate, I know they have a serious commitment to the process of this House and this Nation.

But I rise today to offer an amendment, and I hope that it addresses the chairman's offer of legislative collegiality. If this is such an important effort, then I believe that the amendments that have been offered by my colleagues, and the one that I introduce as we speak, are ones that makes this bill reasonable.

My amendment would except from the bill's congressional approval requirement any rule promulgated by the Department of Homeland Security organized and established in the backdrop of the heinous and tragic terrorist act of 9/11. In fact, I can't imagine this legislation being effective in the midst of tragedy and devastation.

I don't think my friend understands that there's nothing in the REINS Act that prevents a filibuster. A filibuster means that we will never get a resolution voted on by the two Houses—never—because it does not negate a filibuster.

So in the midst of a crisis, where people are in need of relief by the Department of Homeland Security, such as the Department of Homeland Security having to act quickly to establish new or emergency regulations in the protection of critical infrastructure, here it comes, the dastardly REINS Act. I think we would be better off right now to be debating H.R. 900 to eliminate the sequestration to bring jobs back to America.

But I hope that this amendment will be considered, because I can't imagine the very Department that was established to put its foot in the gap now is going to be hindered by the REINS Act.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Chairman, I rise to claim time in opposition to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Virginia is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Chairman, I would say to the gentlewoman from Texas that the bill prohibits a filibuster in the Senate from being used to block consideration of regulations that come before the Congress.

We are making every effort to have that bipartisan collegiality that she suggests, but I don't think this amendment accomplishes that. The amendment seeks to shield the Department of Homeland Security from Congress' authority to approve regulations under the REINS Act. That shield should be denied.

For example, take the Department's rule to extend compliance deadlines for States to issue secure driver's licenses under the REAL ID Act. More than a decade after 9/11 hijackers used fraudulent licenses to board airplanes used to murder 3,000 innocent Americans, DHS continues to keep this extension in place.

This is the kind of decisionmaking that takes place at the Department of Homeland Security. Congress should use every tool it can to reassert its authority over the legislative rulemaking functions it has delegated to DHS, and the REINS Act is available to do that.

I would urge my colleagues to oppose the amendment and to support the underlying bill.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Chairman, how much time do I have remaining?

The Acting CHAIR. The gentlewoman from Texas has 3 minutes remaining.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Thank you.

To the contrary, to my good friend from Virginia, the bill does not entirely prohibit a filibuster. In fact, a filibuster can be used on the procedural motion to bring the bill up, and in the Senate they can never bring this up.

So let me remind my friends:

Galveston, 6,000 people dead and climbing, 1900; Hurricane Katrina, one of the 10 worst, killing 1,836 in 2005; 1980, a heat wave in the southern and central States killing 1,700; Chicago heat wave in 1995.

Disasters that need the relief that the American people deserve.

This tells us what we will be facing while a filibuster is going on in the Senate. This is a map only of this year. Already disasters in Washington State with mud slides, Oklahoma with tornados, Arizona with wildfires, Miami with mud slides.

Then they want to block Homeland Security from developing regulations for infrastructure, they want to stop what is going on with Hurricane Sandy and the repair that is needed and the infrastructure with something called the REINS Act, which, as I said earlier, goes around and around and around.

I hope my colleagues will support this amendment, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I just want to point out to the House that the assertion that this does not prevent a filibuster in the Senate is incorrect. If Members would examine pages 12 through 14 of the bill, they will see multiple ways in which procedural motions and substantive motions in the Senate are barred from undertaking a filibuster, and they must proceed through those points of order and other objections that might be raised to a final vote on this regulation under the REINS Act.

This is a good thing because it will allow for expeditious consideration by the Congress of regulations. Whether they are needed or not needed, they ought to be considered by the Congress, especially if they cost more than $100 million to the American economy.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Chairman, I am glad the gentleman pointed us out to pages 12 to 14, because he indicated a number of procedural hula hoops that we have to jump through. Each of those procedural hula hoops will be subject to a filibuster.

But this is what the American people go through: Here is a tornado or an earthquake, here is Hurricane Sandy. There are a variety of issues that it results in. Here is a wildfire.

I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. COHEN. Thank you. I appreciate you bringing this amendment. There are a whole lot of opportunities for the people of west Tennessee to benefit from it.

We are an area that has been known to have tornados; we have the potential for an earthquake from Reelfoot Lake. FEMA comes under this, and to stop FEMA from having proper regulations that could protect the public would be a serious mistake. It is important that we safeguard our citizens, particularly when they are victims of natural tragedies.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Let me thank the gentleman.

I would like to ask my colleagues to be sensible and realize that you cannot control the other body.

This amendment is a sensible amendment that responds to the outcry of wildfires, tornados, hurricanes, earthquakes. The American people are looking for the Department of Homeland Security to be able to focus on the infrastructure repair, the regulatory scheme and structure to respond to an emergency.

This bill does not deal with emergencies. It deals with an elongated process that, unfortunately, will drown, if you will, the people with a regulatory structure that does not provide them with the relief that first responders need or the people need.

I ask my colleagues of this House to be sensible and vote for the Jackson Lee amendment.

My amendment would exempt from the bill's Congressional approval requirement any rule promulgated by the Department of Homeland Security. As a Senior Member of the Homeland Security and Ranking Member of the Border and Maritime Security Subcommittee, I am very concerned about any legislation that would hinder the Department of Homeland Security's ability to respond to an emergency.

The bill would add new review requirements to an already long and complicated process, allowing special interest lobbyists to second-guess the work of respected scientists and staff through legal challenges, sparking a wave of litigation that would add more costs and delays to the rulemaking process, potentially putting the lives, health and safety of millions of Americans at risk.

The Department of Homeland Security simply does not have the time to be hindered by frivolous and unnecessary litigation, especially when the safety and security of the American people are at risk.

According to a study conducted by the Economic Policy Institute, public protections and regulations "do not tend to significantly impede job creation", and furthermore, over the course of the last several decades, the benefits of federal regulations have significantly outweighed their costs.

There is no need for this legislation, aside from the need of some of my colleagues to protect corporate interests. This bill would make it more difficult for the government to protect its citizens, and in the case of the Department of Homeland Security, it endangers the lives of our citizens.

In our post 9/11 climate, homeland security continues to be a top priority for our nation. As we continue to face threats from enemies foreign and domestic, we must ensure that we are doing all we can to protect our country. DHS cannot react to the constantly changing threat landscape effectively if they are subject to this bill.

Since the creation of the Department of Homeland Security in 2002, we have overhauled the government in ways never done before. Steps have been taken to ensure that the communication failures that led to 9/11 do not happen again. The Department of Homeland Security has helped push the United States forward in how protect our nation. Continuing to make advance in Homeland security and intelligence is the best way to combat the threats we still face.

The Department of Homeland Security is tasked with a wide variety of duties under its mission. One example of an instance where DHS may have to act quickly to establish new or emergency regulations is the protection of our cyber security.

In the past few years, threats in cyberspace have risen dramatically. The policy of the United States is to protect against the debilitating disruption of the operation of information systems for critical infrastructures and, thereby, help to protect the people, economy, and national security of the United States.

We are all affected by threats to our cyber security. We must act to reduce our vulnerabilities to these threats before they can be exploited. A failure to protect our cyber systems would damage our Nation's critical infrastructure. So, we must continue to ensure that such disruptions of cyberspace are infrequent, of minimal duration, manageable, and cause the least possible damage.

Like other national security challenges in the post 9/11 era, the cyber threat is multifaceted

and without boundaries. Some cyber attackers are foreign nations' that utilize their military or intelligence-gathering operations, whereas others are either operating alone or are connected to terrorist groups. In addition, there are cyber threats that are international or domestic criminal enterprises.

According to the Government Accountability Office (GAO), the number of cyber incidents reported by Federal agencies to USCERT has increased dramatically over the past four years, from 5,503 cyber incidents reported in FY 2006 to about 30,000 cyber incidents in FY 2009 (over a 400 percent increase).

The four most prevalent types of cyber incidents and events reported to US–CERT during FY 2009 were malicious code; improper usage; unauthorized access and incidents warranting further investigations (unconfirmed malicious or anomalous activity).

Critical infrastructure in the nation is composed of public and private institutions in the sectors of agriculture, food, water, public health, emergency services, government, defense industrial base, information and telecommunications, energy, transportation, banking and finance, chemicals and hazardous materials, and postal and shipping.

With cyberspace as their central nervous system—it is the control system of our country. Cyberspace is composed of hundreds of thousands of interconnected computers, servers, routers, switches, and fiber optic cables that allow our critical infrastructures to work. Thus, the healthy, secure, and efficient functioning of cyberspace is essential to both our economy and our national security.

In light of an attack that threatens the United State's cyber protection, Homeland Security officials may need to issue emergency regulations quickly. Attacks can be sent instantly in cyber space, and the protection of our critical infrastructure cannot be mitigated by cumbersome bureaucracy.

The Department of Homeland Security is also tasked with combating terrorism, and protecting Americans from threats. With the current unrest in the Middle East, why would we want to limit DHS's ability to do its job?

The Department of Homeland Security is constantly responding to new intelligence and threats from the volatile Middle East and around the globe. We must not tie the hands of those trusted to protect us from these threats.

Hindering the ability of DHS to make changes to rules and regulations puts the entire country at risk. As the Representative for the 18th District of Texas, I know about vulnerabilities in security firsthand. Of the 350 major ports in America, the Port of Houston is the one of the busiest.

More than 220 million tons of cargo moved through the Port of Houston in 2011, and the port ranked first in foreign waterborne tonnage for the 15th consecutive year. The port links Houston with over 1,000 ports in 203 countries, and provides 785,000 jobs throughout the state of Texas. Maritime ports are centers of trade, commerce, and travel along our nation's coastline, protected by the Coast Guard, under the direction of DHS.

If Coast Guard intelligence has evidence of a potential attack on the port of Houston, I want the Department of Homeland Security to be able to protect my constituents, by issuing the regulations needed without being subject to the constraints of this bill.

The Department of Homeland Security deserves an exemption not only because they may need to quickly change regulations in response to new information or threats, but also because they are tasked with emergency preparedness and response.

There are many challenges our communities face when we are confronted with a catastrophic event or a domestic terrorist attack. It is important for people to understand that our capacity to deal with hurricanes directly reflects our ability to respond to a terrorist attack in Texas or New York, an earthquake in California, or a nationwide pandemic flu outbreak.

On any given day the City of Houston and cities across the United States face a widespread and ever-changing array of threats, such as: terrorism, organized crime, natural disasters and industrial accidents.

Cities and towns across the nation face these and other threats. Indeed, every day, ensuring the security of the homeland requires the interaction of multiple Federal departments and agencies, as well as operational collaboration across Federal, State, local, tribal, and territorial governments, nongovernmental organizations, and the private sector. We can hinder the Department of Homeland Security's ability to protect the safety and security of the American people.

I urge my colleagues to support the Jackson Lee amendment in order to ensure that life saving regulations promulgated by the Department of Homeland Security are not unnecessarily delayed by this legislation.

The Acting CHAIR. The time of the gentlewoman has expired.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself the balance of my time, and would just say in opposition to this amendment again, Members only need to look to the bill itself to see that the process in the Senate will not tolerate filibusters at any point in the process from start to finish.

Let me also point out that the American people care very much about how disasters are handled, and so do elected representatives of the American people. But we are talking about regulations written by the agency that cost more than $100 million.

Those regulations, if they are written wrong—and many people would suggest that the Department of Homeland Security has gotten it wrong many times with regulations from the TSA, for example—those regulations should come back to this Congress for review. The American people have the first and foremost place to look for leadership on these issues in the Congress of the United States, the people's House, and the United States Senate, and not to government regulatory agencies.

Yes, they need to write regulations, but they shouldn't have the final say, particularly on the most expensive regulations affecting our economy.

Money that is diverted—money that is diverted—to pay for unnecessary regulations is money that can't be spent to address other problems that we have in this country or to pay down our national debt. That's what is important, and that's why this amendment should be defeated.

We need to have common sense brought to our regulatory process. The REINS Act does it. The REINS Act reins in unnecessary burdensome regulations, it helps protect American jobs, and it ought to be protected, and that includes protected from unnecessary or burdensome regulations in the Department of Homeland Security.

I urge my colleagues to oppose the amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE).

The question was taken; and the Acting Chair announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Texas will be postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 9 OFFERED BY MR. MCKINLEY

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 9 printed in part B of House Report 113–187.

Mr. MCKINLEY. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 20, line 16, strike ''$100,000,000'' and insert ''$50,000,000''.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 322, the gentleman from West Virginia (Mr. MCKINLEY) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from West Virginia.

Mr. MCKINLEY. Mr. Chairman, this bill currently requires that all regulations that cost $100 million or more must first be approved by Congress.

□ 2030

Therefore, I rise today to offer an amendment to reduce that threshold from $100 million to $50 million. This would ensure greater transparency and more accountability in the process. Let's put this in perspective, Mr. Chairman.

For the past 2 years, according to the regulators, of all of the regulations individually that have exceeded $100 million, only 2 percent have been reviewed. That means 98 percent of all of the regulations that we have faced in America have not had the involvement of Congress. I mean, who would be satisfied if only 2 percent of our food that we eat has been inspected? Who would be satisfied if only 2 percent of the planes that we fly in are inspected—or of our homes? businesses? The Obama administration and its overly aggressive bureaucrats are playing with people's lives.

Last weekend, I was at a Serbian picnic in northern West Virginia, and I was approached by two adult males who were very concerned. Mr. Chairman, their eyes welled up with fear and concern because of all of these regulations that are being imposed on them.

They fear whether they're going to have jobs because of all of these regulations which no one is overseeing. These men love to work and they want to work, but they feel these new regulations threaten their American Dream and are taking away the possibility for them to raise their families. Each of us knows men like them. They live in our neighborhoods. Whenever we go home, we see these people. They want to work, but they're afraid of someone moving the goalpost with a new regulation that's not checked by Congress.

Every year, these regulations cost hundreds of billions of dollars annually, and 98 percent of them are implemented without congressional oversight. According to the Small Business Administration, the cumulative burden of regulations exceeds more than $1 trillion annually out of our economy. Let me say this again: nearly 98 percent of all new regulations have no economic analysis or oversight by the American public. According to the GAO, Federal regulators last year, Mr. Chairman, issued 2,500 new regulations—just in 1 year alone.

Doesn't this administration understand that excessive, unchecked regulations harm working families?

Just because the administration can issue a regulation doesn't mean that it should. By reducing the threshold from $100 million to $50 million, we provide Congress an opportunity to rein in these out-of-control agencies and allow more of our people to continue working and supporting their families.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to my good friend, the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. GOODLATTE).

Mr. GOODLATTE. I want to thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I support the amendment. I share in my colleague's desire to bring more congressional scrutiny to regulations with high economic impacts, and I know that recent major regulations have hit West Virginia and the gentleman's constituents particularly hard.

The Environmental Protection Agency's regulations that affect energy sources and power production are among the most troubling. The $100 million threshold for major regulations in the bill is consistent with definitions that have been used by Presidential administrations of both parties since at least the 1990s. However, regulations with a $50 million impact in today's economy will hit America's job creators and families too hard. This is particularly true of small businesses and the families that depend on them on Main Streets throughout the Nation. As a result, the amendment would make sure that Congress is accountable for regulatory decisions of this magnitude, which impose harm on an economy that can ill afford it.

Therefore, I support the gentleman's amendment, and I urge my colleagues to join me in doing so.

Mr. COHEN. I rise in opposition to this amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Tennessee is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. COHEN. Mr. Chairman, the amendment is twice as bad as the bill because it decreases by $50 million the threshold, which means more and more regulations would have to go through this cumbersome process and really stifle regulations and rules, and that's what this is about.

The Speaker said that the job of this Congress is not to pass legislation but to repeal legislation. That's what these bills are about. They're not to improve the lives of Americans by having more safety and more protection but, rather, to defeat proposals that may come from the EPA, which are to protect the air and the water and our Earth, as well as to protect other areas of safety, whether it's automobiles or airplanes or trains or trucks or whatever.

The fact is that this would make it almost impossible to pass a rule or a regulation, and it would allow one House the ability to kill a regulation. This is a House that doesn't have the expertise within it, which has been said by some of the Members in their saying they didn't know how big to build a dam or whatever. That's why we have government people who study and do research and promulgate rules and regulations—to protect us—and it's done in a nonpolitical environment. If you bring it to this environment, you're going to have lobbyists coming up, trying to kill things that affect their industries.

This is a yo-yo bill: you are on your own. That's what they're saying basically, that we don't want protections for consumers or protections for citizens. We want to have something laissez-faire: no rules and regulations. You're out there on your own.

I yield such time as she may consume to the gentlelady from Houston, Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE).

Ms. JACKSON LEE. I thank the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. Chairman, I beg to differ with my good friend who has offered this amendment, which is even more extreme.

I proceeded to read the sections that my good chairman referred me to on how expeditious this process would be in the United States Senate. It's unworkable. How does anyone think that the Senate is going to pass this bill? They've never passed it because what it says is that you're going to kick the resolution out of committee, that you're going to discharge it, and then you're going to move it beyond all of their rules. You're literally abolishing the Senate's rules that they have not redone themselves. They never got an agreement on ending a filibuster, so I have no idea as to issues of security and safety as it relates to homeland security or of the issues dealing with fuel and greenhouse gases, which have decidedly impacted positively the American people as it relates to emissions.

Now we're going from $100 million to $50 million, which, I hate to say, in a country of this size means that we are going to multiply the number of resolutions on this body that has really been slow in the passing of any legislation. Then we are going to move to the Senate, and we are going to tell the Senate committees, If you don't act in 15 days, we're discharging this. Then we will expect the Senate to pass this bill, which is the only way that it's going to get to the President's desk.

I might also say to my good friend from Tennessee, over and over again, we keep talking about what President Obama's administration has done. If this is about President Obama, that's one thing. If this is about creating jobs, the President has offered the American Jobs Act, and we have introduced a bill that has been calculated to have helped create jobs and stop the bleeding of the economy.

