United States of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 113th CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

Vol. 160 WASHINGTON, WEDNESDAY, MARCH 5, 2014 No. 37

House of Representatives

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

DESIGNATION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

WASHINGTON, DC,
March 5, 2014.

I hereby appoint the Honorable CHARLES J. FLEISCHMANN 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 7, 2014, 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, but in no event shall debate continue beyond 11:50 a.m.

UKRAINE

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

Mr. SHIMKUS. Mr. Speaker, last week I came down to the floor to ask the community of world democracies to provide immediate financial help to the country of Ukraine. I would like to report that the United States has committed a billion dollars, and the European Union has committed, as of the news reports today, another $15 billion.

This is critical in the need to help them get their economy back strong after the incidences over the last couple of months. It is unlikely that Russia will pull back from the Crimea. Prime Minister Putin and Foreign Minister Lavrov have said that they cannot control these self-defense forces. Who are they kidding? Russian soldiers with no unit identification does not qualify them as self-defense forces.

If the world stands by and lets this happen, it will be like Neville Chamberlain in the Sudetenland, quoting ''peace in our time'' as Russia continues to gobble up sovereign states.

I want to applaud the Ukrainian commander who was the only calm man on the peninsula, Colonel Yuliy Mamchuk, when he marched his soldiers to the Belbek airbase to continue the job that they do in securing and fixing the facilities. It was a tough standoff, but Colonel Yuliy was astonished by the change of events in that he has had such a great working relationship with the Russian military over the years, and obviously, this relationship no longer resides in the relationship between Ukraine and Russia.

On September 4 through 5 of this year, the next NATO summit will be held in South Wales. I call upon members of NATO to now do what they should have done in the last summit. NATO now must offer membership action plans to those aspirational countries that are moving towards democracy, freedom, and the rule of law. In particular, they need to grant membership action plans to Ukraine, Georgia, and Moldova.

Now is also the time for us to continue to license LNG facilities so that we can export natural gas to our free and democratic countries around the world, to those who are signatories of the World Trade Organization and also to those who are members of NATO. It is difficult times as you know, Mr. Speaker, but the coalition of free democratic countries must stand united against totalitarianism.

TRANSPORTATION NEEDS

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

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, this is the March Madness season on Capitol Hill, when we in Congress greet thousands of our constituents, many who are here to talk about transportation. It is something that every one of our constituents cares about.

Yesterday, I was able to greet hundreds of cyclists from around the country, and then leaders of America's counties; already this morning I've visited with people from the preservation community and a large delegation from Oregon.

Next week, I will start all over again with the American Public Transit Association. These people are all desperate for a 6-year, fully funded transportation bill, with stable, non-general funded money. They are standing on the edge of a cliff due to Congress' refusal—I almost said inability—to provide necessary funds, if not to do it right, at least to do it adequately.

I came to Congress shortly after the Clinton administration and Congress last raised the gas tax. That was 21 years ago, when gasoline was $1.08 a gallon—and I wonder if Barack had even met Michelle—and there it has remained for 21 years.

Due to inflation and fuel economy increases, the average cost per mile that the American motorist pays to the Federal transportation program has been cut in half.

I went on the Budget, and the Ways and Means Committees for the last 8 years in order to deal with this issue. Frankly, I am tired of waiting. I introduced a gas tax increase, phased in over 3 years, to fully fund a 6-year reauthorization. I was pleased to be joined by friends supporting my bill's introduction—by the U.S. Chamber of Commerce, the AFL–CIO, American

Printed on recycled paper.

Trucking Association, AAA, contractors, transit, local government, environmentalists, road builders.

I find it somewhat ironic that people say this will be a heavy lift, because there is little support for it. When Chairman CAMP offered $150 billion last week in his tax reform bill or President Obama suggested $300 billion, where was their broad base of support? Maybe that is why both proposals were declared dead on arrival in the newspapers the next day.

I had a chance to make my case for both short and long-term funding last week in an amazing conference on America's infrastructure challenges at Harvard Business School. After my presentation, I was followed by the president of the AFL–CIO, Rich Trumka, and the president of the U.S. Chamber, Tom Donohue, who said—you know, they don't agree on much—but they both agree that it is time to raise the gas tax.

One of the best examples of leadership was Bill Graves, the president of the American Trucking Association, who has been eloquent and forceful, including when he was Governor of Kansas and raised the gas tax, saying his industry wants their taxes raised.

The AAA issued a strong statement in support, even though their members are not wild about it, because it is needed.

We run out of money September 30 because we have drained the trust fund. Therefore, the United States Department of Transportation is going to stop shipping out money this summer, which means that we are going to start having local governments holding back on their contracts this spring.

While the truckers and AAA have taken a strong leadership stand—not because it is popular, but because it is needed—I hope we in Congress will stop stalling or dealing with short-term fixes. Let's take a stand to raise the gas tax, have an adult conversation with the American public about how to pay for rebuilding and renewing our communities, put hundreds of thousands of people to work, to improve the safety and morning commute for all Americans.

EATING DISORDERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN) for 5 minutes.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, last week people across the Nation and in 51 other countries around the world came together to raise awareness about eating disorders. It was National Eating Disorders Awareness Week, a time not only to learn the facts but also to give people the knowledge and the resources to treat and prevent eating disorders.

Most people know that eating disorders are common in our country. They may even know about them through experience, whether through a friend, a family member, or perhaps they suffered or continue to struggle with one personally.

What is actually not known is how prevalent they are, the reasons why they occur, and what we can do to prevent these tragic illnesses.

According to the Eating Disorders Coalition, eating disorders impact at least 14 million Americans and are so common that 1 to 2 out of every 100 children in America have one. Although eating disorders affect both men and women, the young and the old, and all the races and economic classes, we know that they are seven times more likely to impact women. In fact, 1 in 200 American women suffers from anorexia, and 2 to 3 in 100 women suffer from bulimia, the two most common eating disorders.

Distinguished by an obsession with thinness and fear of weight gain, anorexia usually results in extreme weight loss because of restricted eating habits.

Bulimia is similar in that those suffering also have an obsession with weight and body image. However, while anorexics restrict their food consumption, bulimics instead purge their food after binge eating.

Both anorexia and bulimia can cause heart problems, brain damage, osteoporosis, and even death. Anorexia has the highest mortality rate of any mental illness, and those suffering from it are 57 more times likely to die of suicide relative to their peers.

Many people are also not aware that they can be genetically predisposed to an eating disorder. As reported by the Eating Disorders Coalition, 50 to 80 percent of the factors determining who develops an eating disorder is based on a person's genes. However, just possessing one of those genes does not automatically result in an eating disorder. Other factors like peer pressure and false advertising can be the ultimate contributors.

More and more academic evidence, as well as a study by the American Medical Association, has linked eating disorders with unrealistic body images found in advertising. By the time our children reach 17 years of age, they will have been exposed to over 250,000 television commercials depicting unrealistic body sizes. Too often, this exposure, combined with other factors like predisposition, feelings of inadequacy, societal pressures, and competition, depression, or anxiety can lead to an eating disorder.

The kinds of altered or photoshopped images found in our media today can cause unrealistic expectations of what the body is supposed to look like, causing emotional, mental, and physical health issues, and often resulting in an eating disorder.

That is why I plan to offer legislation to look at how advertising can more closely resemble the true human form while making sure that artistic expression and the freedom of media outlets is not restricted. If enacted into law, this bill would have the Federal Trade Commission work with stakeholders like the Eating Disorders Coalition and other experts across our Nation to study the serious impact of advertising that promotes unrealistic body image expectations, and then report back to Congress on how to best stop the destructive impact of this practice.

Together, Congress can have a positive impact on the tragic epidemic of eating disorders. I look forward to working with my colleagues to bring this important legislation to the floor soon.

COMMEMORATION OF FERDINAND VINCENT ALLISON, JR.

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

Mr. BUTTERFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I rise this morning to honor the life and work of a remarkable community leader, Ferdinand Vincent ''Pete'' Allison, Jr., who passed on Monday, March 3, at the age of 91. Pete Allison was a pillar in the Durham, North Carolina, community. He was a personable, kind, and effective banking leader who took great pride in his work, but even greater pride in his family. He fought for justice; he fought for equality when and where he could.

Pete Allison successfully used his banking career to enrich the lives of countless individuals through his involvement in many organizations and charities. The sympathies of the House of Representatives are with Pete's entire family during this difficult time.

□ 1015

Mr. Speaker, I last visited Mr. Allison and his family less than 48 hours before his passing. He sat in the family's living room and participated in our very serious conversation. As I departed the home, he told me that he had been so sick, and my response to him was that I knew he had had some difficult days, but that he must know that he was blessed. He was blessed to be surrounded by a loving and supportive wife and family, and he responded that he was aware of that fact.

Mr. Allison was on schedule to have been inducted into the North Carolina Banking Hall of Fame. Only 24 other individuals, Mr. Speaker, have been awarded this great honor in our State.

Pete Allison was a graduate of Hampton Institute—now known as Hampton University—an institution that he loved and revered. Following graduation, he earned a master's of business administration from New York University.

Highly educated, but not sure which career path he would take, Mr. Allison, upon graduation, made a trip to Durham to visit his family, who lived in this historic community.

His father worked at North Carolina Mutual Life Insurance Company. Mr. Allison was awed on that visit. He was awed by Durham and its thriving environment for African American business.

On that visit, Pete became acquainted with a gentleman named John ''Shag'' Stewart, who I remember so well, the president of Mutual Savings and Loan Association there in Durham, and he was offered a job as a teller; but he would become more than a teller. He became chief executive officer in less than 25 years, which was remarkable.

During his tenure at the Savings and Loan Association, he continued to build on the groundbreaking work of other men, like John Merrick, C.C. Spaulding, Aaron McDuffie Moore, Richard Fitzgerald, James E. Shepard, W.J. Kennedy, John Hervey Wheeler, Asa Spaulding, Sr., W.G. Pearson, and many, many others in helping to grow what was known nationally as the ''Black Wall Street.''

Pete Allison served at the helm of Mutual Savings and Loan during the institution's most successful years. He spearheaded the transition from a mutual savings and loan association to a mutual savings bank and also led the acquisitions of American Federal Savings and Loan and Greensboro National Bank.

Mr. Allison was a pillar of the Durham community for more than 60 long years. As one who led by example, his friends and former colleagues praise Mr. Allison for having been a strong and effective leader. Most recently, in 2010, Mr. Allison received the Mechanics and Farmers Bank Founders Award, which recognized his commitment to promoting personal and community development.

Mr. Allison is survived by his lovely wife, Dr. E. Lavonia (Ingram) Allison, and we always like to include the Ingram part because that family also has a rich history. Many of our CBC members know Dr. Allison so very well for her community advocacy.

Like her husband, Dr. Allison received her undergraduate degree from Hampton and her graduate and doctoral degrees from New York University. She was a long-time member and head of the influential Durham Committee on the Affairs of Black People, which I believe is the oldest and most effective political committee in the United States.

Mr. Allison was a faithful member of White Rock Baptist Church in Durham.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, Pete Allison is also survived by two children, Dr. F. Vincent Allison III, his namesake; and Michele Allison-Davis; and his four grandchildren.

Mr. Speaker, today, I ask my colleagues to join me in honoring the life and work of F.V. ''Pete'' Allison, Jr.