I am glad my good friend talked about the success of the Dow. That translates into jobs if we get rid of the sequester. There is a bill that will get rid of it, H.R. 900, offered by Mr. CONYERS, which many of us have cosponsored. Where is the debate on the floor of the House of that?

I would simply say that we are now going from the extreme to the very extreme, and you're going to see a pounding of regulations. Moms and dads and children—families—municipalities, places need clean air, clean water. They need better emissions to the extent that it helps with clean air. They need safety. They need security. Now we are going to pile it up with those that may cost $50 million.

How absurd is that in terms of the legislative schedule of this place and the legislative schedule of the United States Senate? Now, I'm not saying anyone is going to shuck off any work—we welcome that—but you have the regular order of legislation. Then every time an amendment comes up—now $50 million—then you're going to say that this must kick in.

I ask my colleagues to reject this amendment because it simply will not work.

Mr. COHEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from West Virginia (Mr. MCKINLEY).

The amendment was agreed to.

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 10 printed in part B of House Report 113–187.

AMENDMENT NO. 11 OFFERED BY MR. WEBSTER OF FLORIDA

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 11 printed in part B of House Report 113–187.

Mr. WEBSTER of Florida. Mr. Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 21, beginning on line 4, strike ''except that such term does not include—'' and all that follows through line 18, and insert the

following: ''except that such term does not include any rule of particular applicability, including a rule that approves or prescribes for the future rates, wages, prices, services, or allowances therefore, corporate or financial structures, reorganizations, mergers, or acquisitions thereof, or accounting practices or disclosures bearing on any of the foregoing.''

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 322, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. WEBSTER) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. WEBSTER of Florida. Mr. Chair, this amendment is straightforward. It closes a regulatory loophole that allows Federal agencies to make major policy changes without appropriate congressional review.

As currently written, the REINS Act covers agency rules developed through the formal notice and comment rulemaking process, but that's not enough. By removing two exceptions from the definition of ''rule,'' we ensure that agency actions that serve a regulatory purpose are subject to the $100 million threshold.

The current administration circumvents congressional oversight and public input by issuing general statements of policy known as ''guidance documents'' in order to achieve its intrusive regulatory agenda. This tactic shields major and costly policy changes from any congressional oversight laws put in place to protect citizens. Let me give you two examples.

The EPA used a guidance document to remove the word ''navigable'' from the definition of ''waters of the United States.'' This would expand its jurisdiction to potentially regulate traditional State waters and roadside ditches that hold water after rainfall. The EPA estimates that this guidance document could cost Americans $171 million annually. Last month, we all know the administration used a guidance document to delay the health care law's employer coverage mandate. The CBO estimates this guidance document will cost $12 billion.

Both of these guidance documents make substantive changes to policy without congressional review. Under the REINS Act as currently drafted, these costly guidance documents would escape the disapproval process even though they breach the $100 million threshold established by REINS.

Good policy does not have to be hidden within the cloak of bureaucratic power grabbing. My amendment seeks to shine light into the dark corner of regulatory infrastructure that is abused by those with an agenda that must be hidden from view. It simply allows elected Representatives the opportunity to review policy changes issued through internal guidance that exceed the $100 million threshold. Hardworking taxpayers are owed a choice and a voice through their elected Representatives in all major policy changes that impact their jobs and their pocketbooks. This amendment secures this fundamental measure of government, accountability, and respect for taxpayers.

By requiring a vote of Congress in all substantive agency rules, the REINS Act results in more clearly written legislation; it improves the regulatory process; and it holds government accountable to the American people for the laws imposed upon them.

I urge my colleagues to support the Webster amendment and strengthen the REINS Act by closing this guidance document loophole, which erodes the rule of law.

I reserve the balance of my time.

□ 2045

Mr. COHEN. In what I'm sure is no surprise to the Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Tennessee is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. COHEN. Once again, this just takes it to another level. It's not just the rules, but then the rules of the rules.

Really what this bill is about is a messaging opportunity. We're supposed to be legislating. The reality is that we don't legislate in Congress; we message. One side says, We're for business. We're against regulations. We're against rules. We want to create enterprise by destroying rules and regulations. The other side, which is my side, says, We're for consumers. We're for safety. We're for protection. We're for health and clean water and clear air. We think that the government process works because it saves people; it saves their lives. We go back and forth.

This would effectively destroy the opportunity to have rules and regulations passed at all. It's not going to get through the Senate, so what it is is a messaging opportunity for us to fill up C–SPAN. It's unfortunate because we should be legislating about jobs and about the sequester. We ought to be talking about benefits that the government does provide, but right now sequestration is taking away important jobs in the Defense Department, moneys from the National Institutes of Health, which would protect people's lives in the long run with treatments and cures that we need, and the next generation will benefit greater than us; yet we're here talking about something that is not going to happen.

It is really unfortunate, because we should be legislating, and this bill just gets us into the weeds, gets us down into the regulations. It's like we're going to strangle the ''bureaucrats.'' But the bureaucrats are the experts who come up with the safety provisions that say your children's toys are going to be safe and your car is going to have brakes and work in the proper manner and your airplane is not going to fall out of the sky when it's not near the airport.

Those are important things to the American people, and if you don't have rules and regulations by experts that can be implemented, we're going to have a lot of accidents. That's why this is a very bad bill and a bad amendment and a bad use of the public's time.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. WEBSTER of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the chairman of the Judiciary Committee, Mr. GOODLATTE.

Mr. GOODLATTE. I thank the gentleman from Florida for yielding, and I'm going to support his amendment.

I share my colleagues's desire to curb the abuse of agency guidance documents and other agency directives, statements, and actions that too often have escaped adequate congressional scrutiny.

The amendment brings within the scope of the Congressional Review Act and the REINS Act rules of agency practice, procedure, and management that could be abused but otherwise would escape a congressional check and balance. It is a measured first step in reining in agency excess, and I look forward to working with the gentleman in the future to see if we can identify additional ways to rein in abusive agency practices and guidance.

I urge my colleagues to support this amendment.

Mr. COHEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time so we can get to the next program on C–SPAN quicker.

Mr. WEBSTER of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I just want to remind everyone that we all remember what happened on July 3 when there was an announcement made that all of the sudden we were going to basically reverse our decision on the Affordable Care Act passed by this Congress. I would not have voted for it had I been here. With one stroke of the pen on a guidance document, they were able to thwart the law that we passed.

We talk about this body is for legislating? Yes, it is. When it does, we expect the executive branch to enforce that law, which it didn't; and it didn't because it was able to use that guidance document to change the law. It's not right. Vote for this amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Florida (Mr. WEBSTER).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 12 OFFERED BY MS. MOORE

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 12 printed in part B of House Report 113–187.

Ms. MOORE. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 23, line 19, insert after ''determines.'' the following (and amend the table of sections accordingly):

''§ 808. Exemption for certain rules

''Sections 801 through 807 of this chapter, as amended by the Regulations from the Executive in Need of Scrutiny Act of 2013 shall

not apply in the case of any rule that relates to veterans or veterans affairs. This chapter, as in effect before the enactment of the Regulations from the Executive in Need of Scrutiny Act of 2013, shall continue to apply, after such enactment, to any such rule, as appropriate.''.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 322, the gentlewoman from Wisconsin (Ms. MOORE) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Wisconsin.

Ms. MOORE. Mr. Chairman, I rise today to offer an amendment to H.R. 367, the REINS Act, and I yield myself 3 minutes of my time.

Today's REINS Act would require a joint resolution approval of Congress every time the executive branch promulgates a major rule. My amendment would simply exempt our Nation's veterans from the burdensome layers and hurdles that H.R. 367 will add to the administration's rulemaking process.

I oppose the underlying bill because it will severely restrict agency or department action when many vulnerable veterans need help. It is just simply unacceptable every single time our Nation's veterans are held hostage by the gridlock we experience in Congress. This is yet another moment. This amendment offers an opportunity to exempt them from that.

Mr. Chairman, just a few little facts:

Today's veterans need help more than ever, and they really deserve it. Unfortunately, over 3,000 Active Duty troops have taken their lives since 2011. We have an estimated 22 veteran suicides per day. We've had over 2 million Active Duty soldiers deployed to Iraq and Afghanistan, many of whom are struggling to transition and trying to find employment. While the VA has made some progress in recent months, Mr. Chairman, the backlog of over 500,000 claims—those older than 125 days—is simply unacceptable.

Some veterans have had to wait up to 2 years for an administrative decision on a claim, and we're adding more administrative requirements for them. We're gravely concerned, all of us are here, on a bipartisan basis, about the growing backlog of appeals pending with the VA as resources are shifted. The amount of claims waiting to be heard by the Board of Veterans Affairs is currently over 45,000 and estimated to increase to approximately 102,000 by 2017. The average length of an appeal completed in fiscal year 2012 was 903 days, Mr. Chairman. Adding hurdles now will do nothing but curtail options available to the administration as it works toward solving these serious problems.

I appeal to the common sense and compassion for veterans of my colleagues. My amendment is simple. Veterans deserve to be left out of this political fight.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Chairman, I rise to claim time in opposition to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Virginia is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Chairman, the statistics about the delays in poor performance at the Department of Veterans Affairs with regard to veterans' claims are reasons to oppose the gentlewoman's amendment. The amendment carves out of the REINS act congressional approval procedures all regulations that affect veterans and Veterans Affairs.

We want to guarantee that the regulatory decisions that affect them are the best decisions. That's why major regulations that affect veterans and Veterans Affairs, like all other major regulations, should fall within the REINS Act. Under the legislation, agencies with authority over veterans' issues will know that Congress must approve their major regulations before they go into effect.

That provides a powerful incentive for the agencies to write the best possible regulations, ones that Congress can easily approve. Congress will have every incentive to approve good regulations and every incentive to disapprove regulations that have led to the kind of delays and uncertainty that veterans face today.

That's a solution that everyone should be able to support. Congress will be more accountable, agencies will write better rules, and veterans and all Americans will reap the benefit.

I urge my colleagues to oppose this amendment, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. MOORE. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I'm sure my colleague agrees with me that we should not add hurdles. We've passed 11 bills since September on behalf of veterans, including the following kinds of initiatives: the 9/11 GI Bill, which we all agreed upon; copayments for medication; and resources for radiation poisoning. Had we had this bill in place, each and every one of these initiatives would have required a joint resolution from Congress each time the VA promulgated these rules.

If those sessions of Congress were anything like the majority's calendar for this year, we would not have had a lot of time to have completed work. This year we've only passed 15 bills into law. That's a record low compared to last year. As the Speaker just recently said—I suppose it would apply here—we should not be judged on how many laws we create; we should be judged on how many laws we repeal. Certainly, we would not have been able to do things like the GI Bill or reduce copayments for medications for veterans had we had this bill in place.

The other thing is you would think that my colleagues would have some pride in this institution. All this bill will do is put much more power within the hands of the executive. We can't appoint bureaucrats to conference committees on the budget.

I yield back the balance of my time.

DISABLED AMERICAN VETERANS NATIONAL SERVICE & LEGISLATIVE HEADQUARTERS,

Washington, DC, July 31, 2013.

Hon. GWEN MOORE,
House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE MOORE: On behalf of DAV (Disabled American Veterans), an organization of 1.2 million wartime wounded, injured, and ill veterans, I am writing with respect to your proposed amendment to H.R. 367, the Regulations from the Executive in Need of Scrutiny Act of 2013, or the ''REIN'' Act.

Your proposed amendment, if accepted, would exempt veterans and veterans affairs from the requirements of the bill that all proposed federal rules that convey a cost of $100 million or more, or that are subject to other circumstances described in the bill, be submitted to Congress before promulgation by the Executive Branch. Under the bill, Congress would require itself to mandatorily act to approve or disapprove any such regulation through fixed rules of procedure and calendars.

Your effort to protect veterans to ensure their benefits and services are provided in an expeditious manner, as proposed by an Executive Branch agency, is deeply appreciated. Under the DAV Constitution and By-Laws, any federal legislation or policy that furthers the interests of wounded and injured veterans carries DAV's strong support.

While endorsing your specific amendment, DAV takes no position on the underlying bill itself, because our membership has not approved a resolution specific to the purpose of Congress generally limiting government regulation-making across the vast federal landscape.

Thank you for proposing your amendment, and please advise me how DAV can aid you in gaining its acceptance by the House as it concludes consideration of the REIN Act.

Sincerely,

BARRY A. JESINOSKI,
Executive Director, Washington Headquarters.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself the balance of my time.

I say to the gentlewoman, my colleague from Wisconsin, that this House is very proud of the fact that we worked in a bipartisan fashion to pass all of those bills. I have absolutely no doubt that if, after we pass those bills, the Department of Veterans Affairs and other agencies affecting veterans didn't do the work properly and didn't get it done right that this Congress would again work in a very bipartisan fashion to say, No, you didn't get it right. Get it right.

That's what this is all about. That's why the REINS Act is important. It's not just for every other American, but also for veterans. This is something that will improve the regulatory process.

There is another study that talks about the creation of jobs, which are important to our veterans who have returned and are looking for employment in this country. This is a study by the Phoenix Center, and it's entitled, ''Regulatory Expenditures, Economic Growth and Jobs: An Empirical Study.'' It was performed by three Ph.D.'s and a lawyer. What could be better than that? I want to read from part of the abstract. It says:

Even a small 5 percent reduction in the regulatory budget, about $2.8 billion, is estimated to result in about $75 billion in expanded private sector GDP each year with an increase in employment by 1.2 million jobs annually. On average, eliminating the job of a single regulator grows the American economy by $6.2 million and nearly 100 private sector jobs annually. Conversely, each million-dollar increase in the regulatory budget costs the economy 420 private sector jobs.

This is a study that shows conclusively that we're right when we say that the REINS Act will help to create jobs in this country and the current regulatory morass that we're facing in this country is costing American jobs. I urge my colleagues to oppose the amendment and to support the underlying bill.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Wisconsin (Ms. MOORE).

The question was taken; and the Acting Chair announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Ms. MOORE. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Wisconsin will be postponed.

□ 2100

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. CRAMER) having assumed the chair, Mr. CONAWAY, Acting Chair of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 367) to amend chapter 8 of title 5, United States Code, to provide that major rules of the executive branch shall have no force or effect unless a joint resolution of approval is enacted into law, had come to no resolution thereon.

NATURAL GAS ECONOMIC IMPACT

(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, yesterday I addressed the positive economic impact on jobs of shale gas production that was documented during a recent hearing in Pennsylvania by the bipartisan Natural Gas Caucus, which I cochair.

An additional area of economic impact of the natural gas production is the direct benefits to Pennsylvania. From 2008 to 2010, Pennsylvania established three leases for natural gas production on State forest lands. These leases have generated signing bonuses totaling $413 million and earned the State another $100 million in royalties.

Since 2007, a total of $1.7 billion in corporate taxes have also been paid. During 2012 and 2013, the natural gas industry contributed $406 million in impact fees that are benefiting counties and communities across Pennsylvania.

By 2035, shale gas will contribute $42.4 billion annually to Pennsylvania's economy, up from the $7.1 billion in 2010.

Mr. Speaker, the economic impact from natural gas development in Pennsylvania is exceeding all expectations. Governor Corbett and the Pennsylvania State legislature are to be congratulated for their leadership in shale gas production.

HEALTH CARE IN AMERICA

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2013, the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. GRIFFIN) is recognized for the remainder of the time until 10 p.m. as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. GRIFFIN of Arkansas. Mr. Speaker, I want to take a little time tonight with my colleague, Representative YOUNG from Indiana, to talk a little bit about health care in America, talk a little bit about the Affordable Care Act that is currently being implemented, and talk about the need for real health care reform in this country.

I want to start out by just emphasizing that I firmly believe we need health care reform. I believe that the health care reform we got in the form of the Affordable Care Act, or ObamaCare, is not the health care reform that we need. And I would say that we have lots of proposals here in the House. I think last Congress we had over 200 bills introduced that related to the health care system, reforming our health care system. And this Congress, we have dozens of health care reform related bills as well.

So the idea that it's either the Affordable Care Act as we're seeing it unfold, or nothing at all, it's a false choice. That's not the choice that we have. There are lots of ideas; lots of much better ideas, I must add. And while I am personally for repeal—I certainly want the Affordable Care Act repealed—I want to replace it with quality, patient-centered health care reform.

I am not against providing relief to Americans who are feeling the burden of the Affordable Care Act or ObamaCare right now. In fact, we had a hearing on the implementation of the ObamaCare law in the Ways and Means Committee today, a committee of which I am a member. And my colleague Representative YOUNG is also a member. And we heard a lot of people say hey, this is the law of the land, don't mess with it. This is the law of the land, let it go. This is the law of the land, any attempt to criticize it, to discuss its shortcomings, is a waste of time.

Well, I reject that outright. And, you know, I think the President, through his actions, has rejected that.

What am I talking about? Well, it's interesting because we've passed seven bills in this House, seven bills, that relate to ObamaCare, changing ObamaCare, repealing a part of ObamaCare, seven that not only passed this House, we sent them to the other side of the Capitol. They passed the Senate. And you know what? The President signed them into law. That may come as a surprise to some folks, but it's the truth. We passed seven bills to change, to modify, to repeal parts of, to make better ObamaCare, and the President has agreed with us on all seven. He signed them into law.

Mr. YOUNG of Indiana. Are these some of the very same bills, my good colleague, that the President in recent speeches has characterized as partisan, misguided, meaningless? I do believe you may be referring to some of those bills.

Mr. GRIFFIN of Arkansas. Those are the same bills, and I would like to go through, if I can, the seven bills, and talk a little bit about what they do and how they were an improvement. I think they are evidence that yes, we'd like to replace this bill with something much better, this law, but in the short term, we will do whatever it takes to provide relief to American workers, relief to American families, relief to small businesses that are under the burden of ObamaCare.

So let me mention a few of these.