POLICIES THAT WORK

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

Mr. MCCLINTOCK. Mr. Speaker, as we begin the annual budget process, we need to stop thinking in terms of Democratic and Republican policies and start thinking in terms of what policies have worked and what policies have not. The successes and failures of both parties could teach us much.

We are now in the sixth year of policies that promise to restore prosperity to America by radically increasing government spending and government intervention in our economy. These 6 years have not been happy ones for our Nation.

When people say this is the worst economy since the depression, I remember a time much more recently when we suffered double-digit unemployment, double-digit inflation, mile-long lines around gas stations, and the prime interest rate at 20.5 percent. Perhaps we don't remember these times as vividly because they didn't last very long.

That was the end of the Carter administration. We elected Ronald Reagan who declared that: ''Government is not the solution to our problem; government is the problem.''

He reduced the tax and regulatory burdens that were crushing the economy and produced one of the most prosperous periods in our Nation's history. In doing so, he was following the precedent of successful presidencies from both parties, including Calvin Coolidge in the 1920s, Harry S. Truman in the mid-1940s, and John F. Kennedy in the early 1960s.

Lest we forget, in 1995, President Bill Clinton proclaimed: ''The era of big government is over.'' He dramatically reduced Federal spending as a percentage of GDP.

He signed what amounted to the biggest capital gains tax cut in American history. He reduced entitlement spending by reforming the open-ended welfare system. He produced 4 years of budget surpluses, and the economy blossomed.

George W. Bush pursued the opposite policies with the opposite results. He dramatically increased Federal spending as a percentage of GDP. He pushed through the biggest expansion of entitlement spending since the Great Society. He began the folly of stimulus spending. He turned in massive budget deficits, and the economy tanked.

The problem with Barack Obama is not that he changed Bush's policies, but, rather, that he did not change them. He took the worst of them and doubled down.

He has added $6.8 trillion to the national debt, meaning that today's young people will have to pay back $56,000, plus interest, per household through their future taxes for nothing more than to pay for this administration's overspending.

He seized one-sixth of the American economy that provides our health care and is well on the way to wrecking it for millions of American families, costing them their health plans, their doctors, their savings, and their security. He has increased annual taxes by $551 billion. That averages about $4,600 for every household in America.

He made a lot of promises that turned out not to be true. He promised that massive government spending would produce prosperity. Instead, average personal incomes declined $2,600 during his presidency, and food stamp dependency is at an all-time high.

Nearly one in six Americans is now living in poverty, including 22 percent of all children. The workforce has shrunk to a smaller proportion of the population, as it was during the disastrous Carter years.

He promised a government takeover of our health care would reduce our health costs and increase coverage for Americans. It has done exactly the opposite. Millions more American families have lost their health plans and their doctors than have gained them, and the overwhelming majority has suffered ruinous increases in their health care costs.

The result is a declining standard of living at home, a declining respect for America abroad, and a generation in danger of becoming the first in our history to be less well off than their parents.

Mr. Speaker, our own experience should now tell us that these policies don't work. They didn't work under George W. Bush, and they certainly haven't worked under Barack Obama. We know what does work, reducing the financial and regulatory burdens that government has placed on the economy, as both Ronald Reagan and Bill Clinton proved.

It is time that we abandon these policies of debt, doubt, and despair. It is time we recognize that this government has grown too big and too powerful at the expense of hardworking taxpayers. It is time we restored those uniquely American principles of individual liberty, constitutionally limited government, and personal responsibility that have always been the foundation of our Nation's freedom, its prosperity, and its happiness.

QUIZ: WHO IS THE ''DEPORTER-IN-CHIEF''?

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

Mr. GUTIERREZ. Mr. Speaker, I have come to the floor to discuss a very serious illness afflicting Members of the U.S. House of Representatives. Dana Milbank of The Washington Post diagnosed it as ''Obama derangement syndrome.''

Milbank defined the syndrome as an affliction in which: ''The President's opponents are so determined to thwart him that they will reverse long-held views if they believe it will weaken his stature.''

I would define it as a broader and more serious condition, the irrational fear that the 44th President of the United States of America is something he is not.

From a public health standpoint, the news is pretty bad. Those of us concerned with the long-term health of the

body politic have identified an aggressive fact-resistant strain of Obama derangement syndrome that affects how the Republican Caucus views immigration enforcement.

Remember, the Republicans are currently sitting on their hands when it comes to immigration reform because they say they cannot trust the President of the United States to enforce immigration laws.

Well, I thought it would be a good time to offer a quiz to determine just how fact-resistant the current epidemic of Obama derangement syndrome really is.

Here we have the last three Presidents of the United States: Bill Clinton, George Bush, and Barack Obama. Mr. Speaker, let's test our knowledge of how much or how little they have enforced the immigration laws of the United States during their terms.

Question one: Which President deported a population slightly larger than the population of the entire State of Nebraska, with almost 2 million deported so far?

Barack Obama has deported more people than the number living in the entire State of Nebraska. No one has deported more people. A star for first place goes to Barack Obama.

Question two: Who expanded immigration enforcement by local law enforcement a hundredfold? One of these Presidents expanded the Secure Communities program for deporting immigrants who are booked into local jails from 31 jurisdictions in this Nation to over 3,000.

And who was that? Yes, President Barack Obama, another dubious star.

Question number three: Let's go to ''boots on the ground,'' where the immigration issue seems to begin and end for many Republicans. Who spent more money on immigration enforcement than all other Federal law enforcement combined? Well, if you guessed Barack Obama, you would be right.

Yes, the $18 billion he spends is $3.5 billion more every year than we spend on the FBI, ATF, DEA, and Secret Service—all of them combined—in order to achieve what? Unprecedented deportations, so he gets another star.

Question four: What crimes are the most prosecuted crimes in Federal court? Do you think kidnapping, murder, counterfeiting, political corruption?

No. Under Barack Obama, the number one crime prosecuted as a misdemeanor is being illegally in this country. And the number one crime prosecuted as a felony in Federal courts is what? Illegal reentry to the United States. He gets another star.

Finally, for question five, we get to detention. Which of these Presidents put more than 420,000 people in detention in just one single year of his presidency? Yes, arrested and put them in jail.

President Barack Obama has detained more immigrants in jails, prisons, and detention facilities than any other President of the United States of America.

That is five for five, and it goes to the deporter-in-chief, Barack Obama; but because Obama derangement syndrome is so fact-resistant, I am not optimistic I have convinced anybody this morning, but tell that to the more than 5,000 American citizen children who today sit in foster care because their moms or dads have been deported.

Mr. Speaker, let's be clear. The immigrant community is organized and will continue to pressure Republicans and the President until this unprecedented wave of deportation ends.

Republicans can either be participants in how this country advances more sensible immigration policies, or they can just simply sit on the sidelines while the President does it with his phone and his pen.

And secondly, if we pass immigration reform in this body today, most of the new reforms won't take place for about 2 years. Obama won't even be President of the United States of America.

In fact, if Republicans continue to insist on making immigration reform a football in their game against the current President, they are all but guaranteeing that the President in 2 years will not be a member of your party—not a member of the Republican Party—and could very well be the wife of one of these three gentlemen.

HARRY REID V. JUSTIN CARTER RE: OBAMACARE

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

Mr. BROOKS of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, in September of 2013, Democrat Senate Majority Leader HARRY REID sought to marginalize and denigrate Americans who believe in America's foundational principles by calling them anarchists and fanatics.

□ 1030

Their offense? They exercised their First Amendment freedom of speech rights by speaking out against and opposing ObamaCare and socialized medicine.

In February 2014, Democrat Senate Majority Leader HARRY REID sought to marginalize and denigrate Charles Koch and Dave Koch by calling them ''as un-American as anyone that I can imagine.'' Their offense? They exercised their freedom of speech rights by exposing how badly ObamaCare hurts millions of Americans.

Also in February 2014, Democrat Senate Majority Leader HARRY REID brazenly proclaimed that all those pesky Americans who dare exercise their freedom of speech rights by complaining about ObamaCare are all telling lies. Mr. REID said:

> There's plenty of horror stories being told. All of them are untrue, but they're being told all over America.

Mr. REID's calling Americans liars puts me in a quandary because north Alabama citizens often complain to me about ObamaCare. Who should I believe, Senate Majority Leader HARRY REID or north Alabama citizens?

This week, Justin Carter of C&C Fabrication, a 47-year-old family-owned business in Laceys Spring, Alabama, told me:

> C&C Fabrication was formed by two brothers, Ray and C.M. Carter, in 1967 and is today a small, family-owned and family-operated business. Through hard work and strong leadership, C&C has grown to over 100,000 square feet, with 51 skilled workers. Even as the ObamaCare corporate mandate has been delayed, its imminent implementation forces C&C to make very serious, very real decisions regarding its future. C&C's health care premiums increased by over 10 percent in October 2013. C&C has been notified that an additional 15 percent increase is coming in October 2014.
>
> These increases will cost C&C almost $70,000 per year in increased health care premiums alone, and these increases do not even fully capture the impact of the corporate mandates. In order to fully comply with ObamaCare, C&C must restructure its benefits package for all employees, as well as each worker's hourly pay rate. These increased costs could rise as high as $160,000 per year.
>
> Failure to comply with ObamaCare will result in over $120,000 per year in fines for C&C; however, noncompliance could actually be the most prudent, most financially sound method of survival for C&C but at a cost to its employees in the form of benefit reductions, many of whom have been employed by C&C for decades. This would force C&C employees to the exchanges to buy plans with worse coverage and with higher deductibles than is currently provided to them by C&C.
>
> The sad reality is that because of ObamaCare and uncertain economic times, C&C will likely have only one feasible choice for the survival of the company, and that is to ensure that its corporate size stays below the limit of 50 employees. While this will exempt C&C Fabrication from ObamaCare and help it survive, it will also sacrifice the jobs of valued employees and cap the earning potential of the company, ensuring that this small business will not grow or create jobs.
>
> C&C has been fortunate to serve the community into its third generation and has taken pride in the work it performs. Many hardworking individuals have given service to C&C, and, in turn, C&C has done its very best to provide them with a living. However, ObamaCare mandates have the potential to derail C&C's future and greatly threaten its survival.

So who is telling the truth about how badly ObamaCare is damaging America? Justin Carter, a north Alabama citizen and job creator, or Democrat Senator HARRY REID, who is desperate to keep his job even to the point of denigrating American citizens who dare to exercise their freedom of speech rights? Well, I know Justin Carter and the Carter family, and I know HARRY REID. Quite frankly, I believe Justin Carter of north Alabama is telling the truth about ObamaCare hurting Americans. And, Mr. Speaker, it is not a close call.

SUPPORTING UKRAINE'S FUTURE

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

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in continued support of the sovereignty and territorial integrity of the nation of Ukraine and stand with the people of that country for their liberty and full human rights.

The first objective of international efforts to calm Ukraine must be the overriding goal of no more bloodshed. The world community of nations must step up forcefully to affirm Ukraine's new government, and not just for the sake of tomorrow.

Morally, nations that had supported Soviet dictator Joseph Stalin or were bystanders to communism and Naziism that slaughtered millions and millions of people inside those borders owe Ukraine an historical debt. No place on Earth suffered more. As the demonstrators on Maidan have proven, tyrants and corrupt officials couldn't kill Ukraine's people's longing for freedom and liberty.

This is Ukraine's moment, and it is a breakpoint in liberty's march that history will judge.