H.R. 4: H.R. 4 repealed the small business paperwork 1099 mandate. I remember when I first got to Congress, I heard from a bunch of folks about the 1099 filing obligation under the President's health care law. We repealed that. You know what the President did? He agreed. Bad part of the law.

Next, H.R. 1473. We cut $2.2 billion from what was characterized as a stealth public plan, a consumer-operated and -oriented plan, and froze the IRS budget. The President signed that into law.

Next, H.R. 674. We saved taxpayers $13 billion by adjusting the eligibility for ObamaCare programs. The President signed that into law.

H.R. 2055 made more reductions to the consumer-operated and -oriented plan that I mentioned earlier, also to the IPAB, the Independent Payment Advisory Board, an independent board that's going to cut Medicare, because it hasn't been reformed, when it runs out of money. So that was signed into law. And again in today's hearing in the Ways and Means Committee, folks on the other side of the aisle were saying this talk, this criticism about the President's law, ObamaCare, a waste of time, meaningless, all politics. Hogwash; the President signed a bunch of it into law.

Mr. YOUNG of Indiana. Well, it is hogwash. And it's particularly hogwash because among those various reforms that you've itemized there, let's reflect on how much persuasion, how much public argument was required to even bring the President of the United States to go along with repealing this egregious, superfluous 1099 obligation.

We had to make the public argument. We had to win the argument because there was great reluctance, if recollection serves, and I think it does, to make any changes whatsoever to what most Americans now know as ObamaCare.

The thought was and the thinking still seems to be among a number of our colleagues that if they touch the act, then that is going to lead to further reform, perhaps dissolution or repeal of the act altogether and replacement with something that is more patient centered, with something, frankly, that is more bipartisan.

So to our colleagues who often level criticisms at those of us who are identifying ways to alleviate the pain on the American people with respect to this law, the so-called Affordable Care Act, I think it bears reminding the importance of continuing the argument, forcefully making the argument about all the pain that it is causing.

Mr. GRIFFIN of Arkansas. Precisely. And a lot of people ask, why all the focus, why all the energy, why all the speeches? Because it's important, number one. And, number two, it takes the energy, the focus, the time, the prioritization, the resources, to convince people, the President included, that this is not the way to go.

Now, I think if you were to throw these seven different bills out there a few years ago when ObamaCare passed and say, hey, what are the chances of the President signing this? People would have said no way. No way it's going to happen. So it's a process. It's a process of making the argument with facts; not through personal attack, with facts. Make the vigorous argument. That's what this body and democracy is about, make the argument, win the argument, and then repeal or change.

And I would mention, there are three more: H.R. 3630 slashed billions of dollars from some discretionary funds, some slush funds which they had some flexibility to use, and the President agreed with that. He signed that into law.

H.R. 4348 adjusted a drafting error. It saved $670 million.

And H.R. 8 repealed what was called the CLASS program—Community Living Assistance Services and Support program. The former Democratic chairman of the Senate Budget Committee called the CLASS program ''a Ponzi scheme of the first order, the kind of thing Bernie Madoff would be proud of.''

We saved billions of dollars through the repeal of H.R. 8. So to reiterate, there are seven bills we fought hard for, and every single one of them ultimately was signed into law by the President of the United States.

Now, I would be remiss if I didn't mention that the biggest change, the most consequential change to ObamaCare, the most open and full recognition that the President's health care law is unworkable and problematic and a burden is the fact that the President himself just a few weeks ago on July 2, through a blog post, a Department of Treasury blog post, said, you know what? I am going to suspend, postpone for a year the so-called employer mandate that is one of the key pillars of the ObamaCare law.

□ 2115

Now, what is that mandate?

Mr. YOUNG of Indiana. Well, the mandate is that every employer across the United States of America who employs 50 or more persons on a full-time basis must provide government-sanctioned, government-approved health insurance to their employees.

Now, look, superficially, that sounds just great. There's some problems here. First, this law redefines full-time in a way that Americans have never understood

Mr. GRIFFIN of Arkansas. If you were to ask me what does full-time mean to you, I'd say, growing up in south Arkansas, full-time means 40 hours in a week or more, right?

That's a commonsense, practical application of what full-time is.

Would that be right under ObamaCare?

Mr. YOUNG of Indiana. That's what most Hoosiers think as well.

I think I've traveled quite a bit, gotten to know people around the country. And I don't believe I've encountered, I reckon, anyone who thought that full-time was 30 hours. So where did this come from? Out of thin air, presumably.

Mr. GRIFFIN of Arkansas. So the bottom line is the President recognized—and I applaud him for this—I applaud him for recognizing the problem, the burden of his law, particularly the employer mandate. And he said, I'm going to postpone that part of the law. I'm basically going to repeal, in effect, repeal that for a year; just make that go away for a year as a practical matter.

Now, I applaud his recognition that the law has problems. The problem I had with that action is I don't think, still do not believe the President had the power to do that. If he wants the law changed, he should have called Congress. We would have been more than happy to deliver up a bill—send it over to the Senate—that postponed the employer mandate a year.

In fact, because of the President doing that, that's precisely what we did. So I introduced H.R. 2667, that does that in legislation, not through a regulatory change, a blog post. But I introduced the Authority for Mandate Delay Act, which we voted on. We passed on this floor.

Why?

It does the same basic thing, a little bit different, but the same basic thing that the President was doing, and we did it so that what he did would be legal. And you know what? Thirty-five Democrats supported this bill. Thirty-five Democrats supported this bill, and I applaud them for doing it.

Mr. YOUNG of Indiana. Potentially, you, myself and so many other Members of this body agreed with the substance of the President's blog post, though one would question whether we were intended to be a Nation of laws or instead a Nation of blog posts. We could get into that separate conversation.

I think fair-minded people agreed that the delay was appropriate. ObamaCare is not ready for prime time. The computer systems don't seem to be ready. Employers are confused about exactly how this law's going to work, exactly how it's going to impact them. Employees are confused. And something had to be done.

But I think that recognition that something had to be done only occurred because there were people in Congress making arguments, as they continue to make arguments, with respect to the flaws in this legislation.

Mr. GRIFFIN of Arkansas. And I would add to that there are many of us that believe the reason this law is not working is because it will never work. It is unworkable by design. It is top-down. It is the old way of doing things in a world that is becoming network bottom-up, innovative, new way of doing things. This is an old central control, top-down way of legislating.

And so the President recognized that. But, of course, for partisan politics reasons, even though my bill did basically what he did, he opposed it. He opposed the bill that would have made his actions legal.

And, of course, now it is sitting, napping, because we hope to awake it, it's napping in the Senate, in the United States Senate, with your companion bill, the Individual Mandate Delay.

Mr. YOUNG of Indiana. Well, kudos to the one of, what is it, six colleagues on the other side of the aisle that joined us in voting for your bill.

Mr. GRIFFIN of Arkansas. Thirty-five Democrats.

Mr. YOUNG of Indiana. Thirty-five in total?

Mr. GRIFFIN of Arkansas. That's right.

Mr. YOUNG of Indiana. I think one out of every six members of their conference were supportive of your bill.

Mr. GRIFFIN of Arkansas. That's exactly right.

Mr. YOUNG of Indiana. I think that was the right thing to do, the right vote to cast. It certainly preserved the precedent that it is this body that passes the laws, that develops the legislation.

It's the job of the executive branch to sign those various acts into law, and then to execute them, not to recraft the laws as it might see convenient, for whatever motives.

And so you mentioned my bill, which is really, in the end, the American people's bill because it's designed to provide relief to American families, the Fairness for American Families Act.

You know, the thinking behind this is quite simple. If the President wants

to offer businesses a relief from the employer mandate tax, as our Supreme Court has styled it, then why won't you offer relief to working Americans and their families?

It's that simple. And I have yet to hear an acceptable response. No, we're playing politics.

Well, are those one of nine Democrats who voted for my legislation also playing politics?

No, candidly, I think they're being fair minded. Some would argue that they're looking for political cover or whatever. I'll let others assess that.

But, certainly, it's good legislation. It's fair and equitable legislation to accord the same sort of treatment to hardworking Americans that the President would give to the business community.

And though I agree, let me go on record that that business community needs relief too.

Mr. GRIFFIN of Arkansas. Well, and one in nine of the Democrats voted for your bill. I think it was 22 total. I think, just a year or two ago, that would have been unthinkable, that 35 would have joined voting for the Employer Mandate Delay and 22 or so for your bill. It would have been unthinkable.

It is because we have been relentless in pursuit of a better way, relentless in pursuit of real health care reform, relentless in identifying and letting folks in Washington know that the people back home, constituents, have made their voice very clear, where I live, in Arkansas, on the issue of the Affordable Care Act or ObamaCare.

And what's interesting is, today, in the Ways and Means Committee, we had the head of the IRS testifying. And he was explaining why the President decided to delay, for 1 year, one of the two key components of the Affordable Care Act—one being the employer mandate, and the other part of the law being the individual mandate.

We know that the President delayed that one, the employer mandate, and he was explaining why he did that. And this is a paraphrase of what he said.

It's the head of the IRS describing why the President gave 1 year relief to businesses impacted by the employer mandate. He said, to paraphrase, not a direct quote, but to paraphrase, he said, in effect, we heard from a lot of American small businesses that this was a burden on them, and so we acted to give them relief. That's a paraphrase, but that's effectively what he said.

I agree with the general sentiment. It is a burden on American workers and small businesses, et cetera, and they do need relief, and I'm glad they're getting it.

But it raises the question, why wouldn't you give that same relief, as a matter of fairness, to individuals, families, workers impacted by the individual mandate, the other key component of ObamaCare, of the Affordable Care Act?

Why would you give relief to small businesses and businesses and what have you, but not give relief to individuals?

It fundamentally doesn't make sense. It's not fair.

And when he said that, I thought to myself, well, is it possible that he doesn't know, that the head of the IRS and the administration don't know that individuals and families and workers are also impacted in a negative way, that they are burdened, many of them, by this law?

Yes, they want health care reform. Yes, people need insurance. Yes, people want to be covered. But this is not the way to go.

Does he not know the impact that this law is having?

So I thought, why don't we put all the opinions aside, the op eds, the editorialists, and why don't we just talk about some of the news headlines?

Without my commentary, I thought you and I could just read some of the headlines. These are news stories, not op eds, not editorial writers. These are news stories from a variety of publications from around the country. And I thought it would be instructive to run through some of those tonight.

Mr. YOUNG of Indiana. There seem to be a lot there. How would you like to proceed?

Mr. GRIFFIN of Arkansas. I tell you what, I'll read through one of these, and I'll put one up. You could read through, and then I'll take one. These are headlines from around the country. And we're going to run through them because they are news stories that, regardless of what you hear from this administration, this is what's happening around the country.

The AP: Florida Insurance Officials: Rates Will Rise Under ObamaCare.

Georgia Insurance Rates Spike Under ObamaCare.

Now, I would point out, we don't have to guess what's going to happen anymore. We don't have to predict what's going to happen.

Why? Because we're already there. Implementation is under way. It's already happening. So we'll just let the facts speak.

Chattanooga Business Owner Says ObamaCare Costing Workers Pay Raises and Benefits.

Consumers Could See 25–Percent Premium Increases Under ObamaCare.

UNA Asks Student Employees to Work Fewer Hours.

Mr. YOUNG of Indiana. So the Contra Costa Times of Concord says that half of the Affordable Care Act call-center jobs will be part-time.

The Missourian says ObamaCare is going to impact Franklin County workers.

The Weekly Standard reports Wisconsin grocery store forced to cut hours due to ObamaCare.

The Huffington Post reports that White Castle indicates that ObamaCare is causing them to consider only hiring part-time workers.

KHN indicates Wellpoint sees small employers dropping their health coverage.

There's more.

Mr. GRIFFIN of Arkansas. I would point out that these are from all over the country. Growing worries about ObamaCare forcing insurers out of State markets.

Iowa Public Radio: Full-time vs part-time workers. Restaurants weigh ObamaCare.

ObamaCare forces work-hour limits for CMU students.

Brevard cuts some workers' part-time hours to avoid ObamaCare rules.

ObamaCare delay is a relief for a family business.

□ 2130

Mr. YOUNG of Indiana. So we're already picking up on some trends here. From a number of the headlines, we're getting the sense that this health care law is not what we were told it would be, what the American people were told it would be. It's not sustainable. That's why there's all manner of taxes, from medical device taxes to what was once a tanning tax. They're looking for revenue under every rock to make this thing sustainable.

It doesn't control costs. By some estimates in my own State, the State of Indiana, premiums are expected to go up 70 percent-plus within the next year or so. There are problems about access that we're hearing about that are captured in articles around the country. Rural areas, in particular, can expect to have a shortage of doctors as a direct result of this law. And there are quality concerns.

I've just listed my thoughts on what health care reform ought to accomplish. All those various things ought to happen. Unfortunately, ObamaCare is failing on every front. And I don't say this with any celebration. I lament the fact. It's all the more reason that we need to continue to educate our colleagues and that minority of the American people that still believe this is going to work.

Mr. GRIFFIN of Arkansas. As we see here:

Texas Business Owner Facing $1 Million in Annual ObamaCare Costs;

Maryland Employers Cutting Hours Due to ObamaCare;

Waitress Said She's Losing Full-Time Status Due to the ObamaCare Rule;

St. Pete College: HCC Cut Adjuncts' Hours Over Health Care;

Local Entrepreneur Sells Part of Business Due to ObamaCare.

Mr. YOUNG of Indiana. There are people behind every one of these headlines.

Forbes says: Labor Unions Are Indicating That ObamaCare Will Shatter Our Health Benefits and Cause Nightmare Scenarios.

My recollection was that labor was very much behind this bill, originally. I would love to work with them or any members of union or union leadership

to be part of the solution here to help alleviate some of the pain. Welcome home.

Mr. GRIFFIN of Arkansas. I share your feeling there. I found common ground with a lot of labor union folks on the Keystone pipeline because they want the jobs.

Mr. YOUNG of Indiana. Absolutely.

Mr. GRIFFIN of Arkansas. Here, the labor unions are realizing this is a nightmare.

Mr. YOUNG of Indiana. Well, they're hearing from their members.

Mr. GRIFFIN of Arkansas. The members are speaking out.

Mr. YOUNG of Indiana. That's right.

Mr. GRIFFIN of Arkansas. Here you see:

Restaurant Shift: Sorry, Just Part-Time.

There's a theme here.

Workers' Hours Cut—'ObamaCare' Blamed.

Again, for those just tuning in, we're just reading news headlines, not op-eds. These are news headlines, stories from around the country, everything from the Weekly Standard to the Huffington Post, the AP.

Mr. YOUNG of Indiana. Objective journalists.

Mr. GRIFFIN of Arkansas. ObamaCare Strikes: Part-Time Jobs Surge to All-Time High; Full-Time Jobs Plunge by 240,000;

16,500 Working Fewer Hours Due to ObamaCare Mandate.

This is one of the mandates we've been talking about here tonight.

Mr. YOUNG of Indiana. Let me press ''pause'' here before we read more of these headlines, which are incredibly illustrative and instructive.

So many of them deal with the cut in the number of hours for our wage earners during the worst economy since the Great Depression.

Mr. GRIFFIN of Arkansas. Sure.

Mr. YOUNG of Indiana. Why is that happening? Why is that happening?

Well, you've got employers that are now mandated to provide health insurance to their employees, and many of them, in order to remain profitable, must change their way of doing business. So they change people from full-time into a part-time status. They hire people into part-time positions rather than full-time positions.

And then we have, perhaps most pathetically and tragically, what has been dubbed the ''29er effect,'' where people are working more than 30 hours a week, many of whom are barely getting by, barely able to put food on the table and meet their utility bills and so on, that are being dropped down to 29 or fewer hours.

How is that helpful to the American people?

Mr. GRIFFIN of Arkansas. And these are folks that the Obama administration says are full-time, but they're really not full-time. They may be working 35 hours a week. They don't even have a truly full-time, 40-hour-a-week job, what most folks across America know to be full-time. We talked about this before. Who said that 30 hours is full-time?

A lot of folks working 35 hours are trying to make ends meet. They would rather work 40 and get some other time. But what is happening is they're being cut back below 30, which is not just the number of hours they work. It's simultaneously reducing the money they take home.

Mr. YOUNG of Indiana. That's right. And we have legislation here, again, to address this problem, like the Saving American Workers Act. There's lots of cosponsors here in the House.

Mr. GRIFFIN of Arkansas. That's your bill.

Mr. YOUNG of Indiana. I introduced the bill in response to some of the same things I'm hearing from my colleagues who are, in turn, hearing from their constituents and the sort of things I hear back home in Indiana, which is this is absolutely ridiculous. We're helping very few people at the expense of many.

Let's restore the definition of full-time as it's always been popularly understood and provide some relief. So we need to move forward on that. Let's continue to educate and assess what is being reported across the country on some of these.

Mr. GRIFFIN of Arkansas. Houston Doctors to Close Doors Because of ObamaCare;

Aetna Letter Warns Customers: 'Many People Will Pay More for Health Insurance' Under ObamaCare;

East Penn Cuts Cafeteria Workers' Hours to Avoid ObamaCare;

Affordable Care Act Insurance Mandates Leading Some Businesses to Cut Employees' Work Hours;

Limiting Part-Time Hours Unintended Result of Health Law.

Maybe the unintended consequences have something to do with the fact they didn't know half of what was in the law in the first place.

Mr. YOUNG of Indiana. That's right.

I've seen some Indiana headlines—a number of them—related to some of these effects. One pops out there for me.

The Indianapolis News: School Part-Timers Fear Fewer Hours, Less Pay, as Impact of Health Care Law Kicks In.

Let's remember this is not just businesses that are being impacted. We've got municipalities, school workers, and businesses, especially in the hospitality industry or your retail sector, where we see a lot more people being hired on a part-time basis. Seemingly, every aspect of our economy and much of our society is being adversely impacted by this law.

Now, that's not to say that some people aren't helped. All things being equal, if we can insure a few more million people, that's a great thing; but with all the collateral damage created by this law and its unsustainability, that's the real problem here.

Mr. GRIFFIN of Arkansas. And we can help those people. We can help those people through other means. As I said before, the idea that it's the ObamaCare model or nothing is a false choice. There are many other better patient-centered ways to do this to reach the same goal.

Health Care Law Causing SCC to Reexamine Adjunct Faculty Members;

Local Employers Struggle with Affordable Care Act.

When employers are struggling, the workers are struggling. The families are struggling.

ObamaCare Glitch Could Make Coverage Unaffordable for Low-Wage Workers;

ObamaCare's $96-an-Hour Cost Spike May End 30-Hour Workweek.

We're getting short on time, so I think we ought to run through these.

I want to talk a little bit about where our bills are now, sitting at the other end of the Capitol. I want to urge our Senate friends to think about the opportunity they have.

But let's take a quick look at these before we close out.

Rancho Cucamonga May Reduce Part-Time Hours to Avoid Health Care Costs;

Part-time Staff Hours in Flux Due to ObamaCare;

Fort Wayne Community Schools Cut Hours for Part-Time Positions;

Maricopa Community College Staffs Pinched by Obama Health Law;

Dallas Area Cities, School Districts Expect Budget Hits from Affordable Care Act.

And the good news just keeps on coming. There's a little sarcasm there. This is just awful.

Mr. YOUNG of Indiana. Out in Colorado: Fort Collins Small Businesses Prepare for Affordable Care Act Changes;

The World-Herald: Districts to Cut Back Paraprofessionals' Hours as a Result of Health Care Law.

It's already even impacting paraprofessionals right now.

Beacon Journal: Limiting Part-Time Hours to Avoid Health Care Costs.

More of the same, impacting yet more Americans.

Requirements for Health Care Reform and Resulting Requirements for Chesterfield County Public Schools;

The Salt Lake Tribune: Ahead of Health Reform, Granite District Cuts Part-Time Workers' Hours.

Mr. GRIFFIN of Arkansas. And there's so many more. One that I actually didn't get up here was reported just tonight. In Ohio, they announced that premiums statewide are going up 41 percent.

AAA Parks Full-Time Jobs, Cites Health Law;

Agencies Must Cut Some Part-Timers' Hours or Offer Health Insurance;

Part-Time Employee Hours Cut Over Health Care;

Fast-Food Worker Hours Cut, New Health Care Law Blamed.

I know we're short on time. We've got some other colleagues that want to talk tonight, but I just want to close

by first of all thanking my colleague, Representative YOUNG of Indiana, for being here with me.

But I'd just like to point out that the employer mandate bill that mimics what the President did, that postpones the employer mandate for 1 year, we passed it here with 35 Democrats, bipartisan. Your bill, the individual mandate postponement, 22 Democrats. We passed them out of here. We did our job.

The worst the White House could say about my bill is that it was redundant. Those bills are sitting down in the Senate, waiting for action.

Mr. YOUNG of Indiana. Redundant to the Treasury Department's blog post, it bears reminding. They're sitting over there, gathering dust, as the American people demand relief. It is so important.

I want to thank you for your leadership on this issue. Those in Arkansas are well represented by you on this and other matters, working very hard to ensure that where relief can be provided, we provide it; where the prerogatives of the legislative branch can be defended, you will defend them.

That's where I stand as well. We just need the United States Senate to act.

Mr. GRIFFIN of Arkansas. On the employer mandate delay, they should pass that immediately to make the President's actions legal, and they should pass the individual mandate delay to make the President's actions fair.

I appreciate you being here with me tonight. You are an outstanding member of the Ways and Means Committee, and I appreciate your leadership.

We're running out of time. I want to thank folks for joining us tonight, and I yield back the balance of my time.

□ 2145

JERUSALEM AS THE CAPITAL OF ISRAEL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Arizona (Mr. FRANKS) is recognized for the remainder of the time until 10 p.m. as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. FRANKS of Arizona. I thank Congressman GRIFFIN for the opportunity here. Mr. Speaker, I thank you for the time.

Mr. Speaker, the tiny Nation of Israel began in earnest more than 3,000 years ago. Since that time the people of Israel have faced more heartaches, threats of annihilation, bigotry, torture, and genocide than any other people in the history of humanity. Yet even today, in 2013, against all odds and opposition, the noble people of Israel remain. And the peace of Israel continues to be the linchpin of peace for the entire world.

Today Israel faces another catastrophic challenge among the many in its long struggle throughout history that threatens to end its existence as a nation. The greatest challenge Israel faces today is the growing threat of a nuclear armed Iran. This is a menace that also threatens the peace and security of the entire family of mankind.

Mr. Speaker, Israel has been our truest friend and ally in the Middle East now for approximately 65 years, and during that entire time it has faced many unthinkable threats from enemies who desire to see its absolute annihilation. Now more than ever before the United States of America and the nation of Israel must stand together against the threat of a nuclear Iran and against those who would see our two nations and all those we love and all those who love human freedom eradicated from the face of the Earth.

One of the most important ways America can send a signal to the world that there is no space between us and Israel is to transfer our Embassy to an existing, newly constructed consulate in Jerusalem and once and for all make it clear that the United States officially and unequivocally recognizes Jerusalem as the undivided capital city of the state of Israel.

This is something we should have done a long time ago, Mr. Speaker. However, there has never been a more important time to do it because the world today, including some of our most dangerous enemies, doubt America's resolve to stand with Israel. And the actions of the Obama administration would create such doubt in any reasonable person's mind. For instance, when it was announced that the Israeli Government had completed one more step in the permit process for building houses in Jerusalem, the Obama administration openly rebuked Israel and demanded that they do several things by way of ''penance'' for building houses for its citizens.

Now Mr. Speaker, I cannot tell you how bewildering it is for me as an American Congressman to hear our own American President expressing more outrage toward Israel for building homes in its own capital city than he has expressed toward a madman like Mahmoud Ahmadinejad for building nuclear weapons with which to threaten the peace and security of the entire world.

Mr. Obama demanded that the permits be canceled, despite the fact that every Prime Minister of Israel has allowed them in their capital. Mr. Obama told Israeli Prime Minister Benjamin Netanyahu to make a ''substantial gesture'' towards the Palestinians and release Palestinian prisoners. Mr. Obama has made no such demands of the Palestinians, and the Palestinians have made no such concessions. In fact, Mr. Speaker, every concession that Israel has ever made for decades has been met and responded to by violence and terror.

Nevertheless, President Obama is continuing to insist that Israel publicly state its willingness to negotiate the division of Jerusalem and the right of return for millions of descendants of Palestinian refugees to Israel. Indeed, Mr. Speaker, no President in our history has been more bent upon isolating our friends and emboldening our enemies as this President.

And Mr. Speaker, it places Israel in a great conundrum. For if, on the one hand, they take military action to halt Iran's nuclear program, the world—including this administration—will openly condemn them and they will face intense isolation and hostility from the international community.

On the other hand, if they do not take action and they allow Iran to gain nuclear weapons, they face the real and imminent possibility that Iran will either directly or through its proxies unleash a nuclear hell on Earth that will annihilate their tiny homeland.

It is perilous beyond description for us all, Mr. Speaker, that the leader of the free world doesn't seem to understand the gravity of allowing the Iranian regime and the Government of Iran today to gain nuclear weapons capability. It is vital for those of us in Congress to make it clear that America's commitment to Israel remains steadfast and that Israel's enemy is America's enemy.

Once again, Mr. Speaker, America should make a major effort and make a major statement to that effect by transferring our Embassy to Israel's capital city, Jerusalem. This move would require nothing from American taxpayers. It could happen by selling the current Embassy in Tel Aviv, and that could even bring a substantial upside to America financially. This is something that we need to do for the sake of making it clear to the world that we will stand by Israel.

America has established bilateral relations with so many nations across the world, and in each case we have recognized their capital city. Yet when it has come to the State of Israel, our most critical and cherished ally on this Earth, Israel's capital city of Jerusalem is the only one in the world which we have yet to recognize.

Ironically, Mr. Speaker, it was America that was the first nation on Earth to recognize Israel as a nation, a mere 11 minutes after Israel's declaration. President Harry Truman said:

I had faith in Israel before it was established, I have faith in it now. I believe it has a glorious future before it—not just as another sovereign nation, but as an embodiment of the great ideals of human civilization.

Mr. Speaker, if America now ignores the opportunity to be the first to fully recognize Jerusalem as Israel's capital city, can we truly claim that we are Israel's nearest and dearest friend? And, can we honestly say that we are fully committed to our own principles?

The majority of Israel's citizens and leaders have yearned for their capital city's recognition by the people of the world and, moreover, by the people of the United States for so very long. Israel's capital city houses its government framework, including the Israeli Parliament, the Knesset, the Supreme

Court, the Bank of Israel, its diplomatic corps of the Israeli Ministry of Foreign Affairs, and the Prime Minister's and President's offices. And very significantly, Jerusalem surrounds many of Israel's most sacred remembrances, including the tombs of the fallen soldiers on Mount Herzl, as well as the symbol of the most insidious injustice ever endured by the Jewish people, the Holocaust Museum—Yad Vashem.

Mr. Speaker, not so long ago one of the Members of this House said very eruditely and arrogantly: ''I don't take sides for or against Israel, and I don't take sides for or against Hezbollah.'' I believe, Mr. Speaker, that that is more dangerous, that kind of moral equivalence, that kind of moral neutrality, it's more dangerous to humanity than terrorism itself.

Ronald Reagan gave an address in 1983 when the world faced a similar threat in the growing strength and nuclear ambition of the Soviet Union. He stated:

I urge you to beware the temptation to ignore the facts of history and the aggressive impulses of an evil empire, to simply call the arms race a giant misunderstanding and thereby remove yourself from the struggle between right and wrong and good and evil.

Mr. Speaker, we cannot remove ourselves from that struggle.

Let us all be reminded that we have been here before. The free nations of the world once had opportunity to address the insidious rise of the Nazi ideology in its formative years, when it could have been dispatched without great cost. But they delayed, and the result was atomic bombs falling on cities, 50 million people dead worldwide, and the swastika's shadow nearly plunging the planet into Cimmerian darkness.

You know, it is said that those who survived the Holocaust achieved their revenge through simply living. Rather than allowing their faith and their hopes to be crushed by the atrocities of the past, they chose instead to dry their tears and to look up and to begin building again. And indeed they did build again. They built a future and a family and a community and a nation. And Mr. Speaker, the God of Jacob honored their courage. The threat of the Nazis is no more, and one day this threat of global jihad will be no more.

Mr. Speaker, recognizing Jerusalem as the rightful capital of Israel is not solely an act of foreign attributes and powers. It is the noble act of courage and justice that comports with everything that America is. We have assisted the Jewish people in restoring their ancient state. We must now act and recognize her restored ancient city, Jerusalem.

Together, we can ensure that Jerusalem continues to be a center for answered prayers and dreams come true. And I pray that the United States will be the first nation to officially and formally recognize Israel's capital city and to transfer our Embassy to Jerusalem. This will undeniably affirm our commitment and our resolve on behalf of Israel. And we will be standing steadfastly on our own Declaration of Independence, as well, Mr. Speaker, as on the right side of history.

With that, Mr. Speaker, I would just pray that the light of God's peace will shine down upon the streets of Jerusalem forever.

I yield back the balance of my time.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. YOUNG of Florida (at the request of Mr. CANTOR) for today on account of bronchitis.

Mr. LEWIS of Georgia (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for today on account of attending Lindy Boggs' funeral.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

Karen L. Haas, Clerk of the House, reported and found truly enrolled bills of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H.R. 1911. An act to amend the Higher Education Act of 1965 to establish interest rates for new loans made on or after July 1, 2013, to direct the Secretary of Education to convene the Advisory Committee on Improving Postsecondary Education Data to conduct a study, on improvements to postsecondary education transparency at the Federal level, and for other purposes.

H.R. 2167. An act to authorize the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development to establish additional requirements to improve the fiscal safety and soundness of the home equity conversion mortgage insurance program.

H.R. 2611. An act designate the headquarters building of the Coast Guard on the campus located at 2701 Martin Luther King, Jr., Avenue Southeast in the District of Columbia as the ''Douglas A. Munro Coast Guard Headquarters Building'', and for other purposes.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. FRANKS of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 9 o'clock and 55 minutes p.m.), the House adjourned until tomorrow, Friday, August 2, 2013, at 9 a.m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of Rule XIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

2450. A letter from the Congressional Review Coordinator, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule — Handling of Animals; Contingency Plans; Stay of Regulations [Docket No.: APHIS-2006-0159] (RIN: 0579-AC69) received July 31, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

2451. A letter from the Chairman and Chief Executive Officer, Farm Credit Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Releasing Information; General Provisions; Accounting and Reporting Requirements; Reports of Accounts and Exposures (RIN: 3052-AC76) received July 30, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

2452. A letter from the Under Secretary, Department of Defense, transmitting the Department's report on the amount of purchases from foreign entities in Fiscal Year 2012; to the Committee on Armed Services.

2453. A letter from the Acting Under Secretary, Department of Defense, transmitting a letter on the approved retirement of Vice Admiral Robert S. Harward, Jr., United States Navy, and his advancement to the grade of vice admiral on the retired list; to the Committee on Armed Services.

2454. A letter from the Under Secretary, Department of Defense, transmitting a report on balances carried forward at the end of the Fiscal Year (FY) 2012; to the Committee on Armed Services.

2455. A letter from the Chairman, Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, transmitting Annual Report to the Congress on the Presidential $1 Coin Program; to the Committee on Financial Services.

2456. A letter from the Chief Counsel, FEMA, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Final Flood Elevation Determinations [Docket No.: FEMA-2013-0002] received July 26, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Financial Services.

2457. A letter from the Chief, Planning and Regulatory Affairs Office, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's ''Major'' final rule — National School Lunch Program and School Breakfast Program: Nutrition Standards for All Foods Sold in School as Required by the Healthy, Hunger-Free Kids Act of 2010 [FNS-2011-0019] (RIN: 0584-AE09) received July 30, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

2458. A letter from the Director, Regulations Policy and Management Staff, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Animal Feeds Contaminated With Salmonella Microorganisms [Docket No.: FDA-2013-N-0253] received July 31, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2459. A letter from the Chief of Staff, Media Bureau, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule — Amendment of Section 73.202(b) Table of Allotments, FM Broadcast Stations (Centerville, Midway, Lovelady, and Oakwood, Texas); Applications of Stations KTWL(FM), Hempstead, Texas (Facility ID No. 21204), and KLTR(FM), Brenham, Texas (Facility ID No. 40775), to Change Communications of License [MB Docket No.: 12-92] (RM-11650; RM-11679) (File No. BPH-20120529ADK; BPH-20120529ADI) received July 26, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2460. A letter from the Director, Office of Congressional Affairs, Nuclear Regulatory Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule — Regulatory Guide 1.124, Revision 3, ''Service Limits and Loading Combinations for Class 1 Linear Type Supports'', pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2461. A letter from the Director, Office of Congressional Affairs, Nuclear Regulatory Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule — Interim Enforcement Policy for Permanent Implant Brachytherapy Medical Event Reporting [NRC-2013-0114] received July 30, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2462. A letter from the Director, Office of Congressional Affairs, Nuclear Regulatory Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule — Developing Software Life-Cycle Processes for Digital Computer Software Used in Safety Systems of Nuclear Power Plants; Regulatory Guide 1.173, Revision 1, received July 30, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2463. A letter from the Director, Office of Congressional Affairs, Nuclear Regulatory Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule — Software Requirement Specifications for Digital computer Software and Complex Electronics Used in Safety Systems of Nuclear Power Plants; Regulatory Guide 1.172, Revision 1, received July 30, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2464. A letter from the Director, Office of Congressional Affairs, Nuclear Regulatory Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule — Software Unit Testing for Digital Computer Software Used in Safety Systems of Nuclear Power Plants; Regulatory Guide 1.171, Revision 1, received July 30, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2465. A letter from the Director, Office of Congressional Affairs, Nuclear Regulatory Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule — Test Documentation for Digital Computer Software Used in Safety Systems of Nuclear Power Plants Regulatory Guide 1.170, Revision 1, received July 30, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2466. A letter from the Director, Office of Congressional Affairs, Nuclear Regulatory Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule — Configuration Management Plants for Digital Computer Software Used in Safety Systems of Nuclear Power Plants; Regulatory Guide 1.169, Revision 1, received July 30, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2467. A letter from the Director, Office of Congressional Affairs, Nuclear Regulatory Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule — Verification, Validation, Reviews, and Audits for Digital Computer Software Used in Safety Systems of Nuclear Power Plants; Regulatory Guide 1.168, Revision 2, received July 30, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2468. A letter from the Director, Office of Congressional Affairs, Nuclear Regulatory Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule — Preparation of Environmental Reports for Nuclear Power Plant License Renewal Applications; Regulatory Guide 4.2, Revision 1, received July 30, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2469. A letter from the Director, Office of Congressional Affairs, Nuclear Regulatory Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule — Final Safety Evaluation by the Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation Topical Report WCAP-12610-P-A & CENPD-404-P-A, Addendum 2/WCAP-14342-A & CENPD-404-NP-A, Addendum 2, ''Westinghouse Clad Corrosion Model for ZIRLO and Optimized ZIRLO'' Westinghouse Electric Company Project No. 700, received July 30, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2470. A letter from the Assistant Secretary For Export Administration, Department of Commerce, transmitting the Department's final rule — Revisions to the Export Administration Regulations: Military Vehicles; Vessels of War; Submersible Vessels, Oceanographic Equipment; Related Items; and Auxiliary and Miscellaneous Items that the President Determines No Longer Warrant Control under the United States Munitions List [Docket No.: 110928603-3298-01] (RIN: 0694-AF39) received July 30, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

2471. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Export Administration, Department of Commerce, transmitting the Department's final rule — Additions to the List of Validated End-Users in the People's Republic of China: Samsung China Semiconductor Co. Ltd. and Advanced Micro-Fabrication Equipment, Inc., China [Docket No.: 130611539-3539-01] (RIN: 0694-AF93) received July 26, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