Where do we go from here? Our path must be diplomatic, economic, humanitarian, and military. Diplomatically, the international community must affirm Ukraine and her interim government. I commend President Obama and Secretary Kerry for their leadership. Yesterday, the OSCE announced that 18 participating countries will send 35 unarmed military observers to Ukraine. Let them reveal the truth.

Countries with large Ukrainian diaspora, like our country, along with Poland, Canada, Argentina, Italy, Portugal, Australia, the United Kingdom, and Kazakhstan, should seek constructive means to help.

Further, the world community and OSCE should assure sufficient election monitors are recruited and trained for the upcoming elections in Ukraine on May 25. Then, economically, the world community should proceed to work through Ukraine's financial challenges. However, any financial assistance to Ukraine should be contingent on repayment, and Ukraine's new government must clearly define performance standards and lay out a reasonable plan to repay any foreign aid.

Transitioning from a kleptocracy to a functioning state will require technical assistance, management expertise, and loaned personnel from governments throughout the world. In addition, the United States and other nations should impose targeted financial, economic, trade, and travel sanctions on Russian assets on a timetable that demonstrates our resolve.

The United Nations and global supporters of Ukraine must respond if Ukraine requests humanitarian relief to those places most in need. As long as Russian aggression persists, its participation in the G8 should be suspended. And, finally, militarily, the parties to the 1994 Budapest accords should enforce that agreement.

In addition, Ukraine exists in an inferior military posture to its more powerful neighboring states. To remedy this shortcoming, NATO should create a new category of provisional membership for nations whose military has fought alongside NATO member forces in the war on terrorism. Ukraine has.

As a true borderland region, Ukraine is positioned to be truly a bridge between East, West, North, and South in that most important region of Central Europe. The free world must walk with Ukraine as she moves toward a more free and democratic future. There is no turning back.

SEVENTH CENTURY RELIGIOUS PERSECUTION

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

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Speaker, much ink has been used regarding Secretary of State John Kerry's comments this weekend characterizing Vladimir Putin's outrageous incursion into Ukraine as a ''19th century act in the 21st century.'' But if we are looking through the lens of history, it is also worth noting what a small community of Syrian Christians has been forced to endure.

Writing in National Review Online this week, stalwart religious freedom advocate Nina Shea authored a piece, headlined, ''Syrian Jihadists Are Forcing Christians to Become Dhimmis Under Seventh-Century Rules.'' Shea notes:

> The religious persecution in Syria deepened this week, as evidenced by a written ultimatum purportedly distributed by the rebel jihadist group ISIS, Islamic State of Iraq and Syria, to Christians in the northern providence capital of Raqqa.
>
> Rejecting conversion to Islam or death, some 20 Christian leaders of that city held firm in their faith and submitted to the Islamists' demands to live by as dhimmis.

Shea continued to explain the implications of this status. She said:

> Under this arrangement, in exchange for their lives and the ability to worship as Christians, they must abide by purported seventh-century rules of Caliph Umar.
>
> According to the Raqqa ultimatum, these include bans on renovating and rebuilding churches and monasteries, many of which need repair because they have been shelled and blown up over the past 3 years, and bans against the public display of crosses and Christian symbols and the ringing of bells.

She went on to say:

> They are forbidden from reading Scripture indoors loud enough for Muslims outside to hear, and the practice of their faith must be confined within the walls of their remaining churches, not exercised publicly at, for example, weddings or funerals.

Many have remarked that Raqqa was once one of Syria's most liberal cities. Its Christian community numbered about 3,000 before the conflict. They have since been devastated by violence and migration. Their exact number today is unknown.

This month marks the anniversary of the uprising which eventually spiraled into the war and violence which has terrorized Syria for 3 years now. Muslims and Christians alike have experienced horrific violence. But, as Shea quotes:

> The Christians who remain in Raqqa must now bear the additional suffering of dhimmitude.

Their plight, while more stark, given the official nature of their subjugation, parallels, in many ways, that of other besieged religious minorities, specifically Christians throughout the broader Middle East.

The latest outrage finally garnered a statement from the Department of State's spokesman. But a statement provides little solace to a people facing death, forced conversion, or, in the case of these Christian leaders who refused to abandon their faith, an exacting toll to abide by the dictates of their conscience.

Such an outrage demands a response from policymakers and faith leaders alike. I have joined with Congresswoman ANNA ESHOO and others in sending a letter to Secretary Kerry urging the Department of State to cooperate with a Syria Study Group to be facilitated by the Washington, D.C.-based Atlantic Council. The study group would be charged with producing a report as quickly as possible that would help the administration and Congress identify and implement ways for bringing this crisis to a close in a manner fully consistent with the interests and the political transition objectives of the United States. Surely the protection of ancient faith communities like Syria's Christian community is one such interest.

Meanwhile, I believe that it is critical for the faith community in the West, specifically the Church in America, to find its voice on behalf of our marginalized and persecuted brothers and sisters abroad, be they in Syria, Egypt, or Iraq. I meet regularly with representatives of these groups. They are desperate for help, or at least the solidarity, and they cannot understand the seeming lack of urgency by their brethren here in America, and, frankly, nor can I.

HONORING DALLAS COUNTY HIGH SCHOOL, ALABAMA'S CLASS 4A STATE BASKETBALL CHAMPIONS 2014

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

Ms. SEWELL of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to honor the Dallas County High School Hornets on winning the State of Alabama title in the class 4A State basketball championship on Saturday, March 1, 2014. On behalf of the Seventh Congressional District, I pay honor and tribute to the Hornets for their exemplary athleticism and teamwork, as well as the outstanding leadership of Head Coach Willie Moore and his coaching staff.

Dallas County High School's basketball championship victory capped off

an impressive season of 28 wins and 4 losses. With each victory during the season, the team remained humble and grounded. In every game, these young men and the coaching staff pursued excellence and were driven by hard work, determination, and teamwork.

Throughout the season, Coach Willie Moore encouraged the team by quoting Whitney Young, Jr.:

> It is better to be prepared for an opportunity and not have one than to have an opportunity and not be prepared.

The Hornets finished the 2013–2014 season undefeated in their region and lost only four games overall. To earn their place in the championship title game, Dallas County beat other high school teams during the tournament, including Madison County, Dora, Bibb County, and Beauregard.

□ 1045

On March 1, 2014, the Dallas County Hornets came to the 4A State Championship prepared for the opportunity they had earned. The championship game against J.O. Johnson High School from Huntsville, Alabama, was a nail-biter from start to finish. The Hornets never gave up, even when they were behind. At halftime, the Hornets were down by 11 points, but in the third quarter, the Hornets made a thrilling comeback.

Senior William Lee made a 3-pointer at the regulation buzzer to force the game into overtime. The 6′9″ standout and UAB signee William Lee continued to show dominance during the overtime by making three crucial free throws with 5.4 seconds to play. The Hornets won a 51–48 victory, taking the Class 4A High School Boys State Championship. William Lee scored 22 points, made 13 rebounds and seven blocks.

As the daughter of a high school basketball coach, I know that this decisive victory is the result of a tremendous effort on the part of all the players and the coaching staff at Dallas County High School. Spurred on by an enthusiastic student body and encouraging faculty and families, this team proved that outstanding achievements are possible even in rural Black Belt Alabama. I couldn't be prouder of this amazing accomplishment.

The State high school basketball championship victory is truly a reflection of the hard work and steadfast determination of the entire team and coaching staff. Members of the team include Jayden Buford, Scott Cole, Raheem Phillips, Kendell Motley, Jerrod Moorer, Henry Baker, Timothy Baker, Travon Muse, Javaris Muse, B.J. Leshore, William Lee, Ladarius Furlow, and Lowell Furlow.

I would like to also acknowledge and pay tribute to the head coach, Willie Moore, and assistant coaches, Cliff Nix, Charles Thompson, Kenny Allen, Justin Moore, and Hugh Martin for their outstanding work.

On behalf of the Seventh Congressional District, the State of Alabama, and this Nation, I ask my colleagues to join me in celebrating the accomplishments of the Dallas County High School basketball team for their victory in Alabama's Class 4A State Basketball Championship. We honor and pay tribute to this team, the coaches and the school for this distinguished honor, and we appreciate their contributions to the school spirit and the community pride that we have in them.

Congratulations, and go Hornets.

RESTRICTIONS ON RELIGIOUS FREEDOMS AROUND THE WORLD

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

Mr. BYRNE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in this House on Ash Wednesday to talk about a problem that should be heavy on the hearts of everyone in this body and around the Nation, and that is the persecution of Christians around the world.

Millions of Christians will start their Lenten period of fasting and penitence today, and over the next several weeks will act out their faith leading up to Holy Week, when we remember the death and crucifixion of Jesus, and then the feast of Easter, his resurrection.

Sadly, in too many parts of the world, Christians will not be allowed to openly profess their faith and act out the things that for centuries Christians have been able to do.

This chart on my left, which was prepared by the Pew Research Center, shows that around the world there is religious persecution, but it is particularly bad in Asia and, sadly, in the Middle East, the very part of the world where Jesus came from.

This next chart from the same source shows that the problem is getting worse, not better. Sadly, we are seeing that the perpetrators are now more frequently governments than private individuals in these countries. The bottom part of this chart tells us the saddest news of all: the most likely people in the world to be persecuted for their religious beliefs are Christians. This is a little-known fact to many people. For some reason, the news media has not been willing to cover it as well as they should have been, but perhaps during this season of Lent in preparation for Easter, it is a time when all of us can understand that this is a real problem, a humanitarian problem, a problem for the rights and freedoms of people all over the world.

Now, there is something we can do about it, but we need to understand the problem more specifically to do so.

This last chart perhaps is the most troubling of all. In 1914, Christians made up about 20 percent of the entire population of the Middle East. By 2013, they made up only 4 percent. In Iraq since 2003, almost a million Christians have fled that country. Since the troubles began in Syria in 2011, half a million Christians have fled. In Egypt since the troubles there in 2011, 100,000 Coptic Christians have left that country.

Now, if you look at what is happening in Iraq and Egypt, that should be of particular concern to us because we will send this year to each of those two countries in aid over $1 billion. That is taxpayer money that has been brought to our government and that we send to those countries from the people of the United States of America. I believe we should exercise a different foreign policy. Not only should we state that we are going to stand up for the protection of religious minorities around the world that are persecuted, but in countries like Iraq and Egypt where we send hundreds of millions of dollars of aid, we should demand it, and we should demand it not just because we are a country in which the majority of people are Christians but because it is the right thing to do, and we have historically done that as a Nation.

As we go toward Holy Week and people around the world remember that Jesus Christ himself was persecuted to death, and for centuries thereafter throughout the Roman Empire, throughout what we today call the Middle East, Christians were persecuted, we need to make sure that the clock is not going to be rolled back, as it clearly is today. The United States of America, our President, our Secretary of State, this body, the entire Congress, and the American people should do what we have traditionally done, and that is to stand up for the rights of people around the world. In this particular context, that means standing up for Christians who are being persecuted and killed merely because of their beliefs.

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 52 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:

Dear Lord, we give You thanks for giving us another day.

We use this moment to be reminded of Your presence and to tap the resources needed by the Members of this people's House to do their work as well as it can be done.

As the world observes the tensions mounting within Ukraine and Venezuela, may we all note well the crippling effects of ideological divides

when a shared sense of national unity might bring greater hope and possible solution to serious political problems.