2472. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting a letter regarding the section 620K(b) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

2473. A letter from the Secretary, Department of the Treasury, transmitting as required by section 401(c) of the National Emergencies Act, 50 U.S.C. 1641(c), and section 204(c) of the International Emergency Economic Powers Act, 50 U.S.C. 1703(c), a six-month periodic report on the national emergency with respect to terrorists who threaten to disrupt the Middle East peace process that was declared in Executive Order 12947 of January 23, 1995; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

2474. A letter from the Special Inspector General for Afghanistan Reconstruction, transmitting the twentieth quarterly report on the Afghanistan Reconstruction; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

2475. A letter from the Director, Diversity and Inclusion Division, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the Department's No FEAR Report to Congress for Fiscal Year 2012; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

2476. A letter from the Associate General Counsel for General Law, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

2477. A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting Annual Category Rating Report from November 1, 2011 to October 31, 2012; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

2478. A letter from the Assistant Director, Executive and Political Personnel, Department of the Air Force, transmitting ten reports pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

2479. A letter from the Principal Deputy Assistant Attorney General, Department of Justice, transmitting ATF 2013 PACT Act Report, pursuant to Public Law 111-154, section 4(f)(2) (124 Stat. 1103); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2480. A letter from the Senior Attorney Advisor, Department of Justice, transmitting the Department's final rule — Removing Unnecessary Office on Violence Against Women Regulations [OVW Docket No.: 110] (RIN: 1105-AB40) received July 26, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2481. A letter from the Principal Deputy Assistant Attorney General, Department of Justice, transmitting a report regarding the International Marriage Broker Regulation Act (IMBRA); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2482. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Bell Helicopter Textron Canada Helicopters [Docket No.: FAA-2013-0019; Directorate Identifier 2010-SW-051-AD; Amendment 39-17485; AD 2013-12-07] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received July 26, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2483. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; B-N Group Ltd. Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2013-0314; Directorate Identifier 2013-CE-004-AD; Amendment 39-17490; AD 2013-13-02] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received July 26, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2484. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Cessna Aircraft Company Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2012-1052; Directorate Identifier 2012-CE-014-AD; Amendment 39-17471; AD 2013-11-11] (RIN: 2120-AA64), pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2485. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; The Boeing Company Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2013-0205; Directorate Identifier 2012-NM-226-AD; Amendment 39-17493; AD 2013-13-05] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received July 26, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2486. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Bombardier, Inc. Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2012-1155; Directorate Identifier 2012-NM-115-AD; Amendment 39-17445; AD 2013-09-04] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received July 26, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2487. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Eurocopter France Helicopters [Docket No.: FAA-2012-1214; Directorate Identifier 2011-SW-071-AD; Amendment 39-17482; AD 2013-12-04] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received July 26, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2488. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Standard Instrument Approach Procedures, and Takeoff Minimums and Obstacle Departure Procedures; Miscellaneous Amendments [Docket No.: 30907; Amdt. No. 3542] received July 26, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2489. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Standard Instrument Approach Procedures, and Takeoff Minimums and Obstacle Departure Procedures; Miscellaneous Amendments [Docket No.: 30906; Amdt. No. 3541] received July 26, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2490. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Standard Instrument Approach Procedures, and Takeoff Minimums and Obstacle Departure Procedures; Miscellaneous Amendments [Docket No.: 30905; Amdt. No. 3540] received July 26, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2491. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Establishment of Class E Airspace; Port Townsend, WA [Docket No.: FAA-2012-0926; Airspace Docket No. 12-ANM-24] received July 26, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2492. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Amendment of Class D Airspace; El Monte, CA [Docket FAA No.: FAA-2013-0505; Airspace Docket No. 13-AWP-4) received July 26, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2493. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Establishment of Area Navigation (RNAV) Routes; Washington, DC [Docket No.: FAA-2013-0081; Airspace Docket No.: 12-AEA-5] (RIN: 2120-AA66) received July 26, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2494. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Amendment of VOR Federal Airways V-55 and V-169 in Eastern North Dakota [Docket No.: FAA-2013-0484; Airspace Docket No. 13-AGL-16] (RIN: 2120-AA66) received July 26, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2495. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Amendment of Class E Airspace; Live Oak, FL [Docket No.: FAA-2013-0001; Airspace Docket No. 12-ASO-45] received July 26, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2496. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Amendment of Class E Airspace; Selmer, TN [Docket No.: FAA-2013-0074; Airspace Docket No.: 13-ASO-3] received July 26, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2497. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Establishment of Class E Airspace; Captiva, FL [Docket No.: FAA-2012-1335; Airspace Docket No.: 12-ASO-19] received July 26, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2498. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Modification of VOR Federal Airway V-537, GA [Docket No.: FAA-2012-0971; Airspace Docket No. 12-ASO-31] (RIN: 2120-AA66) received July 26, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2499. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Amendment of Class E Airspace; Tuskegee, AL [Docket No.: FAA-2013-0158; Airspace Docket No. 13-ASO-5] received July 26, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2500. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Bombardier, Inc. Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2012-0420; Directorate Identifier 2011-NM-284-AD; Amendment 39-17315; AD 2013-01-01] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received July 26, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2501. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; The Boeing Company Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2013-0302; Directorate Identifier 2013-NM-019-AD; Amendment 39-17503; AD 2013-13-15] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received July 26, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2502. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; PILATUS Aircraft Ltd. Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2013-0598; Directorate Identifier 2013-CE-015-AD; Amendment 39-17506; AD 2013-14-01] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received July 26, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2503. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; The Boeing Company Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2012-0864; Directorate Identifier 2011-NM-023-AD; Amendment 39-17496; AD 2013-13-08] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received July 26, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2504. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Cessna Aircraft Company Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2012-1330; Directorate Identifier 2012-CE-006-AD; Amendment 39-17470; AD 2013-11-10] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received July 26, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2505. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Various Restricted Category Helicopters [Docket No.: FAA-2013-0553; Directorate Identifier 2011-SW-041-AD; Amendment 39-17502; AD 2013-13-14] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received July 26, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2506. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; PILATUS Aircraft Ltd. Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2013-0223; Directorate Identifier 2012-CE-049-AD; Amendment 39-17468; AD 2013-11-08] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received July 26, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2507. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Rolls-Royce plc Turbofan Engines [Docket No.: FAA-2012-1327; Directorate Identifier 2012-NE-47-AD; Amendment 39-17478; AD 2013-12-01] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received July 26, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2508. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Airbus Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2012-1034; Directorate Identifier 2011-NM-051-AD; Amendment 39-17383; AD 2013-05-11] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received July 26, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2509. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Hawker Beechcraft Corporation (Type Certificate Previously Held by Raytheon Aircraft Company) Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2013-0462; Directorate Identifier 2013-NM-092-AD; Amendment 39-17476; AD 2013-11-16] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received July 26, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2510. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; The Boeing Company Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2012-1221; Directorate Identifier 2012-NM-151-AD; Amendment 39-17474; AD 2013-11-14] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received July 26, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2511. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Eurocopter France Helicopters [Docket No.: FAA-2013-0522; Directorate Identifier 2013-SW-018-AD; Amendment 39-17487; AD 2013-10-51] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received July 26, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2512. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Eurocopter Deutschland GmbH Helicopters [Docket No.: FAA-2013-0018; Directorate Identifier 2010-SW-060-AD; Amendment 39-17483; AD 2013-12-05] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received July 26, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2513. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Establishment of Class E Airspace; Presidio, TX [Docket No.: FAA-2012-0770; Airspace Docket No. 12-ASW-6] received July 26, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2514. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Standard Instrument Approach Procedures, and Takeoff Minimums and Obstacle Departure Procedures; Miscellaneous Amendments [Docket No.: 30908; Amdt. No. 3543] received July 26, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2515. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Establishment of Class E Airspace; Parkston, SD [Docket No.: FAA-2012-1282; Airspace Docket No. 12-AGL-16] received July 26, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2516. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Modification of VOR Federal Airway V-345 in the Vicinity of Ashland, WI [Docket No.: FAA-2013-0236; Airspace Docket No. 13-AGL-5] (RIN: 2120-AA66) received July 26, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2517. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Establishment of Class E Airspace; Colt, AR [Docket No.: FAA-2012-1281; Airspace Docket No. 12-ASW-13] received July 26, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2518. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Establishment of Class E Airspace; Worthington, MN [Docket No.: FAA-2012-1139; Airspace Docket No. 12-AGL-12] received July 26, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2519. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Establishment of Class E Airspace; Elbow Lake, MN [Docket No.: FAA-2012-1121; Airspace Docket No. 12-AGL-8] received July 26, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2520. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Establishment of Class E Airspace; Ogallala, NE [Docket No.: FAA-2012-1138; Airspace Docket No. 12-ACE-6] received July 26, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2521. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Establishment of Class E Airspace; Sanibel, FL [Docket No.: FAA-2012-1334; Airspace Docket No. 12-ASO-18] received July 26, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2522. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Amendment of Restricted Areas R-2504A and R-2504B; Camp Roberts, CA, and Restricted Area R-2530; Sierra Army Depot, CA [Docket No.: FAA-2013-0515; Airspace Docket No. 13-AWP-8] (RIN: 2120-AA66) received July 26, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2523. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Amendment of Restricted Areas R-2907A and R-2907B; Lake George, FL; and R-2910, Pine Castle, FL [Docket No.: FAA-2010-1146; Airspace Docket No. 10-ASO-25] (RIN: 2120-AA66) received July 26, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2524. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Establishment of Class E Airspace; Grand Canyon, AZ [Docket No.: FAA-2013-0163; Airspace Docket No. 13-AWP-2] received July 26, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2525. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Modification of Class D and E Airspace; Twin Falls, ID [Docket No.: FAA-2013-0258; Airspace Docket No. 13-ANM-12] received July 26, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2526. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Embraer S.A. Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2012-1230; Directorate Identifier 2011-NM-107-AD; Amendment 39-17477; AD 2013-11-17] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received July 26, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2527. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Learjet Inc. Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2013-0214; Directorate Identifier 2012-NM-152-AD; Amendment 39-17497; AD 2013-13-09] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received July 26, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2528. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; The Boeing Company Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2008-0620; Directorate Identifier 2007-NM-357-AD; Amendment 39-17499; AD 2013-13-11] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received July 26, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2529. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Eurocopter Deutschland (Eurocopter) Helicopters [Docket No.: FAA-2012-0520; Directorate Identifier 2013-SW-027-AD; Amendment 39-17484; AD 2013-12-06] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received July 26, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2530. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Airbus Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2012-1035; Directorate Identifier 2011-NM-235-AD; Amendment 39-17492; AD 2013-13-04] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received July 26, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2531. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Eurocopter Deutschland GmbH Helicopters [Docket No.: FAA-2012-1305; Directorate Identifier 2010-SW-041-AD; Amendment 39-17475; AD 2013-11-15] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received July 26, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2532. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Airbus Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2012-1039; Directorate Identifier 2011-NM-275-AD; Amendment 39-17491; AD 2013-13-03] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received July 26, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2533. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; DASSAULT AVIATION Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2012-1067; Directorate Identifier 2011-NM-231-AD; Amendment 39-17444; AD 2013-09-03] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received July 26, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2534. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Dowty Propellers Propellers [Docket No.: FAA-2009-0776; Directorate Identifier 2009-NE-32-AD; Amendment 39-17481; AD 2010-17-11R1] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received July 26, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2535. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; PILATUS Aircraft Ltd. Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2013-0383; Directorate Identifier 2013-CE-008-AD; Amendment 39-17498; AD 2013-13-10] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received July 26, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2536. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Piper Aircraft, Inc. Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2013-0535; Directorate Identifier 2013-CE-018-AD; Amendment 39-17489; AD 2013-13-01] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received July 26, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2537. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Sikorsky Aircraft Corporation (Sikorsky) Model Helicopters [Docket No.: FAA-2012-1206; Directorate Identifier 2012-SW-021-AD; Amendment 39-17269; AD 2012-23-13] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received July 26, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2538. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Rolls-Royce Deutschland Ltd & Co KG Turbofan Engines [Docket No.: FAA-2013-0458; Directorate Identifier 2013-NE-19-AD; Amendment 39-17480; AD 2013-21-03] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received July 26, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2539. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Piper Aircraft, Inc. Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2012-0983; Directorate Identifier 2012-CE-001-AD; Amendment 39-17457; AD 2013-10-04] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received July 26, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2540. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Engine Alliance Turbofan Engines [Docket No.: FAA-2012-1329; Directorate Identifier 2012-NE-46-AD; Amendment 39-17479; AD 2013-12-02] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received July 26, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2541. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; General Electric Company Turbofan Engines [Docket No.: FAA-2013-0447; Directorate Identifier 2013-NE-17-AD; Amendment 39-17488; AD 2013-10-52] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received July 26, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2542. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Various Helicopter Models [Docket No.: FAA-2013-0521; Directorate Identifier 2013-SW-010-AD; Amendment 39-17486; AD 2013-06-51] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received July 26, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2543. A letter from the Assistant Chief Counsel for Hazardous Materials Safety, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Hazardous Materials: Revision to Fireworks Regulations (RRR) [Docket No.: PHMSA-2010-0320 (HM-257)] (RIN: 2137-AE70) received July 26, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2544. A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting Memorandum of Understanding Between the United States and the Government of Belize Concerning the Imposition of Import Restrictions on Archaeological Materials Representing the Cultural Heritage of Belize, pursuant to 19 U.S.C. 2602(g)(1); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

2545. A letter from the Chief Counsel/Administrative Specialist, Department of Justice, transmitting the Department's final rule — Sale and Issue of Marketable Book-Entry Treasury Bills, Notes, and Bonds [Docket No.: Fiscal-BPD-2013-0001] received July 26, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

2546. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule — Appeals Settlement Guideline, New Qualified Plug-In Electric Drive Motor Vehicle Credit [UIL: 30D.00-00] received July 31, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

2547. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule — Recognizing advance payments for gift cards that are redeemable for goods or services from an unrelated entity (Rev. Proc. 2013-39) received July 29, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

2548. A letter from the Director, Office of Regulations and Reports Clearance, Social Security Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Change in Terminology: ''Mental Retardation'' to ''Intellectual Disability'', pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

2549. A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting Memorandum of justification for the President's waiver of the restrictions on the provision of funds to the Palestinian Authority; jointly to the Committees on Foreign Affairs and Appropriations.

2550. A letter from the Program Manager, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the Department's final rule — Medicare Program; Inpatient Psychiatric Facilities Prospective Payment System — Update for Fiscal Year Beginning October 1, 2013 (FY 2014) [CMS-1447-N] (RIN: 0938-AR63) July 30, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); jointly to the Committees on Ways and Means and Energy and Commerce.

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. BROUN of Georgia:

H.R. 2900. A bill to repeal the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act and the Health Care and Education Reconciliation Act of 2010; to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to repeal the percentage floor on medical expense deductions, expand the use of tax-preferred health care accounts, and establish a charity care credit; to amend the Social Security Act to create a Medicare Premium Assistance Program, reform EMTALA requirements, and to replace the Medicaid program and the Children's Health Insurance program with a block grant to the States; to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide for cooperative governing of individual and group health insurance coverage offered in interstate commerce; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committees on Ways and Means, Education and the Workforce, Natural Resources, the Judiciary, House Administration, Appropriations, and Rules, 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. BLUMENAUER (for himself, Mr. POE of Texas, Mr. COLE, Mr. JONES, Mr. RIBBLE, Mr. ROHRABACHER, Mr. SENSENBRENNER, Mr. SHIMKUS, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. TERRY, Mr. HANNA, Mr. SCHOCK, and Ms. EDWARDS):

H.R. 2901. A bill to strengthen implementation of the Senator Paul Simon Water for the Poor Act of 2005 by improving the capacity of the United States Government to implement, leverage, and monitor and evaluate programs to provide first-time or improved access to safe drinking water, sanitation, and hygiene to the world's poorest on an equitable and sustainable basis, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Ms. SLAUGHTER (for herself, Mr. COHEN, Mr. DEFAZIO, Mr. DEUTCH, Mr. DINGELL, Mr. DOGGETT, Ms. ESHOO, Mr. GRIJALVA, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. MORAN, Mr. NOLAN, Mr. POCAN, Mr. POLIS, Ms. SHEA-PORTER, Mr. TONKO, and Mr. LEWIS):

H.R. 2902. A bill to require the Supreme Court of the United States to promulgate a code of ethics; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DENT (for himself, Mrs. BEATTY, Mr. STIVERS, Mr. PERRY, Mr. GERLACH, Mr. SENSENBRENNER, Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania, Mr. MORAN, and Mr. MARINO):

H.R. 2903. A bill to amend section 487(a) of the Higher Education Act of 1965 to provide increased accountability of nonprofit athletic associations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. WHITFIELD (for himself, Mr. POLIS, Mr. PERLMUTTER, Mr. BEN RAY LUJÁN of New Mexico, Ms. DEGETTE, Mr. LOEBSACK, Ms. KAPTUR, Ms. BROWNLEY of California, Mr. YOUNG of Florida, Mr. COFFMAN, and Mr. HONDA):

H.R. 2904. A bill to provide for payment to the survivor or surviving family members of compensation otherwise payable to a contractor employee of the Department of Energy who dies after application for compensation under the Energy Employees Occupational Illness Compensation Program Act of 2000, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary, and in addition to the Committee on Education and the Workforce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. WHITFIELD (for himself, Mr. POLIS, Mr. PERLMUTTER, Mr. BEN RAY LUJÁN of New Mexico, Ms. DEGETTE, Mr. LOEBSACK, Ms. KAPTUR, Ms. BROWNLEY of California, Mr. YOUNG of Florida, Mr. PIERLUISI, and Mr. HONDA):

H.R. 2905. A bill to amend the Energy Employees Occupational Illness Compensation Program Act of 2000 to strengthen the quality control measures in place for part B lung disease claims and to establish the Advisory Board on Toxic Substances and Worker Health for the contractor employee compensation program under subtitle E of such Act; to the Committee on the Judiciary, and in addition to the Committee on Education and the Workforce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. FITZPATRICK (for himself and Mrs. BUSTOS):

H.R. 2906. A bill to amend MAP-21 to improve contracting opportunities for veteran-owned small business concerns, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, and in addition to the Committee on Small Business, 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. WILSON of South Carolina:

H.R. 2907. A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to ensure that members of the reserve components of the Armed Forces who have served on active duty or performed active service since September 11, 2001, in support of a contingency operation or in other emergency situations receive credit for such service in determining eligibility for early receipt of non-regular service retired pay, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. COLE:

H.R. 2908. A bill to amend the Small Business Act to allow the use of physical damage disaster loans for the construction of safe rooms; to the Committee on Small Business.

By Mr. BISHOP of New York (for himself, Mr. MCKINLEY, Mr. MICHAUD, Mr. GRIMM, Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, and Mr. GIBSON):

H.R. 2909. A bill to require the Secretary of Labor to maintain a publicly available list of all employers that relocate a call center overseas, to make such companies ineligible for Federal grants or guaranteed loans, and to require disclosure of the physical location of business agents engaging in customer service communications, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committees on Armed Services, Oversight and Government Reform, and Education and the Workforce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. WAXMAN (for himself, Mr. PALLONE, Mrs. CAPPS, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Ms. MATSUI, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, and Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois):

H.R. 2910. A bill to protect American children and their families from the epidemic of gun violence by banning access to certain weapons, strengthening the Nation's mental health infrastructure, and improving the understanding of gun violence; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committees on Ways and Means, and Education and the Workforce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. RUSH (for himself and Mr. COHEN):

H.R. 2911. A bill to require the Federal Communications Commission to expand eligibility for part 74 licenses to certain wireless microphone users, to establish safe haven channels for wireless microphones, and to authorize access by owners and operators of wireless microphones to the TV bands databases for the purpose of protecting wireless microphone operations from interference; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. CHAFFETZ (for himself, Mr. COFFMAN, Mr. TIERNEY, and Ms. SPEIER):

H.R. 2912. A bill to provide authority for the Special Inspector General for Afghanistan Reconstruction to suspend and debar contractors under certain circumstances; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and in addition to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, 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. BOUSTANY:

H.R. 2913. A bill to authorize certain Department of Veterans Affairs major medical facility leases, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, and in addition to the Committee on the Budget, 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. SPEIER (for herself, Ms. TITUS, and Mr. MCDERMOTT):

H.R. 2914. A bill to prevent abusive billing of ancillary services to the Medicare program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. COTTON (for himself and Mr. GOWDY):

H.R. 2915. A bill to amend section 2423 of title 18, United States Code, to eliminate a defense, to a criminal prosecution under that section, based on the state of mind of the defendant as to the age of the minor engaging in, or intended to engage in, a commercial sex act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SHUSTER (for himself, Mr. TERRY, Mrs. CAPITO, Mr. MURPHY of Pennsylvania, Mr. ROTHFUS, Mr. STIVERS, Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky, Mr. LATTA, Mr. DENT, Mr. ROKITA, Mr. BUCSHON, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. RADEL, Mr. BARLETTA, Mr. MARINO, Mr. GERLACH, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio, Mr. HUNTER, Mr. ISSA, Mr. RAHALL, Mr. MULLIN, Mr. MCKINLEY, Mr. TURNER, Mr. AMODEI, Mr. PERRY, Mr. TIBERI, Mr. JOYCE, Mr. CUELLAR, Mr. DENHAM, Mr. NUNES, Mr. REED, Mr. WHITFIELD, Mr. SIMPSON, and Mr. MICA):

H.R. 2916. A bill to require congressional review of certain rules promulgated by the Environmental Protection Agency; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committees on the Judiciary, and Rules, 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. SERRANO (for himself, Mr. HINOJOSA, Mr. DOGGETT, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. RICHMOND, Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York, Ms. MENG, Mr. PIERLUISI, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Mr. GUTIÉRREZ, Mr. CARTWRIGHT, Mr. HONDA, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. SIRES, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. VARGAS, Mr. NOLAN, Mr. CASTRO of Texas, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, and Mr. JEFFRIES):

H.R. 2917. A bill to promote savings by providing a tax credit for eligible taxpayers who contribute to savings products and to facilitate taxpayers receiving this credit and open a designated savings product when they file their Federal income tax returns; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MCKINLEY (for himself, Mrs. CAPITO, Mr. RAHALL, Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio, Mr. BARR, Mr. MORAN, Mr. ENYART, Mr. BUCSHON, Mr. STIVERS, Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, Mr. WHITFIELD, Ms. FUDGE, Ms. SCHWARTZ, Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. TURNER, Mr. CLAY, Mr. JOYCE, Mr. GIBBS, and Mr. DOYLE):

H.R. 2918. A bill to amend the Surface Mining Control and Reclamation Act of 1977 to transfer certain funds to the Multiemployer Health Benefit Plan and the 1974 United Mine Workers of America Pension Plan; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committee on Natural Resources, 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. LUMMIS (for herself, Mr. COHEN, Mr. GARCIA, and Mr. COLLINS of Georgia):

H.R. 2919. A bill to amend titles 5 and 28, United States Code, to require annual reports to Congress on, and the maintenance of databases on, awards of fees and other expenses to prevailing parties in certain administrative proceedings and court cases to which the United States is a party, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CARTWRIGHT (for himself, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Mr. LEWIS, Mr. MEEKS, Ms. SEWELL of Alabama, Mr. TAKANO, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Mr. CLAY, Mr. HONDA, Mr. RUSH, Ms. CLARKE, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Mr. PERLMUTTER, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. ELLISON, Mr. LANGEVIN, Ms. KAPTUR, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. HINOJOSA, Mr. PASCRELL, Mr. HIMES, Mr. RANGEL, and Mr. COHEN):

H.R. 2920. A bill to improve the financial literacy of students; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. BLUMENAUER (for himself and Mr. COLLINS of New York):

H.R. 2921. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to modify the taxation of hard cider; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HOLDING (for himself, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. COBLE, Mr. WATT, and Mr. MARINO):

H.R. 2922. A bill to extend the authority of the Supreme Court Police to protect court officials away from the Supreme Court grounds; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MARCHANT:

H.R. 2923. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to require the Secretary of the Treasury to disclose certain taxpayer rights in the letter of acknowledgment of receipt of an application to be treated as an organization described in section 501(c)(3); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MARCHANT:

H.R. 2924. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to require that the Secretary of the Treasury follow certain procedures relating to status applications of 501(c)(4) organizations; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BRADY of Texas (for himself, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mr. BUCHANAN, Mr. GERLACH, Mr. KIND, Mr. LEVIN, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Mrs. BLACK, Mr. DOGGETT, Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania, Mr. BOUSTANY, Mr. LEWIS, Mr. NUNES, Mr. GRIFFIN of Arkansas, Mr. SMITH of Nebraska, Mr. SCHOCK, Mr. REICHERT, Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. REED, Mr. PAULSEN, Ms. JENKINS, Mr. RENACCI, Mr. LIPINSKI, and Mr. VAN HOLLEN):

H.R. 2925. A bill to amend title XI of the Social Security Act to expand the permissive exclusion from participation in Federal health care programs to individuals and entities affiliated with sanctioned entities; 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. ALEXANDER:

H.R. 2926. A bill to prohibit the revocation or withholding of Federal funds to programs whose participants carry out voluntary religious activities; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. BILIRAKIS:

H.R. 2927. A bill to prevent the implementation of certain tax and fee provisions of the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act until the Secretary of the Treasury certifies that reporting requirements relating to employer status and employee income levels and health care status may be made with 100 percent accuracy and without fraud; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committee on 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 Ms. BROWNLEY of California:

H.R. 2928. A bill to direct the Election Assistance Commission to develop and publish recommendations for best practices that States may use in establishing and operating independent Congressional redistricting commissions; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CARNEY (for himself, Mr. HECK of Nevada, Mr. WEBSTER of Florida, and Mr. WELCH):

H.R. 2929. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow a deduction for contributions to tax-exempt Housing Equity Savings Accounts; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CARSON of Indiana (for himself, Ms. BROWN of Florida, Mr. CARTWRIGHT, and Mr. POLIS):

H.R. 2930. A bill to amend the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 to award grants to eligible entities to establish, expand, or support school-based mentoring programs to assist at-risk middle school students with the transition from middle school to high school; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. COBLE:

H.R. 2931. A bill to amend the false claims provisions of title 31, United States Code, with respect to health care programs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. COURTNEY (for himself, Mr. COBLE, Ms. DELAURO, Mr. LANGEVIN, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Mr. JONES, Mr. YOUNG of Florida, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Mr. LOBIONDO, Mr. CAPUANO, Mr. DEUTCH, Mr. GRIMM, Mr. PIERLUISI, Mr. WITTMAN, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, Ms. BROWN of Florida, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Mr. BISHOP of New York, Mr. MCINTYRE, Mr. UPTON, Ms. ESTY, Mr. LEVIN, Mr. HIMES, Mr. MICHAUD, Mr. HUIZENGA of Michigan, and Ms. GRANGER):

H.R. 2932. A bill to require the Secretary of the Treasury to mint coins in commemoration of the United States Coast Guard; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mrs. DAVIS of California (for herself and Mr. BISHOP of Georgia):

H.R. 2933. A bill to require States and local educational agencies to report on the achievement of military-connected students in annual report cards under the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Ms. DELAURO (for herself, Ms. LEE of California, Ms. MOORE, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. RANGEL, and Ms. MENG):

H.R. 2934. A bill to amend the Consumer Product Safety Improvement Act of 2008 to ban flame retardant chemicals from use in resilient filling materials in children's products; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. FORTENBERRY (for himself and Ms. MCCOLLUM):

H.R. 2935. A bill to establish more efficient and effective policies and processes for departments and agencies engaged in or providing support to, international conservation; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. FOSTER (for himself, Mr. DEUTCH, Mr. QUIGLEY, Mr. POLIS, Ms. TITUS, Ms. NORTON, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Mr. ENYART, Mr. TONKO, Mr. GARCIA, Mr. LARSEN of Washington, and Mr. ELLISON):

H.R. 2936. A bill to provide for punishments for immigration-related fraud, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HURT (for himself, Mr. GRIFFITH of Virginia, Mr. HANNA, and Mr. OWENS):

H.R. 2937. A bill to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act with respect to the guidelines for specification of certain disposal sites for dredged or fill material; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Ms. JENKINS:

H.R. 2938. A bill to provide that certain requirements of the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act do not apply if the American Health Benefit Exchanges are not operating on October 1, 2013; 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. KENNEDY (for himself and Mr. FRANKS of Arizona):

H.R. 2939. A bill to award the Congressional Gold Medal to Shimon Peres; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. KIND (for himself, Mr. NEAL, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. PASCRELL, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mr. LEWIS, Ms. SCHWARTZ, Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois, and Mr. LEVIN):

H.R. 2940. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to reduce the rate of tax on domestic manufacturing income to 20 percent; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mrs. KIRKPATRICK (for herself, Mr. COLE, Mr. COOK, Ms. TITUS, Mr. O'ROURKE, Ms. SINEMA, Mr. BARBER, and Mr. GRIJALVA):

H.R. 2941. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to authorize the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to make certain grants to assist nursing homes for veterans located on tribal lands; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mrs. KIRKPATRICK:

H.R. 2942. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to reestablish the Professional Certification and Licensure Advisory Committee of the Department of Veterans Affairs; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. LAMBORN (for himself, Mr. HUELSKAMP, Mr. ADERHOLT, Mr. WESTMORELAND, Mr. COLE, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Mr. JONES, Mr. FLEMING, Mr. MILLER of Florida, Mrs. BACHMANN, and Mr. ROE of Tennessee):

H.R. 2943. A bill to amend the General Education Provisions Act to prohibit Federal education funding for elementary or secondary schools that provide access to emergency postcoital contraception; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. LARSEN of Washington:

H.R. 2944. A bill making supplemental appropriations for fiscal year 2014 for the TIGER discretionary grant program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Appropriations, and in addition to the Committee on the Budget, 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. LEVIN (for himself and Mr. GERLACH):

H.R. 2945. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to permanently extend and expand the charitable deduction for contributions of food inventory; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LOBIONDO:

H.R. 2946. A bill to direct the Administrator of the Transportation Security Administration to assess and report on the risk posed to commercial aviation security if a flight deck door is opened during flight; to the Committee on Homeland Security.

By Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York (for herself, Ms. LEE of California, and Ms. NORTON):

H.R. 2947. A bill to express United States foreign policy with respect to, and to strengthen United States advocacy on behalf of, individuals persecuted and denied their rights in foreign countries on account of gender, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and in addition to the Committees on Financial Services, and the Judiciary, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. MATHESON (for himself and Mr. HARPER):

H.R. 2948. A bill to require analyses of the cumulative and incremental impacts of certain rules and actions of the Environmental Protection Agency, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, 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. MCMORRIS RODGERS:

H.R. 2949. A bill to delay for one year certain amendments to the Medicaid program made by the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mrs. MCMORRIS RODGERS:

H.R. 2950. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to delay the application of the individual health insurance mandate for individuals who have not attained age 27; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mrs. MCMORRIS RODGERS:

H.R. 2951. A bill to require certain preconditions for allowing premium tax credits, reductions in cost-sharing, and funding of Navigators and related Exchange enrollment activities, 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. MEEHAN:

H.R. 2952. A bill to amend the Homeland Security Act of 2002 to make certain improvements in the laws relating to the advancement of security technologies for critical infrastructure protection, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security.

By Mr. MICHAUD:

H.R. 2953. A bill to provide Medicare payments to Department of Veterans Affairs medical facilities for items and services provided to Medicare-eligible veterans for non-service-connected conditions; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committees on Energy and Commerce, and Veterans' 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 Mr. MILLER of Florida:

H.R. 2954. A bill to authorize Escambia County, Florida, to convey certain property that was formerly part of Santa Rosa Island National Monument and that was conveyed to Escambia County subject to restrictions on use and reconveyance; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Ms. MOORE (for herself and Mr. POCAN):

H.R. 2955. A bill to amend the Runaway and Homeless Youth Act to ensure that recipients of assistance under that Act provide services to sexual and gender minority youth in a manner that is culturally competent, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. MURPHY of Florida (for himself, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Ms. ESTY, and Mr. BARBER):

H.R. 2956. A bill to eliminate unnecessary oil tax credits and subsidies for major oil companies to reduce the national debt; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committee on Natural Resources, 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. MURPHY of Pennsylvania (for himself, Mr. BARBER, Mr. ROE of Tennessee, Mr. BURGESS, Mr. CASSIDY, Mr. DENT, Mr. TIBERI, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. GUTHRIE, Mr. BUCSHON, and Mr. MARINO):

H.R. 2957. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act and the Social Security Act to extend health information technology assistance eligibility to behavioral health, mental health, and substance abuse professionals and facilities, 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. NADLER (for himself, Ms. HAHN, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, Mr. LARSEN of Washington, Ms. SPEIER, Mr. PASCRELL, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. CAPUANO, Ms. MOORE, Mr. SCHIFF, Mrs. CAPPS, Mr. PALLONE, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mr. HONDA, Mr. MORAN, Mr. ISRAEL, Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. LOWENTHAL, and Mr. HOLT):

H.R. 2958. A bill to amend title 49, United States Code, to provide certain port authorities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. NUGENT (for himself and Mr. MATHESON):

H.R. 2959. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to provide a national standard in accordance with which nonresidents of a State may carry concealed firearms in the State; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PALLONE:

H.R. 2960. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to require sponsors of Medicare prescription drug plans to implement procedures to prevent fraud and abuse, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committees on Ways and Means, and the Judiciary, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. PASCRELL (for himself and Mr. RUNYAN):

H.R. 2961. A bill to amend the Truth in Lending Act and the Higher Education Act of 1965 to require additional disclosures and protections for students and cosigners with respect to student loans, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services, and in addition to the Committee on Education and the Workforce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker,

in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. PAYNE (for himself, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Mr. KING of New York, Mr. CARTWRIGHT, Mr. KEATING, Mr. LANCE, Mr. SWALWELL of California, Mr. DEFAZIO, Mr. ANDREWS, Mr. RICHMOND, Ms. CLARKE, Mr. SIRES, Mr. CLYBURN, Mr. PASCRELL, Mr. RANGEL, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, Ms. GABBARD, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Mr. PETERS of California, and Mr. O'ROURKE):

H.R. 2962. A bill to provide for an independent assessment of the future resilience and reliability of the Nation's electric power transmission and distribution system, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security.

By Mr. PITTS:

H.R. 2963. A bill to provide dollars to the classroom; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. PITTS:

H.R. 2964. A bill to establish and provide for the treatment of Individual Development Accounts, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PITTS:

H.R. 2965. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow nontaxable employer matching contributions to section 529 college savings plans; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. RICHMOND (for himself, Ms. FUDGE, and Ms. BROWN of Florida):

H.R. 2966. A bill to amend the Higher Education Act of 1965 to suspend, for a certain period, the use of adverse credit history in determining eligibility for Federal Direct PLUS Loans; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. SCHOCK (for himself and Mr. COOPER):

H.R. 2967. A bill to provide for fiscal gap and generational accounting analysis in the legislative process, the President's budget, and annual long-term fiscal outlook reports; to the Committee on the Budget.