Send, O God, Your healing grace upon those torn nations and upon the Members of this assembly who struggle to see the shared hope for a better future in those with whom they disagree.

All this day and through the week, may our Representatives do their best to find solutions to pressing issues facing our Nation. Please hasten the day when justice and love shall dwell in the hearts of all peoples and rule the affairs of the nations of Earth.

May all that is done this day be for Your greater honor and glory.

Amen.

THE JOURNAL

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

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

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER. Will the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. FITZPATRICK) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance?

Mr. FITZPATRICK 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 up to 15 requests for 1-minute speeches on each side of the aisle.

AMERICA'S MILITARY STRENGTH

(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, yesterday, the President unveiled his budget and used the military as a punching bag to push his Big Government programs.

According to a recent Charleston Post and Courier editorial:

> Congress should proceed with extreme caution before going along with the latest recommendations for ''savings'' through deep defense cuts. If America rapidly retreats from world power status, our enemies will jump into the void. We can't unilaterally end the Islamic radical terrorists' war on us, and we shouldn't ignore history lessons about what happens when the United States tries to isolate itself from the menaces that threaten the international community.

At a time when threats are increasing and countries on nearly every continent are in turmoil, it is naive for the President to downgrade our military strength. Maintaining our national defense is the primary function of the national government.

I find it dangerous that the President has suggested this proposal which places American families at risk of further attacks. We should follow the advice of the Veterans of Foreign Wars. Our Nation is still at war. Peace through strength.

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

REMEMBERING DR. DON WILL

(Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California. Madam Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to a true champion for education, Donald Will, who passed away this past February. Dr. Donald Will was a fervent advocate of peace and influenced Chapman University's role in promoting peace and the study of peacemaking.

A member of the Chapman faculty since 1987, Don was described as a pillar of the Chapman community for over 25 years. He came to Chapman University when it needed his expertise most, and the world needed his peace expertise, and he has had such a magnificent effect that lasts until now.

During his time with Chapman, Dr. Will put all of his heart and time from his academic and personal life into carrying out the pursuit of peace. And don't we need it today in our world?

His commitment to his students and to the value of peaceful relations shone brightly through his teachings. He leaves a lasting legacy of humility, humanity, and dedication as he strengthened the link between school and home, both locally, nationally, and in an international way.

I am honored to have known and to have worked with Dr. Donald Will, and I ask my colleagues to honor him today.

ALL-OF-THE-ABOVE ENERGY STRATEGY

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

Mr. BOEHNER. Madam Speaker and my colleagues, I know the whole House is paying close attention to the crisis in Ukraine. What is going on there is more than a cause for concern. It is a cause for action. America has a responsibility to stand up for freedom around the globe, and the House will work with the administration to support the Ukrainian people and confront Russian aggression.

In fact, the House has already taken serious steps in this regard. For years, we have been pursuing an all-of-the-above energy strategy. It is part of our focus on the floor this week, in fact. Because developing our own resources doesn't just bring jobs home, it strengthens America abroad.

Last month, the Energy and Commerce Committee released a report that says:

> By becoming a natural gas exporter, the U.S. can supplant the influence of other exporters, like Russia and Iran, while strengthening ties with our allies and trading partners around the world.

The key word in that statement is ''can.'' We can supplant Russia's influence, but we won't, so long as we have to contend with the Energy Department's achingly slow approval process.

As we speak, the administration is sitting on 24 applications for natural gas exports. It has approved just six in the last 3 years. Now, this amounts to a de facto ban that only emboldens Vladimir Putin, allowing him to sell large quantities of natural gas to our allies.

The American people have seen the threat that Mr. Putin puts forward. They know something must be done. The President should do the right thing here and end this de facto ban, so that we can strengthen both our economy and our security here and abroad.

THE BUFFALO NIAGARA INTERNATIONAL AIRPORT

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

Mr. HIGGINS. Madam Speaker, in a recent nationwide realignment, the Transportation Security Administration made the decision to consolidate all administrative functions for its upstate region at the Albany Airport.

I believe this decision was misguided and illogical. In all of the other proposed consolidations around the country, smaller airports are being made subordinate to larger airports; but in this case, inexplicably, the TSA proposes to make the Buffalo/Niagara Falls International Airport subordinate to Albany, despite the fact that Buffalo's airport has twice the passenger volume as Albany.

Furthermore, nearly 40 percent of passengers flying out of Buffalo are Canadians and other foreign nationals, which would seem to necessitate a more complex TSA operation.

Mr. Speaker, TSA's rollout of this proposed change has been full of inconsistencies and contradictions, and that is why I have asked TSA to reconsider this flawed decision and consolidate operations where it makes sense, in Buffalo.

TUBEROUS SCLEROSIS COMPLEX RESEARCH

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

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Madam Speaker, as a member of the Rare Disease Congressional Caucus, I rise today in support of continued funding for tuberous sclerosis complex research in the fiscal year 2015 Department of Defense Appropriations Act.

TSC is a genetic condition that afflicts an estimated 50,000 Americans,

causing tumors in the kidneys, lungs, liver, heart, eyes, skin, and brain. Researchers have linked TSC to seizures, autism, and severe intellectual disability.

Research on this condition is also having a notable impact on our understanding of traumatic brain injury and other medical conditions, like cancer and diabetes.

The TSC program at the Department of Defense is critical to our continued understanding of this condition.

With me on the floor today, Mr. Speaker, is a beautiful little girl, Stephanie from Pennsylvania, who has been diagnosed with TSC.

Her brave spirit brings light to the importance of this cause and helps remind us of others living with this condition across the United States.

It is crucial that we continue to band together as a community and a legislative body to support this significant research initiative.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN). The Chair reminds Members not to refer to persons on the floor as guests of the House.

DEEPENING THE SAVANNAH HARBOR

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

Mr. BARROW of Georgia. Madam Speaker, I rise in great disappointment that the President's budget makes no provision for deepening the Savannah harbor.

The Port of Savannah is one of the busiest in the country and is a major throughway for all sorts of essential goods coming in and out of the country. The State of Georgia has collaborated with the Federal Government to ensure that the port is deepened to accommodate the larger ships that will soon come through the expanded Panama Canal.

After decades of study, State and local stakeholders, congressional authorizers and appropriators, the Corps of Engineers, the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, and the EPA have all endorsed this project as technically feasible, economically justified, cost-effective, environmentally responsible, and in the national interest.

Vice President BIDEN recently visited Savannah and promised we would get this project done, ''come hell or high water.'' Only OMB now stands in the way.

This project makes sense to almost everyone who has studied it. I share the frustration of my constituents that it continues to be stalled by bureaucracy, and I urge the President to lead, follow, or get out of the way of the effort to make this project happen.

NUCLEAR ENERGY

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

Mr. WILLIAMS. Madam Speaker, as a business owner of 42 years, I know a few things about job creation, and with more than 10 million Americans out of work, it is time to energize the energy business. We need to let the private sector drive our initiatives and promote the advancement of safe nuclear energy.

Nuclear power sustains 100,000 high-paying jobs, and 2,000 of those are in Texas facilities. In my district, the 25th District of Texas, there are hundreds of highly skilled workers at the Comanche Peak Nuclear Plant who are doing a great job and are doing great things to promote this clean, reliable, and inexpensive energy source, less expensive than coal or natural gas.

Texas plays a vital national and international role in the development of new technologies and is among the 10 States with the greatest nuclear power generation capacity in the whole country.

Nuclear energy should play a major role in our Nation's all-inclusive energy plan, and that is why our policies should support it. Nuclear creates good jobs, puts billions of dollars into our economy, and is a safe, clean, and reliable energy source we simply can't afford to ignore. Let's move forward. In God we trust.

JOHN BUHRMASTER'S ICBA NOMINATION

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

Mr. TONKO. Madam Speaker, I rise today to congratulate John Buhrmaster, who is president of 1st National Bank of Scotia in the capital region of New York, upon his nomination as chairman of the Independent Community Bankers of America, here in Washington, D.C.

The Independent Community Bankers of America represents almost 7,000 community banks across our great Nation, financial institutions that provide opportunity for our local small businesses and family farms to expand operations, develop surrounding economies, and hire locally.

John will provide steady leadership for an 11-person executive panel that draws expertise and know-how from across the Nation to support our small banks.

Again, I congratulate Mr. Buhrmaster on his appointment, and I look forward to working with him to boost small financial institutions and their important role in economic expansion on a community level.

□ 1215

CELEBRATING THE CENTENNIAL OF THE COOPERATIVE EXTENSION SERVICE

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

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Madam Speaker, this year marks the 100th anniversary of the Smith-Lever Act of 1914, which established the Cooperative Extension Service. Extension is a unique educational partnership among Federal, State, and local governments and the Nation's land-grant universities to extend research-based knowledge to the American public and private industry.

Over the years, Extension has connected individuals and families with the resources and expertise of our Nation's land-grant university system. In Pennsylvania, Pennsylvania State University provides this educational network, working to help families make sound economic and nutritional choices, and help businesses increase efficiency and troubleshoot production and industry challenges.

Madam Speaker, today, the Penn State College of Agricultural Sciences is on the Hill with agricultural businesses and industry advocates to share with us the importance of the Cooperative Extension Service.

As we celebrate the 100th anniversary of the Smith-Lever Act, I want to give congratulations and recognition to the outstanding Penn State Extension team, which is led by Interim Dean Barb Christ, and thank them for their important work to improve the lives and economic outcomes of countless families and businesses across the country.

WOMEN'S HISTORY MONTH

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

Ms. HAHN. Madam Speaker, this month we join together as a nation to celebrate Women's History Month. We pay tribute to the generation of women whose courage, perseverance, and leadership have helped build our great Nation—from everyday working mothers to women like civil rights icon Rosa Parks and labor activist Dolores Huerta. Our journey would not be possible without these great women and so many others who proudly took the seat at the table and at the front of the bus to chart the way for our Nation's progress.

But, while progress has been made in gender equality, we still have a lot more work to do when two-thirds of the minimum wage workers are women in this country and nearly one-third of families headed by a single female are living in poverty.

Instead of simply using Women's History Month to highlight the contributions of women leaders, let's take this

opportunity to examine the current challenges facing our mothers, our sisters, and our daughters and ensure that these women have workplace protections such as equal pay, affordable child care, and medical leave.

Our success as a nation hinges on the success of women, because we know that when women succeed, America succeeds.

IN THE COMPANY OF WOMEN ANNUAL CELEBRATION

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

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, it is with great pleasure that I recognize the hardworking women leaders who, throughout the years, have made instrumental contributions to the district I so humbly represent and to our entire south Florida community, in fact.

On March 13, the Miami-Dade County Commission for Women, the Parks Foundation of Miami-Dade, and the Miami-Dade Parks, Recreation and Open Spaces Department will be hosting the In the Company of Women Awards in celebration of Women's History Month. This annual celebration honors some of the exceptional women in our community in fields like the arts, communications, government, and athletics.

The 12 honorees this year will join the ranks of many outstanding women, including my late mother, Amanda Ros, who was honored during their third annual In the Company of Women celebration. As a fellow recipient of this award also, I am pleased that the great passion and dedication of these women leaders will be recognized, and it will inspire them to do even better work. Their many accomplishments are an example of what women everywhere can strive to attain.

Congratulations to each award winner.