By Mr. SIRES:

H.R. 2968. A bill to amend titles 23 and 49, United States Code, with respect to congestion mitigation and metropolitan transportation planning, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. TERRY (for himself and Mr. THOMPSON of California):

H.R. 2969. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide for the recognition of attending physician assistants as attending physicians to serve hospice patients; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committee on 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. TIPTON:

H.R. 2970. A bill to facilitate the remediation of abandoned hardrock mines, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. TONKO:

H.R. 2971. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to encourage the deployment of highly efficient combined heat and power property, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. TONKO:

H.R. 2972. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide tax incentives for producing electricity from wasted heat; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. TONKO:

H.R. 2973. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Interior to carry out projects and conduct research on water resources in the Hudson-Mohawk River Basin, to establish a Hudson-Mohawk River Basin Commission, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources, and in addition to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, 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. WALORSKI (for herself and Ms. KUSTER):

H.R. 2974. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to provide for the eligibility for beneficiary travel for veterans seeking treatment or care for military sexual trauma in specialized outpatient or residential programs at facilities of the Department of Veterans Affairs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Ms. WATERS (for herself, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. GRIJALVA, Ms. BORDALLO, Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, Mr. LYNCH, Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California, Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Ms. SEWELL of Alabama, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Mr. PAYNE, Ms. NORTON, Ms. BROWN of Florida, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Mr. CONNOLLY, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. FARR, Ms. LEE of California, Mr. HINOJOSA, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. POLIS, Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia, Ms. CLARKE, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Mr. KEATING, and Ms. SCHAKOWSKY):

H.R. 2975. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to authorize grants for training and support services for Alzheimer's patients and their families; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Ms. WATERS (for herself, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. GRIJALVA, Ms. BORDALLO, Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, Mr. LYNCH, Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California, Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Ms. SEWELL of Alabama, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Mr. PAYNE, Ms. NORTON, Ms. BROWN of Florida, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Mr. CONNOLLY, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. FARR, Ms. LEE of California, Mr. HINOJOSA, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. POLIS, Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia, Ms. CLARKE, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, Mr. KEATING, and Ms. SCHAKOWSKY):

H.R. 2976. A bill to amend the Violent Crime Control and Law Enforcement Act of 1994 to reauthorize the Missing Alzheimer's Disease Patient Alert Program; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WHITFIELD (for himself and Ms. DEGETTE):

H.R. 2977. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide for coverage, as supplies associated with the injection of insulin, of containment, removal, decontamination and disposal of home-generated needles, syringes, and other sharps through a sharps container, decontamination/destruction device, or sharps-by-mail program or similar program under part D of the Medicare program; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. DESANTIS (for himself and Mr. SALMON):

H.J. Res. 55. A joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relating to the equal application to the Senators and Representatives of the laws that apply to all citizens of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York (for herself, Mr. ANDREWS, Ms. BASS, Mrs. BEATTY, Mr. BECERRA, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Mr. BISHOP of New York, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Ms. BROWN of Florida, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Mrs. CAPPS, Mr. CAPUANO, Mr. CÁRDENAS, Ms. CASTOR of Florida, Mr. CICILLINE, Ms. CLARKE, Mr. CLAY, Mr. CLYBURN, Mr. COHEN, Mr. COOPER, Mr. COSTA, Mr. COURTNEY, Mr. CROWLEY, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois, Mrs. DAVIS of California, Mr. DEFAZIO, Ms. DEGETTE, Mr. DENT, Mr. DINGELL, Ms. DUCKWORTH, Mr. ELLISON, Mr. FARR, Mr. FATTAH, Mr. FOSTER, Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN, Ms. FUDGE, Ms. GABBARD, Mr. GARAMENDI, Mr. GRAYSON, Mr. AL GREEN of Texas, Mr. GRIJALVA, Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico, Mr. GUTIÉRREZ, Mr. HIGGINS, Mr. HIMES, Mr. HINOJOSA, Mr. ISRAEL, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Mr. JEFFRIES, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. KEATING, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. KILDEE, Ms. LEE of California, Mr. LEVIN, Mr. LEWIS, Mr. LOEBSACK, Ms. LOFGREN, Mrs. LUMMIS, Mr. LYNCH, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mr. MCGOVERN, Ms. MENG, Ms. MOORE, Mr. NADLER, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. PASCRELL, Mr. PERLMUTTER, Ms. PINGREE of Maine, Mr. QUIGLEY, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. RUIZ, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California, Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia, Ms. SEWELL of Alabama, Ms. SHEA-PORTER, Mr. SHERMAN, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Ms. TITUS, Mr. TONKO, Ms. TSONGAS, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Ms. WATERS, Mr. WATT, Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. WELCH, and Ms. WILSON of Florida):

H.J. Res. 56. A joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to equal rights for men and women; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. NEUGEBAUER:

H.J. Res. 57. A joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States to require a two-thirds vote of each House of Congress to increase the statutory limit on the public debt; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WILSON of SOUTH CAROLINA (for himself, Mr. MEADOWS, Mr. COTTON, Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina, Mr. DESANTIS, Mrs. HARTZLER, Mr. WESTMORELAND, Mr. PEARCE, and Mr. CRAMER):

H. Con. Res. 48. Concurrent resolution commemorating the 46th anniversary of the reunification of Jerusalem; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. BRADY of PENNSYLVANIA:

H. Con. Res. 49. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress that the United States Postal Service should issue a commemorative postage stamp honoring the Reverend Doctor Leon Sullivan and that the Citizens' Stamp Advisory Committee should recommend to the Postmaster General that such a stamp be issued; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. CAMP:

H. Con. Res. 50. Concurrent resolution designating a National Railroad Monument located in Diamond District Park in historic

downtown Durand, Michigan, as the ''National Railroad Memorial''; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. JONES (for himself, Ms. BONAMICI, and Mr. GARAMENDI):

H. Res. 323. A resolution amending the Rules of the House of Representatives to observe a moment of silence in the House on the first legislative day of each month for those killed or wounded in the United States engagement in Afghanistan; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. FARR (for himself and Mr. YOUNG of Alaska):

H. Res. 324. A resolution expressing support for designation of the week of September 22, 2013, through September 28, 2013, as ''National Marine Technology Week'' to recognize the important contributions that marine technology has made to the United States; to the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology.

By Mr. ROHRABACHER (for himself, Mr. LAMALFA, Mr. GOHMERT, Mr. STOCKMAN, Mr. CALVERT, Mr. HALL, Mr. GARY G. MILLER of California, Mr. COOK, Mr. WESTMORELAND, Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee, Mr. BROUN of Georgia, Mrs. BACHMANN, Mr. CARTWRIGHT, Mr. GRAYSON, and Mr. MCCARTHY of California):

H. Res. 325. A resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives that the President should award the Presidential Medal of Freedom posthumously to Glen Doherty and Tyrone Woods, both of whom died from enemy action during the attack on United States facilities in Benghazi, Libya, on the night of September 11-12, 2012; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

122. The SPEAKER presented a memorial of the Senate of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, relative to Senate Resolution No. 104 urging the President and the Congress to support the adoption of House Bill 1014; to the Committee on the Budget.

123. Also, a memorial of the Senate of the State of Colorado, relative to Senate Joint Memorial 13-003 urging the Congress to enact comprehensive immigration reform; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

124. Also, a memorial of the House of Representatives of the State of Illinois, relative to House Resolution No. 246 urging the Congress to pass the Secure Travel and Counterterrorism Partnership Program Act; jointly to the Committees on the Judiciary and Intelligence (Permanent Select).

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. BROUN of Georgia:

H.R. 2900.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1 (the Spending Clause) of the United States Constitution states that ''The Congress shall have Power To lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts, and Excises, to pay for Debts and provide for the common Defence and general Welfare of the United States.'' This bill restores the proper balance of power between the federal and state governments as intended under the 10th Amendment to the Constitution by devolving the responsibilities related to health care to the states and individuals. It also reinforces the founding constitutional principle that state governments and individuals are properly situated with attending to their own health, safety, and general welfare.

By Mr. BLUMENAUER:

H.R. 2901.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18 of the Constitution.

By Ms. SLAUGHTER:

H.R. 2902.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The authority to enact this bill is derived from, but may not be limited to, Article I, Section 8.

By Mr. DENT:

H.R. 2903.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the Constitution

By Mr. WHITFIELD:

H.R. 2904.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 18 of the United States Constitution

By Mr. WHITFIELD:

H.R. 2905.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 18 of the United States Constitution

By Mr. FITZPATRICK:

H.R. 2906.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 18

By Mr. WILSON of South Carolina:

H.R. 2907.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8

The Congress shall have the power to provide for the common defense.

By Mr. COLE:

H.R. 2908.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to Article I, Section 8 which allows Congress to regulate trade with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes

By Mr. BISHOP of New York:

H.R. 2909.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3.

By Mr. WAXMAN:

H.R. 2910.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Section 8 of Article I.

By Mr. RUSH:

H.R. 2911.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3

''The Congress shall have Power ''to regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes.''

By Mr. CHAFFETZ:

H.R. 2912.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clause 1 of Section 8 of Article I of the Constitution: 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;

Clause 14 of Section 8 of Article I of the Constitution: To make Rules for the Government and Regulation of the land and naval Forces;

Clause 18 of Section 8 of Article I of the Constitution: 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. BOUSTANY:

H.R. 2913.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Section 8 of Article 1 of the United States Constitution

By Ms. SPEIER:

H.R. 2914.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8: Congress shall have the power to regulate commerce among the states, and provide for the general welfare.

By Mr. COTTON:

H.R. 2915.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The constitutional authority on which this bill rests in the power of Congress:

(1) to regulate commerce with foreign nations, and among the several states, and with the Indian tribes, as enumerated in Article 1, Section 8, Clause 3 of the U.S. Constitution;

(2) to make all laws necessary and proper for executing powers vested by the Constitution in the Government of the United States, as enumerated in Article I, Section 8, Clause 18 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. SHUSTER:

H.R. 2916.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted Congress under Article I of the United States Constitution, including the power granted Congress under Article I, Section 8, Clause 18, of the United States Constitution, and the power granted to each House of Congress under Article I, Section 5, Clause 2, of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. SERRANO:

H.R. 2917.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to Article I, Section 8, Clause 1 of the Constitution, which states that that ''The Congress shall have power to lay and collect taxes, duties, imposts and excises. . . .'' In addition, this legislation is introduced pursuant to Article I, Section 8, Clause 18 of the Constitution, which states that 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 this Constitution in the government of the United States, or in any department or officer thereof.''

By Mr. MCKINLEY:

H.R. 2918.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

According to Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 of the Constitution: The Congress shall have power to enact this legislation to regulate commerce with foreign nations, and among the several states, and with the Indian tribes.

By Mrs. LUMMIS:

H.R. 2919.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 9: No Money shall be drawn from the Treasury, but in Consequence of Appropriations made by Law;

and a regular Statement and Account of the Receipts and Expenditures of all public Money shall be published from time to time.

By Mr. CARTWRIGHT:

H.R. 2920.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8 of the U.S. Constitution relating to the power of Congress to lay and collect taxes, duties, imposts and excises, to pay the debts and provide for the common defense and general welfare of the United States)

By Mr. BLUMENAUER:

H.R. 2921.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill modifies the Internal Revenue Code, which Congress enacted pursuant to its powers under the U.S. Constitution, Article I, Section VIII as well as the 16th Amendment to the U.S. Constitution, and, more generally, its powers to tax and spend for the general welfare. Congress has the power under those provisions to enact this legislation as well.

By Mr. HOLDING:

H.R. 2922.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article III, Section I of the U.S. Constitution.

By Mr. MARCHANT:

H.R. 2923.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1

By Mr. MARCHANT:

H.R. 2924.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1

By Mr. BRADY of Texas:

H.R. 2925.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The constitutional authority on which this bill rests is the power of Congress to make rules for the government and regulation of the land and naval forces, as enumerated in Article I, Section 8, Clause 14 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. ALEXANDER:

H.R. 2926.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Amendment I

Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof; or abridging the freedom of speech, or of the press; or the right of the people peaceably to assemble, and to petition the Government for a redress of grievances.

By Mr. BILIRAKIS:

H.R. 2927.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to Article I, Section 8, Clause 1 of the Constitution of the United States.

By Ms. BROWNLEY of California:

H.R. 2928.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 4.

By Mr. CARNEY:

H.R. 2929.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1

The Congress shall have Power to lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts and Excises, to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defence and general Welfare of the United States; but all Duties, Imposts and Excises shall be uniform throughout the United States.

By Mr. CARSON of Indiana:

H.R. 2930.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following: Clause 7 of section 9 of article I of the Constitution, Clause 1 of section 8 of article I of the Constitution, and clause 18 of section 8 of article I of the Constitution.

By Mr. COBLE:

H.R. 2931.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I Section 8 which authorizes Congress to make rules for the government and regulation of the land.

By Mr. COURTNEY:

H.R. 2932.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8: Congress shall have the Power to . . . coin Money, regulate the Value thereof, and of foreign Coin, and fix the Standard of Weights and Measures . . .

By Mrs. DAVIS of California:

H.R. 2933.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1

By Ms. DELAURO:

H.R. 2934.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 of the United States Constitution and Article I, Section 8, Clause 1 of the United States Constitution

By Mr. FORTENBERRY:

H.R. 2935.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. FOSTER:

H.R. 2936.

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 Defense and general welfare of the United States.

By Mr. HURT:

H.R. 2937.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 of the Constitution of the United States.

By Ms. JENKINS:

H.R. 2938.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8:

The Congress shall have Power To lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts and Excises, to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defense and general Welfare of the United States; but all Duties, Imposts and Excises shall be uniform throughout the United States.

By Mr. KENNEDY:

H.R. 2939.

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.

By Mr. KIND:

H.R. 2040.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I Section 8.

By Mrs. KIRKPATRICK:

H.R. 2941.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18, ''The Congress shall have Power To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by the Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof''

By Mrs. KIRKPATRICK:

H.R. 2942.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18, ''The Congress shall have Power To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by the Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof''

By Mr. LAMBORN:

H.R. 2943.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. LARSEN of Washington:

H.R. 2944.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

As described in Article 1, Section 1 ''all legislative powers herein granted shall be vested in a Congress . . .''

By Mr. LEVIN:

H.R. 2945.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clause 1 of Section 8 of Article 1 of the United States Constitution

By Mr. LOBIONDO:

H.R. 2946.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution

By Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York:

H.R. 2947.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 3, which reads: ''To regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with Indian Tribes.''

By Mr. MATHESON:

H.R. 2948.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 3 of the U.S. Constitution

By Mrs. MCMORRIS RODGERS:

H.R. 2949.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to Congress' legislative powers under Article I, Section 8, clause 3 to regulate Commerce among the several States.

By Mrs. MCMORRIS RODGERS:

H.R. 2950.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to Congress' legislative powers under Article I, Section 8, clause 3 to regulate Commerce among the several States.

By Mrs. MCMORRIS RODGERS:

H.R. 2951.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to Congress' legislative powers under Article I, Section 8, clause 3 to regulate Commerce among the several States.

By Mr. MEEHAN:

H.R. 2952.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

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. MICHAUD:

H.R. 2953.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18—The Congress shall have Power To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by the Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.

By Mr. MILLER of Florida:

H.R. 2954.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article IV, Section III, Clause II

By Ms. MOORE:

H.R. 2955.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8

By Mr. MURPHY of Florida:

H.R. 2956.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1: The Congress shall have Power to lay and collect taxes on incomes, from whatever source derived and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts and Excises, to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defense and general Welfare of the United States; but all Duties, Imposts and Excises shall be uniform throughout the United States.

By Mr. MURPHY of Pennsylvania:

H.R. 2957.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3, commonly referred to for this purpose as the Commerce Clause, which states the following: To regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes.

By Mr. NADLER:

H.R. 2958.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clause 3 of section 8 of article I of the Constitution and clause 18 of section 8 of article I of the Constitution.

By Mr. NUGENT:

H.R. 2959.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The Commerce Clause in Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. PALLONE:

H.R. 2960.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, section 8

By Mr. PASCRELL:

H.R. 2961.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. PAYNE:

H.R. 2962.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The constitutional authority on which this bill rests is the power of Congress to make rules for the government and regulation of the land and naval forces, as enumerated in Article I, Section 8, Clause 14 of the United States Constitution

By Mr. PITTS:

H.R. 2963.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8 of the U.S. Constitution

By Mr. PITTS:

H.R. 2964.

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;

Clause 18: To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in Any Department of Officer thereof

By Mr. PITTS:

H.R. 2965.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clause 1 of Section 8 of Article I of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. RICHMOND:

H.R. 2966.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The Constitutional authority for this bill stems from Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. SCHOCK:

H.R. 2967.

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 as stated in Article I, Section 8 and Article I, Section 9 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. SIRES:

H.R. 2968.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the Constitution.

By Mr. TERRY:

H.R. 2969.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The authority comes from Art. I, Sec. 8, cl. 1, the ''tax and spend clause.'' This clause provides, ''The Congress shall have Power To lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts and Excises, to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defence and general Welfare of the United States; . . .''

By Mr. TIPTON:

H.R. 2970.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article IV, Section 3, Clause 2:

The Congress shall have Power to dispose of and make all needful Rules and Regulations respecting the Territory or other Property belonging to the United States

By Mr. TONKO:

H.R. 2971.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 1,

All legislative Powers herein granted shall be vested in a Congress of the United States, which shall consist of a Senate and House of Representatives.

By Mr. TONKO:

H.R. 2972.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 1,

All legislative Powers herein granted shall be vested in a Congress of the United States, which shall consist of a Senate and House of Representatives.

By Mr. TONKO:

H.R. 2973.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 1,

All legislative Powers herein granted shall be vested in a Congress of the United States, which shall consist of a Senate and House of Representatives.

By Mrs. WALORSKI:

H.R. 2974.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article 1, Section 8 of the United States Constitution.

By Ms. WATERS:

H.R. 2975.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, clause 1 of the U.S. Constitution and

Article 1, Section 8, clause 3 of the U.S. Constitution.

By Ms. WATERS:

H.R. 2976.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, clause 1 of the U.S. Constitution and

Article 1, Section 8, clause 3 of the U.S. Constitution.

By Mr. WHITFIELD:

H.R. 2977.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, section 8, clause 3 of the Constitution.