THE PRESIDENT'S BUDGET REQUEST

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

Mr. MORAN. Mr. Speaker, yesterday, the President submitted a very modest but responsible budget request. It contains a host of very good ideas that should move this country forward and that this Congress ought to embrace. For example, on both sides of the aisle, we agree that we ought to eliminate the waste of resources. But the greatest waste of resources is the waste of human potential, and it starts in the earliest years.

So the President would extend access to prekindergarten education for all of our children, because he knows that that will enable us to have a far more prosperous economy and a more cohesive society, and he would pay for it with revenue from tobacco taxes—a great idea.

Similarly, he would take the $4 billion in subsidies we give the oil and gas industry and invest it in new and cleaner alternative energy. He would take $300 billion and invest it in surface infrastructure. I was just over in Uzbekistan this month. They have a faster, more modern rail system than we do, as does China.

Those are the kinds of good ideas that can move this country forward that this Congress should embrace.

PAYING TRIBUTE TO CLYDE HOWELL OF RICHVALE, CALIFORNIA

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

Mr. LAMALFA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to remember and ask this House to adjourn in the memory of a dear friend from Richvale, California, Clyde Howell, who passed away on January 29. He was a longtime community leader.

Early in his life, he served in our United States Air Force in World War II. Clyde was born in Chesterfield, Idaho, later moving to Kingsburg in Central Valley, California.

What Clyde would want to be known most for, though, is not just saving our country in World War II, but also saving souls. He dedicated most of his life in his church and in his community to helping people know about God. That is what Clyde would want us to know.

Clyde was dearly loved by the community. He had a way to reach everybody, including youth. Even though he was a guy in his eighties, he had a way of talking to the young folks with that wry, crooked smile and the twinkle in his eye and a little tap on the shoulder. He had a way of connecting with people that was unique and certainly enjoyed and loved by his community.

He is survived by many, many family members, and we will all miss him in the community.

WOMEN'S HISTORY MONTH

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

Mrs. BEATTY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in honor of March being Women's History Month. I rise today to say thank you for all the services for the women in the Third Congressional District and to the 102 women who serve in the 113th Congress in the House and the Senate.

I rise because we know when women succeed, America succeeds. I ask you to join me in making 2014 a year of action by having equal pay for equal work, providing affordable child care and access to health care.

This afternoon, I am honored to join Swin Cash, a two-time Olympic gold medalist, as we initiate the Let's Move! initiative in honor of the First Lady's Let's Move! So to America, I say let's do this thing in honor of women.

TO RESPOND TO RUSSIAN AGGRESSION, SELL U.S. NATURAL GAS TO UKRAINE

(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, first, Vladimir Putin invaded Georgia. Now, the Russian bear is after Ukraine.

Ukraine is almost totally dependent on Russia for energy. Russian imperialism has proven that it is willing to use gas as a political and economic weapon to intimidate its neighbors. Twice it turned off the fuel switch in Ukraine, and I was even in Ukraine the last time Putin turned off the gas during the winter. It was cold.

Many other European nations are also at the mercy of the Kremlin when it comes to energy. We can help European countries who depend on imperialist Russia for energy by selling them natural gas from America. The demand is there, and the American supply is overwhelming. The only thing standing in the way are the bureaucrats in the Department of Energy.

That is why today I am introducing legislation that would require the Department of Energy to expedite and approve permits to Ukraine, all former Soviet nations, and all members of the European Union.

Let's eliminate Russia's natural gas monopoly. Let's respond to Russian aggression. Let's encourage the Europeans and former Soviet Republics to ''Buy American.''

And that's just the way it is.

HONORING THE MEMORY OF WILLIAM GUSTE, JR.

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

Mr. RICHMOND. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the memory of a true statesman who was a guiding light for Louisiana for many years. I am talking about former Louisiana Attorney General William ''Billy'' Guste.

Attorney General Guste passed away last summer, but I wanted to take a moment to discuss his impact on my home State and discuss who he was as a man because he represents what was best about Louisiana.

You see, Mr. Speaker, he was a fighter. He fought for what was right. He fought for average Louisiana citizens. He fought tooth and nail for environmental justice, for racial fairness, for coastal restoration, for affordable housing, and for the homeless. During his 20 years of service as attorney general, he was always trying to fight for things that he believed would help ordinary, average people.

We should remember this lesson, Mr. Speaker, so that we remember that our

fights should mean something. We should fight to improve the lives of our constituents, not to win political battles.

Growing up in Louisiana, I am a direct beneficiary of Billy Guste's courage to do what was truly right and truly compassionate. In that tradition, Mr. Speaker, I say we must honor Mr. Guste's legacy by doing the same.

HONORING SENATOR BOB DOLE AND HIS LEGACY

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

Mr. YODER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor a truly great Kansan, a Jayhawk, and an American hero who embodies every sense of the term ''public servant.''

Senator Bob Dole has spent his life as a servant to the American people: as a soldier wounded in combat during World War II; he served as a Member of this House, the Senate, and ran for President.

We in Kansas are so very proud of Senator Dole's legacy as our native son. Ten years ago, the University of Kansas, my alma mater, completed construction and opened to the public the Robert J. Dole Institute of Politics on KU's beautiful west campus.

The Dole Institute's official mission is to ''promote political and civic participation as well as civil discourse in a bipartisan, balanced manner.'' This is precisely what Senator Dole stood for in his career, and it is what his legacy, the Dole Institute, promotes today.

We all congratulate the University of Kansas on the 10-year anniversary of the Dole Institute, and congratulate and continue our appreciation for Senator Dole and all the work he does for his native State of Kansas and for his country.

TENNESSEE NATIONAL GUARD

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

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Mr. Speaker, the President filed his budget yesterday, and what a budget it is. It is going to increase spending by $791 billion—that is right, billion with a ''b.'' You would think we had all this money to spend. And when you look a little deeper, you see that the priorities are all askew in this budget.

I want to point out just one to my colleagues, and it deals with the Tennessee National Guard and the way they are being adversely impacted by what this budget is bringing to bear, what the President would want to bring to bear.

The Tennessee Guard has flown the Kiowa Warrior helicopters all throughout Iraq and Afghanistan. They used them in our natural disasters like Hurricane Katrina and the Tennessee flood. And today, due to that budget that I have mentioned that the President filed yesterday, he would like to put them on the chopping block. All 30 Kiowa helicopters, 692 soldiers, and 113 workers are all on the chopping block.

Let's talk about priorities. It is our responsibility in the House to get this right.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 3826, ELECTRICITY SECURITY AND AFFORDABILITY ACT, AND PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 4118, SUSPENDING THE INDIVIDUAL MANDATE PENALTY LAW EQUALS FAIRNESS ACT

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 497 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 497

Resolved, That at any time after 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. 3826) to provide direction to the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency regarding the establishment of standards for emissions of any greenhouse gas from fossil fuel-fired electric utility generating units, 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 Energy and Commerce. 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 an amendment in the nature of a substitute consisting of the text of Rules Committee Print 113–40. 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 the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution. 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 adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider in the House the bill (H.R. 4118) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to delay the implementation of the penalty for failure to comply with the individual health insurance mandate. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. The bill shall be considered as read. All points of order against provisions in the bill are waived. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and on any amendment thereto to final passage without intervening motion except: (1) one hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Ways and Means; and (2) one motion to recommit.

□ 1230

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

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

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on H. Res. 497.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, H. Res. 497 provides for consideration of two bills, one of which addresses the country's worsening health insurance situation due to the Affordable Care Act; the other addresses the Environmental Protection Agency's attempts to cripple our economy with costly regulations which have dubious health benefits.

The rule before us today provides for 1 hour of debate for each bill, controlled by the primary committee of jurisdiction. The committee made in order every amendment submitted for consideration to H.R. 3826, the Electricity Security and Affordability Act, including three amendments offered by Democrats and five amendments offered by Republicans. Finally, the minority is afforded the customary motion to recommit on each bill, allowing for yet another opportunity to amend the legislation. This is a straightforward rule for consideration of two very important bills.

H.R. 3826, the Electricity Security and Affordability Act is a bipartisan response to the Environmental Protection Agency's wrongheaded approach to our energy future. It was carefully crafted by Democratic Senator JOE MANCHIN from West Virginia and the Republican chairman of the Energy and Power Subcommittee, ED WHITFIELD from Kentucky. The bill requires the Environmental Protection Agency to acknowledge within its greenhouse gas regulations that different sources of fuel—such as natural gas, such as

coal—require different approaches to the regulatory sphere. Further, it prevents the Environmental Protection Agency from unilaterally imposing new regulations on existing power plants—those power plants that are already up and running, providing heat to our Nation, which is currently under the throes of a significant cold snap. This limitation exists until Congress has weighed in and passed a law specifying an effective date for the regulations to begin.

Finally, as is just good government, the bill requires strengthened reporting requirements from the Environmental Protection Agency.

One of the most frustrating parts of the EPA's new venture in regulating our existing energy infrastructure is that the EPA has actively blocked proper congressional oversight from receiving the science and calculations used in crafting these new costly regulations. That simply must end. If the Environmental Protection Agency is proposing new regulations because they believe they will truly make Americans healthier, let them share the data. Let them share the data with the United States Congress so it can be peer reviewed. Both the Energy and Commerce Committee and the Science Committee have continually been ignored when requesting such data. That is unacceptable. That must end. This legislation is a step toward bringing accountability to an agency that for too long has run roughshod over our economy.

The second bill contained in this rule, H.R. 4118, Suspending the Individual Mandate Penalty Law Equals Fairness Act, addresses the disparity that President Obama and Secretary Sebelius have created between big businesses, which have been given a reprieve from having to comply with the mandates in the Affordable Care Act, and individual Americans, who have been given no such help by this President. Just this week, the press reported that the administration will delay yet another provision of the Affordable Care Act by allowing insurers to continue offering health plans that do not meet the Affordable Care Act's minimum coverage requirements. It is becoming so commonplace for this administration to waive or ignore provisions—by their own admission, this is their signature law, and they continue to waive provisions. The American people cannot seem to get an even break, and no one even seems to notice anymore. There is little doubt that this is exactly what the President is hoping for.

In the last 8 months, the President has delayed or modified overly 22 provisions in his signature health care law. We are all familiar—we have all seen the headlines: delays in the preexisting program; delays in the employer mandate; delays in the reporting requirement; changing the rules under which Congress has to buy insurance; delay, delay, delay, in his own law. The President has been quick to fix parts of the law that have political consequences for his allies and to protect his own talking points.

Yet, where is the President's protection for the American people?

Under the health care law, Americans who don't have health insurance and refuse to purchase a government-approved insurance policy will face an annual fine—an annual fine—that increases every year.

However, purchasing a government-approved plan also means you have to pay big premiums. You are forced to navigate a dysfunctional Web site. You may lose the doctor you like and place your personal information in jeopardy on an unsecure Web site.

Today, Republicans are offering a legislative solution to help Americans get out from under the crushing weight of the so-called Affordable Care Act. H.R. 4118, also known as the Simple Fairness Act, will give hardworking Americans the same relief that the President has already given to big businesses across the country.

The administration has no problem delaying the employer mandate, not just once for 2014, but a second time for another full year for employers with 51–100 employees. Shouldn't that same relief be provided to rank-and-file Americans?

The President has refused to work with Congress to change the law so today, we are moving ahead and doing what is right for the American people. The Simple Fairness Act will eliminate the penalty for 2014 for those individuals who chose not to purchase a government-approved health care plan.

It is clear that H.R. 4118 offers the only feasible lifeline to millions of Americans who are faced with purchasing an expensive health care plan that does not meet their needs. It is Congress' job to protect the American people. I urge my colleagues to pass this rule so Washington can stop making decisions about American's health care and instead individuals can be free to decide for themselves. I encourage my colleagues to vote ''yes'' on the rule and ''yes'' on the underlying bills.

I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Mr. Speaker, this is just not an ordinary day, this is a very important thing that is happening here, particularly for those of you who watch Congress a lot and want to know what it is we are about. This is a very special occasion here. As you can see by this poster on my right, we are celebrating a double golden anniversary. Today, the majority is holding the 50th vote to repeal or to otherwise undermine the Affordable Care Act under the 50th closed rule.

Now, to people who don't understand what a closed rule is, that means this rule is coming to the floor to debate these bills, and it will not allow them to be amended. That is not exactly an open Congress in a great democracy.

The majority has defied all expectations in reaching those milestones today, and as one often does when celebrating a colleague's 50th birthday or acknowledging a friend's 50th wedding anniversary, I want to take a moment to reflect on all that the majority has done to achieve this great honor.

Indeed, many Americans, including myself, were doubtful we would ever see the majority hold their 50th vote to repeal a good health care law that is already benefiting more than 9 million Americans because, why would Congress want to take health care away from people?

I remember back in 2012, when CBS News reported that the majority had spent 80 legislative hours—costing approximately $48 million—to hold 33 votes to repeal the ACA. That is just the amount of money spent on floor time and committee time. They had held 33 votes at that time to repeal the Affordable Care Act. Given the incredible waste of time and taxpayer money, I was hopeful that the 33rd vote might be the last. But the majority has persevered, and continued to ignore the Nation's pressing priorities to make it to today's 50th vote.

Of course, getting this far wouldn't have been possible without the help of a closed legislative process—a process that has allowed the majority to pursue a 50th vote without pause.

Last year, the majority presided over the most closed session in history, and repeatedly passed closed rules that shut out the voices of the nearly 200 duly elected Members of Congress who sit on my side of the aisle. Now today, the majority is presenting their 50th closed rule in order to hold a 50th gonowhere vote to repeal the Affordable Care Act.

It is truly amazing that the majority has managed to hold the same vote 50 times while so many Americans and so much of the world cries out for help. As we know, there are global crises from Ukraine to Afghanistan. At home, there are millions still looking for work; millions more are working for a minimum wage upon which they cannot survive.

In fact, just this week the number of Americans whose emergency unemployment insurance has expired will surpass 2 million individuals, including almost 200,000 veterans. We could have averted the crisis weeks ago, and we have tried numerous times to do that, but the majority has repeatedly said ''no.'' Indeed, some of our colleagues have said it would be immoral to help out those who have no money coming into their home.

Meanwhile, the Center for American Progress released a report today that found that raising the minimum wage to $10.10 an hour would reduce Federal spending on food stamps by $4.6 billion a year. Despite a similar estimate from the Congressional Budget Office declaring that raising the minimum wage

would lift 900,000 people out of poverty, the majority refuses to join my Democratic colleagues and me to give America a raise.

Mr. Speaker, there are dozens, if not hundreds of bills that deserve our consideration, but today's attempt to repeal a good health care law is not one of them. In fact, I have a list of 50 votes that we could be taking today instead of another vote to repeal the Affordable Care Act—everything from rebuilding our crumbling bridges and roads to creating American manufacturing jobs.

Of particular importance is a bill that I authored called the Preservation of Antibiotics for Medical Treatment Act that will address the immediate crisis of antibiotic-resistant diseases and help to save lives. Despite the urgent need to protect public health, we have been unable to even get a hearing on this important legislation.

The majority's refusal to take action on any of these pressing issues is truly an achievement, not one to be proud of. I hope I have made it clear that we cannot celebrate that achievement.

Mr. Speaker, it is my sincere hope that the milestone the majority is reaching today will be the end of the line for their tired political game. We have far too many issues that need our attention, and it is well past time that we got to work. I strongly urge my colleagues to vote ''no'' on today's rule and the underlying legislation.

I reserve the balance of my time.

50 THINGS THE HOUSE COULD BE DOING INSTEAD OF UNDERMINING THE AFFORDABLE CARE ACT

1. Comprehensive Immigration Reform
2. Emergency Unemployment Compensation Extension Act of 2013 (H.R. 3546)
3. Fair Minimum Wage Act of 2013 (H.R. 1010)
4. Preservation of Antibiotics for Medical Treatment Act of 2013 (H.R. 1150)
5. Paycheck Fairness Act (H.R. 377)
6. Make It in America Manufacturing Act of 2013 (H.R. 375)
7. Advancing Innovative Manufacturing Act of 2013 (H.R. 1421)
8. American Manufacturing Competitiveness Act of 2013 (H.R. 2447)
9. Economy, Energy and Environment Initiative to Support Sustainable Manufacturing (E3) Act (H.R. 2873)
10. Multimodal Opportunities Via Enhanced Freight Act of 2013 or the ''MOVE Freight Act of 2013'' (H.R. 974)
11. American Textile Technology Innovation and Research for Exportation (ATTIRE) Act (H.R. 937)
12. Clean Energy Technology Manufacturing and Export Assistance Act of 2013 (H.R. 400)
13. Put America Back to Work Now Act (H.R. 535)
14. Build America Bonds Act of 2013 (H.R. 789)
15. The Customs Training Enhancement Act (H.R. 1322)
16. American Export Promotion Act of 2013 (H.R.1420)
17. Currency Reform for Fair Trade Act (H.R. 1276)
18. Global Free Internet Act of 2013 (H.R. 889)
19. New Alternative Transportation to Give Americans Solutions (NAT GAS) Act (H.R. 1364)
20. Invest in American Jobs Act of 2013 (H.R. 949)
21. Enforcing Orders and Reducing Customs Evasion (ENFORCE) Act (H.R. 1440)
22. Export Promotion Reform Act (H.R. 1409)
23. Bridge to Jobs Act (H.R. 1419)
24. Reducing Waste and Increasing Efficiency in Trade Act (H.R. 3004)
25. Research and Development Tax Credit Extension Act of 2013 (H.R. 905)
26. The Bring Jobs Home Act of 2013 (H.R. 851)
27. Patriot Corporations of America Act of 2013 (H.R. 929)
28. Market Based Manufacturing Incentives Act of 2013 (H.R. 615)
29. Advanced Vehicle Technology Act of 2013 (H.R. 1027)
30. American Jobs Matter Act (H.R. 1332)
31. Small Business Start-up Savings Accounts (H.R. 1323)
32. Securing Energy Critical Elements and American Jobs Act of 2013 (H.R.1022)
33. Resource Assessment of Rare Earths (RARE) Act of 2013 (H.R. 981)
34. Congressional Made in America Promise Act (H.R. 194)
35. Security in Energy and Manufacturing (SEAM) Act (H.R. 1424)
36. SelectUSA Authorization Act of 2013 (H.R. 1413)
37. Partnering with American Manufacturers for Efficiency and Competitiveness Act (H.R. 1418)
38. The Innovative Technologies Investment Incentives Act (H.R.1415)
39. Cooperative Research and Development Fund Authorization Act of 2013 (H.R. 1711)
40. Advanced Composites Development Act of 2013 (H.R. 2034)
41. All-American Flag Act (H.R. 2355)
42. GREEN Act of 2013 (H.R. 2863)
43. Workforce Investment Act (H.R. 798)
44. American Manufacturing Efficiency & Retraining Investment Collaboration (AMERICA Works) Act (H.R. 497)
45. Strengthening Employment Clusters to Organize Regional Success (SECTORS) Act (H.R. 919)
46. Job Skills for America's Students Act of 2013 (H.R. 1271)
47. National Fab Lab Network Act (H.R.1289)
48. Workforce Development Tax Credit Act of 2013 (H.R. 1324)
49. Job Opportunities Between our Shores (JOBS) Act (H.R. 1436)
50. Broadband Adoption Act of 2013 (H.R. 1685)

□ 1245

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 2 minutes for a response.

Mr. Speaker, there have been 36 changes to the Affordable Care Act since it was signed into law. It has been a little over 3 years since the bill was signed into law. Thirty-six changes means one a month.

How does the breakdown of those 36 changes occur? According to the Galen Institute published this morning, 15 times, Congress has passed and the President signed legislation changing the Affordable Care Act. Twice, the Supreme Court modified the Affordable Care Act, but 19 times, President Obama made a change unilaterally.

We are here today debating a delay on the penalties under the individual mandate, but it might interest the Congress to know that the President himself delayed the individual mandate. The administration changed the deadline for the individual mandate by declaring that customers who had purchased insurance by March 31 will avoid the tax penalty.

Previously and by law, they were required to purchase that insurance by Valentine's Day, February 14, so there has already been a 6-week delay. We are simply trying to place in code what the President is doing unilaterally.

You want to talk about a closed process where people don't have an opportunity to participate? That is governing by executive fiat. That is what we are trying to stop today.

I reserve the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. POLIS) will control the time for the minority.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Colorado.

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

Well, I want to come to the floor to wish the Republicans a happy anniversary. I brought a gold ring. This is the 50th repeal of ObamaCare. I want to wish my colleagues a happy 50th anniversary for the appeal of ObamaCare.

Like any marriage that lasts 50 years, it takes a lot of work. The American people have shown that they want this marriage to last. They have shown that by reelecting Barack Obama as President. They have shown that by electing a Senate that won't even consider a repeal of the Affordable Care Act; but also like any marriage, it takes work along the way to improve it, to work at it, to make changes to it.

Democrats stand ready to work with President Obama, to fine-tune this wonderful marriage celebrating the 50th anniversary of its repeal here today, to make sure it endures for another 50 repeal votes by the House Republicans here in the coming months. We are ready to make the changes that we need to, to ensure that the Affordable Care Act works for every American.

There are issues in the implementation in my district. Two of my counties, Summit and Eagle County, have among the highest insurance rates in the exchange in the entire country, these two counties. That is due to a problem that the State had in implementing it, but we would love to work with Republicans on a Federal fix for Eagle and Summit County, and the other Colorado counties that are affected by it.

I would be proud to work with my colleagues to replace the revenue and the medical and device tax with other sources of revenue to ensure that the Affordable Care Act works.

There are a lot of great ideas, and perhaps it is time that, rather than continue to celebrate anniversaries of repeal, that we enter couples counseling sessions today, and we work together in trying to find common ground.

Rather than talking about repealing ObamaCare and going back to a system we know wasn't working, in which 40 million Americans didn't have health care insurance, in which Americans and my constituents and yours were frustrated that, year after year, rates were going up 10, 15, 20 percent—rather than going back to a formula we know didn't work, let's enter couples counseling and work together to make health care work in our country, to talk about a path forward, with the President, with Democrats, with Republicans, with Independents, to ensure that these cost increases that have been epidemic the last couple of decades come to an end, that we can extend coverage to more American families, that we can ensure that the quality of health care that is our Nation's pride can continue to be available to Americans, regardless of their economic background.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BURGESS. Again, Mr. Speaker, I would just emphasize there have been changes by administrative action, some 19 that President Obama has done all on his own, without any influence from Congress.