By Mr. DESANTIS:

H.J. Res. 55.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article V of the U.S. Constitution

By Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York:

H.J. Res. 56.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

''Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following: Article V—Amendment. The Congress, whenever two thirds of both Houses shall deem it necessary, shall propose Amendments to this Constitution, or, on the Application of the Legislatures of two thirds of the several States, shall call a Convention for proposing Amendments, which, in either Case, shall be valid to all Intents and Purposes, as Part of this Constitution, when ratified by the Legislatures of three fourths of the several States or by Conventions in three fourths thereof, as the one or the other Mode of Ratification may be proposed by the Congress; Provided that no Amendment which may be made prior to the Year One thousand eight hundred and eight shall in any Manner affect the first and fourth Clauses in the Ninth Section of the first Article; and that no State, without its Consent, shall be deprived of its equal Suffrage in the Senate.''

By Mr. NEUGEBAUER:

H.J. Res. 57.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Constitutional Amendments Article V

The Congress, whenever two thirds of both Houses shall deem it necessary, shall propose Amendments to this Constitution, or, on the Application of the Legislatures of two thirds of the several States, shall call a Convention for proposing Amendments, which in either Case, shall be valid to all Intents and Purposes, as Part of this Constitution, when ratified by the Legislatures of three fourths of the several States or by Conventions in three fourths thereof, as the one or the other Mode of Ratification may be proposed by the Congress; Provided that no Amendment which may be made prior to the Year One thousand eight hundred and eight shall in any Manner affect the first and fourth Clauses in the Ninth Section of the first Article; and that no State without its Consent, shall be deprived of its equal Suffrage in the Senate.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 60: Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois.
H.R. 148: Mr. ENYART.
H.R. 182: Mr. SIRES.
H.R. 183: Mr. ENYART.
H.R. 262: Mr. HECK of Nevada and Mr. SCHOCK.
H.R. 279: Mr. RUIZ.
H.R. 281: Ms. KAPTUR.
H.R. 292: Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California.
H.R. 301: Mr. GARDNER and Mr. WITTMAN.
H.R. 310: Mr. KILMER.
H.R. 362: Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California.
H.R. 363: Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California.
H.R. 366: Ms. JENKINS and Mr. SCHNEIDER.
H.R. 419: Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania.
H.R. 460: Mr. PERLMUTTER.
H.R. 474: Mr. ELLISON.
H.R. 485: Ms. TSONGAS.
H.R. 491: Mr. SHERMAN.
H.R. 508: Mr. QUIGLEY, Mr. BARBER, and Mr. GIBSON.
H.R. 523: Mr. SMITH of Missouri.
H.R. 525: Mr. RYAN of Ohio.
H.R. 533: Mr. CARTWRIGHT and Mr. DEFAZIO.
H.R. 543: Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California.
H.R. 574: Mr. CLAY.
H.R. 578: Mr. WOMACK.
H.R. 580: Mr. CARTWRIGHT.
H.R. 620: Mr. ELLISON.
H.R. 621: Mr. BARLETTA.
H.R. 647: Mr. PASCRELL, Mrs. MILLER of Michigan, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Ms. FUDGE, Mr. MCDERMOTT, and Mr. NEAL.
H.R. 679: Mr. SCOTT of Virginia.
H.R. 685: Ms. MOORE, Mr. PRICE of Georgia, Mr. AL GREEN of Texas, Mr. KILMER, Mr. NEAL, Mrs. LOWEY, and Mr. WOMACK.
H.R. 690: Mr. BARLETTA and Mr. WALDEN.
H.R. 702: Mr. COHEN and Mr. LANGEVIN.
H.R. 720: Mr. CARTWRIGHT.
H.R. 724: Mr. SWALWELL of California.
H.R. 755: Ms. ESTY.
H.R. 792: Mr. GOWDY.
H.R. 795: Mr. STOCKMAN.
H.R. 846: Mr. NUNNELEE, Mr. COURTNEY, Mr. COHEN, Mr. KLINE, Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas, Ms. FUDGE, Mr. STUTZMAN, and Mr. POCAN.
H.R. 920: Mr. GALLEGO.
H.R. 938: Mr. THORNBERRY.
H.R. 961: Mr. BERA of California.
H.R. 975: Mr. PRICE of North Carolina.
H.R. 1001: Mr. BISHOP of New York and Mr. COLE.
H.R. 1014: Mr. ROTHFUS.
H.R. 1015: Mr. HUFFMAN, Mr. BACHUS, and Mr. BARLETTA.
H.R. 1020: Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. RENACCI, and Mr. WOMACK.
H.R. 1024: Ms. CLARKE, Mrs. MILLER of Michigan, and Ms. KUSTER.
H.R. 1074: Ms. DEGETTE.
H.R. 1091: Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. GOODLATTE, and Mr. MASSIE.
H.R. 1094: Mr. BERA of California and Mr. SERRANO.
H.R. 1105: Mr. MATHESON and Mr. BACHUS.
H.R. 1146: Mr. MCHENRY.
H.R. 1175: Ms. BASS.
H.R. 1176: Mr. WITTMAN.
H.R. 1237: Mr. STIVERS.
H.R. 1249: Mr. GRIFFIN of Arkansas.
H.R. 1250: Mr. COURTNEY, Mrs. MILLER of Michigan, and Ms. ESTY.
H.R. 1252: Mr. COOK, Mr. RUNYAN, and Mr. PEARCE.
H.R. 1276: Mrs. MILLER of Michigan, Mr. FORTENBERRY, Ms. DUCKWORTH, Mr. FARR, and Mrs. CAPPS.
H.R. 1318: Ms. SEWELL of Alabama, Mr. NEAL, and Mr. CLAY.
H.R. 1327: Ms. MCCOLLUM.
H.R. 1346: Mr. LOWENTHAL.
H.R. 1354: Mr. KILMER.
H.R. 1389: Ms. FRANKEL of Florida and Ms. ESTY.
H.R. 1416: Mr. ISRAEL and Mr. WILSON of South Carolina.
H.R. 1428: Mr. GERLACH.
H.R. 1476: Mr. BENTIVOLIO.
H.R. 1518: Ms. PINGREE of Maine.
H.R. 1526: Mr. COFFMAN.
H.R. 1563: Ms. WILSON of Florida.
H.R. 1593: Mr. MEEKS and Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas.
H.R. 1677: Mr. TAKANO, Mr. POCAN, and Mr. ELLISON.
H.R. 1690: Ms. KUSTER, Mr. DEFAZIO, and Ms. SPEIER.
H.R. 1692: Ms. ESTY.
H.R. 1701: Mr. POSEY.
H.R. 1705: Ms. MCCOLLUM and Mr. PETERS of Michigan.
H.R. 1725: Mr. MCNERNEY, Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico, Mr. BARBER, Ms. KELLY of Illinois, and Mr. COHEN.
H.R. 1726: Mr. MARINO, Mr. WOLF, Mr. DESANTIS, and Mrs. LOWEY.
H.R. 1750: Mr. SMITH of Missouri, Mr. BARR, Mr. WOMACK, Mr. COSTA, and Mr. RADEL.
H.R. 1779: Mr. DUFFY, Mr. BARLETTA, and Mr. HANNA.
H.R. 1780: Mr. ROSS.
H.R. 1787: Mr. CLAY, Mr. LONG, Mr. LUETKEMEYER, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, and Mr. GARDNER.
H.R. 1795: Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California and Mr. PALLONE.
H.R. 1798: Mr. O'ROURKE.
H.R. 1801: Mrs. MILLER of Michigan and Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York.
H.R. 1814: Mr. BOUSTANY, Mr. GALLEGO, Mr. FINCHER, and Mr. CLAY.
H.R. 1818: Mr. YOHO.
H.R. 1823: Mr. HONDA and Mr. TIPTON.
H.R. 1825: Ms. GRANGER and Mr. ROGERS of Alabama.
H.R. 1830: Mr. AL GREEN of Texas.
H.R. 1852: Ms. MCCOLLUM.
H.R. 1869: Mr. KILMER and Mr. BENTIVOLIO.
H.R. 1878: Mrs. MILLER of Michigan and Ms. ESTY.
H.R. 1880: Mrs. CHRISTENSEN and Mr. HASTINGS of Florida.
H.R. 1905: Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mrs. WAGNER, Mr. COFFMAN, Mr. HANNA, Ms. CLARKE, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. RUNYAN, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. RICE of South Carolina, and Mr. HASTINGS of Florida.
H.R. 1921: Ms. NORTON and Ms. BASS.
H.R. 1923: Mr. LONG.
H.R. 1967: Mr. COHEN.
H.R. 1979: Mr. KIND.
H.R. 1980: Mr. RIGELL.
H.R. 1985: Mrs. MCMORRIS RODGERS.
H.R. 1998: Mr. VEASEY, Ms. ESTY, and Mr. LARSON of Connecticut.
H.R. 1999: Mr. COFFMAN.
H.R. 2000: Mr. RUIZ, Mr. VELA, Mr. CARNEY, Mrs. NEGRETE MCLEOD, Ms. SPEIER, Mr. ISRAEL, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. ISSA, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, and Mr. SCHIFF.
H.R. 2003: Ms. TITUS.
H.R. 2009: Mrs. NOEM.
H.R. 2012: Mr. SERRANO.
H.R. 2016: Mr. SWALWELL of California, Mr. YOHO, Ms. FUDGE, Ms. CHU, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Ms. HAHN, Ms. KELLY of Illinois, Mr. JEFFRIES, Mr. CÁRDENAS, Mr. JOYCE, Mr. DENHAM, and Mrs. LUMMIS.
H.R. 2018: Mr. LAMALFA.
H.R. 2022: Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana.
H.R. 2026: Mr. RICE of South Carolina.
H.R. 2041: Mr. CAMPBELL.
H.R. 2046: Mr. BARLETTA.
H.R. 2058: Mr. POLLS and Mr. POSEY.
H.R. 2061: Mr. CAMPBELL, Mr. MURPHY of Florida, and Mr. QUIGLEY.
H.R. 2068: Mr. HUFFMAN and Ms. BONAMICI.
H.R. 2072: Mrs. WALORSKI.
H.R. 2083: Mr. COHEN.
H.R. 2101: Mr. LOEBSACK.
H.R. 2116: Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, Ms. NORTON, and Mrs. BEATTY.
H.R. 2130: Mr. COHEN and Ms. KELLY of Illinois.
H.R. 2131: Mr. HULTGREN.
H.R. 2154: Mr. CARTWRIGHT.
H.R. 2175: Mr. BARR.
H.R. 2207: Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois and Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania.
H.R. 2241: Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee and Mr. YODER.
H.R. 2273: Mr. PETERS of Michigan and Mr. BUCSHON.
H.R. 2278: Mr. CALVERT.
H.R. 2302: Mr. ANDREWS, Mr. NUNNELEE, and Mr. CARTWRIGHT.
H.R. 2308: Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD.
H.R. 2317: Mr. DOGGETT.
H.R. 2324: Mr. BLUMENAUER.
H.R. 2328: Mr. ROTHFUS and Mr. ANDREWS.
H.R. 2355: Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois.
H.R. 2356: Mr. TIERNEY.
H.R. 2382: Mrs. WALORSKI.
H.R. 2387: Mr. WALDEN and Mr. BILIRAKIS.
H.R. 2399: Mr. FARENTHOLD.
H.R. 2424: Mr. HIMES.
H.R. 2429: Mr. CALVERT and Mr. BISHOP of Georgia.
H.R. 2445: Mr. WENSTRUP.
H.R. 2453: Mr. ROSKAM.
H.R. 2476: Mr. CARTWRIGHT and Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio.
H.R. 2505: Mr. BLUMENAUER.
H.R. 2509: Ms. NORTON.
H.R. 2510: Mr. VEASEY and Mr. MCGOVERN.
H.R. 2512: Mr. MCGOVERN.
H.R. 2527: Mr. COHEN.
H.R. 2539: Mr. MURPHY of Florida.
H.R. 2540: Mr. RIGELL, Mr. HIMES, Ms. KELLY of Illinois, and Mr. RANGEL.
H.R. 2578: Mr. PETERSON and Mr. GIBSON.
H.R. 2585: Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois.
H.R. 2590: Mr. KILMER, Mr. DELANEY, and Mr. O'ROURKE.
H.R. 2591: Ms. BROWN of Florida, Mr. ENYART, Mr. MEEKS, and Mr. MARCHANT.
H.R. 2633: Mr. FARR, Ms. DELAURO, Mrs. BEATTY, Mr. AL GREEN of Texas, Mr. POCAN, Mr. ELLISON.
H.R. 2654: Mr. COHEN.
H.R. 2663: Ms. MATSUI.
H.R. 2665: Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois.
H.R. 2670: Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico and Mr. TAKANO.
H.R. 2682: Mr.STIVERS.
H.R. 2687: Mr. HALL, Mr. STOCKMAN, Mr. HULTGREN, Mr. COLLINS of New York, and Mr. ROHRABACHER.
H.R. 2691: Ms. ESTY.
H.R. 2694: Mr. KILMER.
H.R. 2710: Mr. FARENTHOLD.
H.R. 2717: Mr. FRANKS of Arizona and Mr. SALMON.
H.R. 2720: Mr. THOMPSON of California.
H.R. 2725: Mr. SARBANES, Mr. VARGAS, Mr. MCNERNEY, Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana, and Mr. YOUNG of Florida.
H.R. 2743: Mr. BENISHEK.
H.R. 2752: Mr. HARRIS.
H.R. 2770: Mr. POCAN.
H.R. 2773: Mr. CONYERS, Mr. QUIGLEY, Mr. BENISHEK, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. PETERS of Michigan, and Mr. NOLAN.
H.R. 2775: Mr. GUTHRIE, Mr. WITTMAN, Mr. CARTER, Mrs. MCMORRIS RODGERS, Mr. SHIMKUS, Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania, Mr. LABRADOR, Mr. ROYCE, Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina, Mr. DENHAM, Mrs. WAGNER, and Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana.
H.R. 2783: Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana, Ms. KAPTUR, and Mr. STIVERS.
H.R. 2799: Mr. HANNA, Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia, and Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois.
H.R. 2804: Mr. MEADOWS.
H.R. 2805: Mr. SMITH of New Jersey and Mr. POCAN.
H.R. 2809: Mr. BISHOP of Utah.
H.R. 2810: Mr. BRALEY of Iowa, Mrs. CAPPS, and Mr. CARTER.
H.R. 2812: Ms. HANABUSA, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. RUSH, Mr. JEFFRIES, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. RANGEL, and Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi.

H.R. 2825: Ms. BASS, Mr. ELLISON, and Mr. PRICE of North Carolina.
H.R. 2826: Mr. PAULSEN.
H.R. 2833: Mr. GOSAR.
H.R. 2835: Mr. TIBERI.
H.R. 2837: Mr. RENACCI.
H.R. 2839: Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, Mr. SWALWELL of California, and Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD.
H.R. 2845: Mr. MICHAUD and Mr. JONES.
H.R. 2851: Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois, Ms. WATERS, Mr. AL GREEN of Texas, Mr. SMITH of Washington, and Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California.
H.R. 2863: Mr. PASCRELL and Mr. PALLONE.
H.R. 2869: Mr. RADEL.
H. J. Res. 20: Ms. HANABUSA.
H. J. Res. 34: Mr. CAPUANO.
H. J. Res. 44: Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois and Mr. VEASEY.
H. J. Res. 50: Mr. CAMP, Mr. FLEISCHMANN, Mr. ROSKAM, Mr. FINCHER, and Mr. BISHOP of Utah.
H. Con. Res. 24: Mrs. WALORSKI, Mr. RAHALL, and Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee.
H. Con. Res. 45: Mr. AMASH. H. Res. 19: Mr. ENGEL.
H. Res. 30: Mr. DINGELL.
H. Res. 36: Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee.
H. Res. 75: Mr. CARTWRIGHT.
H. Res. 109: Ms. GABBARD and Ms. ESTY.
H. Res. 153: Mr. MASSIE. H. Res. 187: Ms. TSONGAS. H. Res. 188: Ms. TSONGAS. H. Res. 227: Mr. CAPUANO. H. Res. 250: Mr. MULLIN, Mr. FARENTHOLD, and Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania.
H. Res. 281: Mr. KENNEDY, Mr . Capuano, Ms. ESTY, Ms. GABBARD, Mr. ROSKAM, Mr. PETERS of Michigan, Mrs. BACHMANN, Mr. RUNYAN, Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. FARR, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. KEATING, Ms. HANABUSA, Mr. OWENS, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, and Mr. DENT.
H. Res. 293: Mr. CALVERT, Mr. ROYCE, Mr. AMODEI, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania, and Mrs. WAGNER.
H. Res. 301: Mrs. MILLER of Michigan.
H. Res. 308: Mr. ISRAEL, Mr. PALLONE, Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, Mr. KEATING, Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN, Mrs. LOWEY, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. KING of New York and Mr. SCOTT of Virginia.
H. Res. 314: Mr. HIMES.

CONGRESSIONAL EARMARKS, LIMITED TAX BENEFITS, OR LIMITED TARIFF BENEFITS

Under clause 9 of rule XXI, lists or statements on congressional earmarks, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits were submitted as follows:

The provisions that warranted a referral to the Committee on Judiciary in H.R. 2879 do not contain any congressional earmarks, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits as defined in clause 9 of rule XXI.

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. 2783: Mrs. DAVIS of California.
H. Res. 319: Mr. HASTINGS of Washington.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 3 of rule XII, petitions and papers were laid on the clerk's desk and referred as follows:

43. The SPEAKER presented a petition of the City of Falls City, Texas, relative to Resolution No. 061213A calling upon our elected officials to affirm the rights of the citzens under the 2nd Amendment; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

44. Also, a petition of the Municipal Assembly of Jayuya, Puerto Rico, relative to Resolution No. 76 expressing the condemnation of the application of the death penalty by the Federal District Court of the United States at the District of Puerto Rico; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

45. Also, a petition of the Municipal Assembly of Jayuya, Puerto Rico, relative to Resolution No. 77 requesting the President to grant the immediate and unconditional release of Oscar Lopez Rivera; to the Committee on the Judiciary.