Now, if the gentleman were truly interested about an offset for repealing the medical device tax, perhaps he might look more favorably on the bill before us today, H.R. 4118. The Congressional Budget Office scores a significant savings by passing H.R. 4118.

Perhaps there are some other things that could be done with that money as well; but nevertheless, the President has, on his own, delayed employee reporting, delayed subsidies through the Federal exchange. He closed the high-risk pool.

He has doubled the allowable deductibles. He has required self-attestation and eliminated the reporting requirements under the law that he signed in March of 2010.

He last fall said: Okay. I give up. Insurance can offer plans that we just told you were illegal, that they were crummy insurance, and now, we are going to allow them to be offered again.

All of these were actions taken by the executive under a closed process. With no input or oversight by the people's House—by the United States House of Representatives.

I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Isn't that wonderful? Isn't this great that the President has made 19 changes to improve the Affordable Care Act to make it work?

You know what? That is what a marriage takes. That is what has helped the Affordable Care Act withstand the 50th vote to repeal it here in the House. Had the President been inflexible—just like in a marriage, if one partner is inflexible, it would have been a lot harder to survive 50 votes to repeal the Affordable Care Act. Here, we are celebrating the golden anniversary of repeal votes, 50 votes.

But thanks to the President's flexibility with 19 changes, hopefully, there are more along the way to ensure that all Americans have access to affordable health care:

That no American faces pricing discrimination or is kept out of a plan because of a preexisting condition;

That people can move between employers;

That somebody can leave a large company to be an entrepreneur and have a startup without worrying about losing their health care if they have a preexisting condition;

Making sure that young Americans, as they are trying to find a job or working part time, can stay on their parents' plan;

Making sure that Americans have a real choice in the exchanges that choose between multiple providers.

These were some of the elements that I think the American people want to keep and one of the reasons that this health care act has not only withstood 50 votes to repeal and is celebrating its golden anniversary, but will survive the next 50 votes if the House Republicans choose to have them to try to appeal the Affordable Care Act.

The American people want to see changes to make it work. We applaud the President for the 19 changes he made. We encourage him to use the discretion that we rightly give him under the Affordable Care Act to help make it work.

We encourage the discretion at the State level that many Governors, like the Governor of Kentucky and others, have shown to make the Affordable Care Act work in their State.

We applaud the fact that there are over $200 billion of deficit reduction in the Affordable Care Act. If we can find additional savings and replace lost revenue, we are certainly open to that discussion. So I rise in celebration of having withstood 50 repeal votes. We are ready for the next 50.

We use these opportunities to highlight the American people on the benefits of the Affordable Care Act and to say that we are ready to have a real discussion with Republicans, to exert our legislative privilege, to make changes, and in the absence of that, we applaud the President in using the abilities that we give him under the act to help make sure the Affordable Care Act truly makes health care more affordable for American families.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, here is the Affordable Care Act. The President says it is the law of the land. How does it describe the effective date for the individual mandate? Under section 1501, subparagraph D, effective date:

> The amendments made by this section shall apply to the taxable years ending after December 31, 2013.

Pretty unambiguous, pretty easy to understand. It doesn't seem to have a lot of flexibility or wiggle room written into it.

How does the language read that describes the effective date for the employer mandate? Well, that reads under section 1513, subparagraph D, effective date:

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

It doesn't sound as if there is a lot of flexibility; yet the President, on his own, found the flexibility only within the executive branch to say that effective date is no longer valid.

We are simply saying for Mr. and Mrs. American—for the average American, we should be able to delay the effective date of the penalty because this law has been a disaster from start to finish. Stories about the Web site are now legion.

We should give the same relief to the average American that the President gave to his friends in Big Business.

I reserve the balance of my time.

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

This bill—this 50th anniversary—golden anniversary of ObamaCare repeals here in the House—50th vote to repeal the Affordable Care Act, gutting mental parity, health parity, gutting protection for Americans with preexisting conditions, went through no hearings, no markups, no amendments that we are allowed to discuss or debate or vote on here on the floor of the House. This is not the process for improving the quality of health care for American families.

The American people have made it clear they want this marriage to last. They want to make it work. They know it requires hard work. The President has made 19 wonderful changes to the law.

I am not a constitutional lawyer. If there are folks on the other side who want to sue the President, who think that he did something contrary to the law we passed, they are certainly welcome to sue. I believe that the President was given broad discretion under the law to make it work.

I hope that this legislative body takes up the gauntlet and makes the changes we need to make the Affordable Care Act work. Any marriage takes effort. Here, we have a marriage between the Affordable Care Act and the American people, and 50 votes to repeal it are not going to break up that marriage.

It is a stronger marriage than that because the American people have voted on it. They didn't elect a Presidential candidate who wanted to repeal the Affordable Care Act. They didn't elect a Senate that wanted to repeal the Affordable Care Act.

So here we are, and we are welcome to have another 50, 100, 200 votes to repeal the Affordable Care Act; or we can get to work on an open process, letting Members of both parties offer floor amendments. This rule allows no floor amendments.

Having a markup in committee, having hearings in committee about how we can deliver better health care value to the American people will make sure

affordable care is available to every American family and affordable for small businesses, to make America more competitive.

But instead of going through an open process, encouraging ideas from Republicans and Democrats to make health care work in our country, we are presented with the 50th vote to repeal the Affordable Care Act.

In the absence of meaningful improvements and legislation, the President is using the authority that we gave him under this bill to make the changes that he needs to make, to make sure the Affordable Care Act works.

This body can reassert itself and take back its prerogative whenever we want by passing commonsense bipartisan bills to improve the Affordable Care Act, but it truly is hypocritical to criticize the President out of one side of one's mouth for making changes that actually improve the law and make it work better, when here in this body we are refusing to make some of those same commonsense changes.

I hope that if people think that there was authority of the law that exceeded, they are welcome to work that out in the courts. That is what the court is for, to settle the differences of separation of powers between the executive and legislative branches; but I hope, more important, because the American people care about affordable health care, that this body is willing to take up some of those improvements that we can make, to make sure that this marriage can endure for the next 50 votes as well.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 3 minutes.

It sounds as if the gentleman is going to vote for the bill under consideration today because, after all, it is an opportunity to give long-suffering Americans an opportunity to be out of the penalty part of the Affordable Care Act.

Let's be honest, I mean this thing is one of the most coercive pieces of legislation that has ever been passed by the United States Congress. I might just remind people here in the House of Representatives that this law, which was H.R. 3590, was actually not subject to any hearings or any markups in the United States House of Representatives. Maybe it was when H.R. 3590 first passed the House when it was a housing bill in July of 2009.

But remember, what became the health care bill was a housing bill that was amended. The amendment read over in the Senate: ''strike all after the enacting clause and insert.''

And what was inserted was language written by special interests over in the Cloakroom of the Senate Finance Committee, was passed by the Senate on Christmas Eve, and then thrown back over here to the House.

□ 1300

Since the House had passed H.R. 3590 as a housing bill, not as a tax bill like the Affordable Care Act was but as a housing bill, the question before the House then became: Will the House now concur in the amendments to H.R. 3590? It took 3 months for the Speaker to cobble together the 217 votes that she needed to pass this thing, but H.R. 3590 was never heard as a health care bill in my committee, the Committee on Energy and Commerce. It was never heard in the Ways and Means Committee. It was never heard in the Education and Labor Committee. That was H.R. 3200. H.R. 3200 is long gone—no one has seen it for years—but H.R. 3590 is what is embodied in the President's health care law.

So, really, to say that everyone had a chance to participate in this and to debate it, that is, in fact, hypocritical. What is really hypocritical is that H.R. 3590, when it came back to the House, was presented to this House under a closed rule. That is a fact, and that is a fact that should be recognized by the minority. This bill was the product of a closed rule.

I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Mr. Speaker, make no bones about it. The individual mandate is a linchpin of RomneyCare—or whatever you would like to call it—modeled on, in fact, the insurance reforms in Massachusetts. This component is critical to ensuring that people with preexisting conditions are not discriminated against in pricing in the exchange. It is important to make sure that we have a younger, healthier risk pool in the exchange to bring down rates for all Americans.

If this bill were to become law, which it won't—it is simply the 50th repeal of the Affordable Care Act, the golden anniversary of repeals—the entire affordable care structure, including the pricing in the exchange, would go up for American families, and it would devastate health care reform. This is not a bill that has support from the President. It is not a bill that has support from the proponents of the Affordable Care Act. It doesn't make the Affordable Care Act better. It is, in fact, the 50th repeal of the Affordable Care Act.

I was on the Education and Labor Committee, as it was called at the time, two Congresses ago. My colleague from Texas talked about the process under which the health care bill was written. We did have a substantial markup. There were other committees: the Ways and Means Committee and the Energy and Commerce Committee. My committee was one of the committees that it was reported out of, and there were other committees it was not reported out of.

This was an amazing process of writing this bill over the period of a year. In fact, in our Democratic Caucus meetings, we even, essentially, functioned as a committee of our entire Caucus, where we went through the bill page after page, and we made suggestions. There were a number of bills that were written by Republicans that were included in the Affordable Care Act, and there were amendments that I was involved with that were included. Like in any legislative process, some that I advocated for were not included in the final bill.

Unlike this bill, which had no hearing and no markup in any form—because the gentleman from Texas is right. This bill number came from the Senate, and that is the normal process around here. We sometimes have bills from the Senate we approve, and sometimes they originate here and go over there. So this bill number and this title came from something else, and they approved it in reconciliation.

Yet the Affordable Care Act—the bill that led to it—went through my committee. I remember being up until, really, I think, 7 o'clock in the morning. We went straight through the night, under Chairman MILLER, offering a number of amendments, some passing and some not. Sometimes I was on the prevailing side, sometimes not. We had a lively discussion over amendments from Democrats and Republicans, some of which made it into the final bill and some of which didn't. That is the legislative process.

To somehow compare that to the legislative process around this bill is like night and day. So, although the gentleman from Texas is technically correct—the bill number was a reconciliation from the Senate that the House concurred in and sent back with some changes—the work that went into forming that bill had countless hearings and had several markups, including one that I participated in and offered amendments in and voted for and against amendments from both sides of the aisle in.

We are where we are. We would love to see the Affordable Care Act go through a process now. Again, why not allow amendments under this rule? Why not allow Republicans or Democrats, who have ideas to make health care more affordable, to offer them now to the floor? If they would pass, then they would move on to the Senate.

Instead, we have a narrowly focused Affordable Care Act repeal that makes health care less affordable for American families by leading to a risk pool in the exchanges that is less healthy and older. We need to ensure that young people are part of the exchanges. Young people want to have insurance, and they want to have affordable insurance. Let's make sure they have a way to do that in the exchanges. This bill would repeal that.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, seeing no other speakers on my side, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. POLIS. To the gentleman from Texas, I say it is possible I will have one more speaker. If I see her arrive, I will yield to her. Otherwise, I am prepared to close, and I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Speaker, this week, the number of people who lost their unemployment benefits as a result of Congress' failing to extend the Emergency Unemployment Compensation program has climbed to 2 million Americans. If we defeat the previous question, I will offer an amendment to the rule to bring up legislation that would restore unemployment insurance and provide much-needed relief to countless families across the country as well as to stimulate our economy.

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I do urge my colleagues to vote ''no'' and defeat the previous question and to vote ''no'' on the underlying bills.

We could be doing a lot of important work here in the House rather than to have, I think, what both sides would agree is a purely symbolic 50th vote to repeal the Affordable Care Act, unless there are, perhaps, some who think ''50'' is the magic number. I think anybody who has a degree of political sense realizes, if the other 49 didn't go anywhere, this one is very unlikely to go anywhere. Rather than proceed with something that isn't going anywhere and that gives the Democrats once again the opportunity to talk about how important it is to make health care more affordable—and the American people overwhelmingly want health care to be fixed, not repealed—we could be doing a lot of important things that the American people actually want this body to do.

Let's talk about immigration reform.

There is a bill that passed the Senate with Democrats and Republicans—68 votes. It is rare for more than two-thirds of the United States Senate to come together around a commonsense solution. How did they do that? They did that because the American people want this problem solved. They are sick and tired—and they should be; I am, too—of having over 10 million people illegally in this country. In my district, there are tens of thousands of people who are there illegally. We don't even know because there is no way to even count. President Obama has deported over 2 million people at an enormous cost to taxpayers—$10,000 to $20,000 per deportation. That is how much it costs taxpayers—you and me, Mr. Speaker.

Guess what? There is a bipartisan solution supported by the law enforcement community, supported by the business community, supported by the technology industry, supported by both the agriculture industry—farmers and farmworkers—and supported by business and labor, supported by the faith-based community, supported by over 75 percent of Americans across the political spectrum, supported by a majority of Republicans and a majority of Democrats and a majority of Independents. That bill is ready.

There is a bipartisan House version, H.R. 15. Let's bring that forward under a rule. That bill would have the votes to pass tomorrow if we brought it forward. We could send it to the President. We could reduce the deficit by over $100 billion, increase our GDP, create hundreds of thousands of jobs for American citizens, as the bill has been scored. Finally, we could secure our borders so we could have control over who comes and goes, both people and illicit products. That is what the American people want. Let's get that bill through rather than celebrate yet another empty anniversary for the repeal of the Affordable Care Act.

I strongly suggest that my colleagues start bringing forward bills that the American people want to see pass. If we can bring forward immigration reform with bipartisan support and get it out of this body and to the President's desk, the American people will start to improve their opinions of this institution. When I see the polls and they say, oh, 15 percent approval is what Congress has—or 12 percent—it is really no wonder because it is a little bit like a broken record around here. They are, frankly, sick and tired of our every week, it seems like, repealing the Affordable Care Act and making health care more expensive for the American people. They don't want to see us talking about golden rings and 50th anniversaries of votes. They want to see us solving problems.

We offer the Speaker and the majority leader the opportunity to do that. We welcome the Republican immigration principles. There are ample grounds to work on a bipartisan solution based on H.R. 15 or on another bill that encapsulates those principles that the Republicans laid down on which we can find common ground so as to solve a very real problem, to grow our economy, to reduce our deficit, to secure our borders, and to ensure that America remains competitive in the global economy. I challenge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to reach a solution on that issue and to really move forward with regard to making health care more affordable.

I urge my colleagues to vote ''no'' on this closed process—this closed rule—that allows no Republican ideas and no Democratic ideas to come forward, to enter this discussion. I urge my colleagues to defeat the previous question so the Democrats can bring forward the unemployment insurance bill, and I also encourage my colleagues to vote ''no'' on the underlying bill.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Talk about doing the will of the people. There was an election in Texas yesterday. There was a question on the ballot—to support or oppose the President's takeover of the health care industry in this country. Ninety-two percent of the people were recorded as being in opposition to the President's takeover of health care. So, in fact, in the district I represent, that is a significant amount.

Today's rule provides for the consideration of two bills to provide relief for hardworking Americans who are faced with the administration's expensive and restrictive mandates both in the health insurance and energy sectors.

I want to thank my colleagues LYNN JENKINS from Kansas, the Republican Conference vice chair, as well as the chairman of the Energy and Commerce Subcommittee on Energy and Power, Mr. WHITFIELD from Kentucky, for their thoughtful pieces of legislation.

I encourage my colleagues to vote ''yes'' on the rule and ''yes'' on the underlying bills.

The material previously referred to by Mr. POLIS is as follows:

AN AMENDMENT TO H. RES. 497 OFFERED BY MR. POLIS OF COLORADO

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

SEC. 3. 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. 3546) to provide for the extension of certain unemployment benefits, and for other purposes. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. General debate shall be confined to the bill and shall not exceed one hour equally divided among and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Ways and Means and 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. 4. Clause 1(c) of rule XIX shall not apply to the consideration of H.R. 3546.

THE VOTE ON THE PREVIOUS QUESTION: WHAT IT REALLY MEANS

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

Mr. Clarence Cannon's Precedents of the House of Representatives (VI, 308–311), describes the vote on the previous question on the rule as ''a motion to direct or control the consideration of the subject before the House being made by the Member in charge.'' To defeat the previous question is to give the opposition a chance to decide the subject before the House. Cannon cites the Speaker's

ruling of January 13, 1920, to the effect that ''the refusal of the House to sustain the demand for the previous question passes the control of the resolution to the opposition'' in order to offer an amendment. On March 15, 1909, a member of the majority party offered a rule resolution. The House defeated the previous question and a member of the opposition rose to a parliamentary inquiry, asking who was entitled to recognition. Speaker Joseph G. Cannon (R–Illinois) said: ''The previous question having been refused, the gentleman from New York, Mr. Fitzgerald, who had asked the gentleman to yield to him for an amendment, is entitled to the first recognition.''

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 and clause 9 of rule XX, this 15-minute vote on ordering the previous question will be followed by 5-minute votes on adoption of House Resolution 497, if ordered; and the motion to suspend the rules on H.R. 938.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 221, nays 184, not voting 25, as follows:

[Roll No. 93]

YEAS—221

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

NAYS—184

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

NOT VOTING—25

Chaffetz
Courtney
Crawford
DeGette
DeLauro
Duffy
Esty
Gosar
Green, Gene
Himes
Hinojosa
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Larson (CT)
McCarthy (NY)
McDermott
Messer
Negrete McLeod
Pastor (AZ)
Schneider
Shea-Porter
Smith (NJ)
Southerland
Wagner

□ 1337

Mr. NADLER, Mrs. BEATTY, and Mr. GARCIA changed their vote from ''yea'' to ''nay.''

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

So the previous question was ordered.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated for:

Mrs. WAGNER. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 93 I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted "yes."

Stated against:

Mr. HIMES. Mr. Speaker, had I been present for the vote on the Previous Question, rollcall vote 93, I would have voted "no."

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.

RECORDED VOTE

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

A recorded vote was ordered.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 228, noes 182, not voting 20, as follows:

[Roll No. 94]

AYES—228

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

NOES—182

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

NOT VOTING—20

Chaffetz
Courtney
Crawford
DeGette
DeLauro
Duffy
Esty
Gohmert
Gosar
Green, Gene
Himes
Hinojosa
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Larson (CT)
McCarthy (NY)
Negrete McLeod
Pastor (AZ)
Schneider

□ 1344

So the resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated against:

Mr. HIMES. Mr. Speaker, had I been present for the vote Agreeing to the Resolution, rollcall vote 94, I would have voted "no."

UNITED STATES-ISRAEL STRATEGIC PARTNERSHIP ACT OF 2014

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 938) to strengthen the strategic alliance between the United States and Israel, and for other purposes, as amended, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from 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 410, nays 1, not voting 19, as follows:

[Roll No. 95]

YEAS—410

Aderholt
Amash
Amodei
Bachmann
Bachus
Barber
Barletta
Barr
Barrow (GA)
Barton
Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Benishek
Bentivolio
Bera (CA)
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Boustany
Brady (PA)
Brady (TX)
Braley (IA)
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Broun (GA)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Burgess
Bustos
Butterfield
Byrne
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Cantor
Capito
Capps
Capuano
Cárdenas
Carney
Carson (IN)
Carter
Cartwright
Cassidy
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chabot
Chu
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Coble
Coffman
Cohen
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Conaway
Connolly
Conyers
Cook
Cooper
Costa
Cotton
Cramer
Crenshaw
Crowley
Cuellar
Culberson
Cummings
Daines
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
Davis, Rodney
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DelBene
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Deutch
Diaz-Balart
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle
Duckworth
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Edwards
Ellison
Ellmers
Engel
Enyart
Eshoo
Farenthold
Farr
Fattah
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foster
Foxx
Frankel (FL)
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Garcia
Gardner
Garrett
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gibson
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Grayson
Green, Al
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Grijalva
Grimm
Guthrie
Gutiérrez
Hahn
Hall
Hanabusa
Hanna
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings (FL)
Heck (NV)
Heck (WA)
Hensarling
Herrera Beutler
Higgins
Holding
Holt
Honda
Horsford
Hoyer
Hudson
Huelskamp
Huffman
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt
Israel
Issa
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Jenkins
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (OH)
Jordan
Joyce
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kelly (PA)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kinzinger (IL)
Kirkpatrick
Kline
Kuster
Labrador
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Langevin
Lankford
Larsen (WA)
Latham
Latta
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis
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
Matheson
Matsui
McAllister
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul
McClintock
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McHenry
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
McNerney
Meadows
Meehan
Meeks
Meng
Messer
Mica
Michaud
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Miller, George
Moore
Moran
Mullin
Mulvaney
Murphy (FL)
Murphy (PA)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Neugebauer
Noem
Nolan
Nugent
Nunes
Nunnelee
O'Rourke
Olson
Owens
Palazzo
Pallone
Pascrell
Paulsen
Payne
Pearce
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Perry
Peters (CA)
Peters (MI)
Peterson
Petri

Pingree (ME)
Pittenger
Pitts
Pocan
Poe (TX)
Polis
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rahall
Rangel
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rice (SC)
Richmond
Rigell
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Ruiz
Runyan
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sanford
Sarbanes
Scalise
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schock
Schrader
Schwartz
Schweikert
Scott (VA)
Scott, Austin
Scott, David
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sessions
Sewell (AL)
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Sinema
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Southerland
Speier
Stewart
Stivers
Stockman
Stutzman
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Terry
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tierney
Tipton
Titus
Tonko
Tsongas
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walorski
Walz
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Waxman
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—1

Massie

NOT VOTING—19

Chaffetz
Courtney
Crawford
DeLauro
Duffy
Esty
Gosar
Green, Gene
Hastings (WA)
Himes
Hinojosa
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Larson (CT)
McCarthy (NY)
Negrete McLeod
Pastor (AZ)
Schneider

□ 1355

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.

Stated for:

Mr. HIMES. Mr. Speaker, had I been present for rollcall vote 95 on passage of H.R. 938, I would have voted "aye." I am proud that my colleagues on both sides of the aisle came together in support of continuing our nation's strong relationship with Israel and promoting Israel's right to defend itself against threats and unprecedented challenges in the Middle East.

SUSPENDING THE INDIVIDUAL MANDATE PENALTY LAW EQUALS FAIRNESS ACT

Ms. JENKINS. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 497, I call up the bill (H.R. 4118) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to delay the implementation of the penalty for failure to comply with the individual health insurance mandate, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 497, the bill is considered read.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 4118

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 ''Suspending the Individual Mandate Penalty Law Equals Fairness Act'' or as the ''SIMPLE Fairness Act''.

SEC. 2. DELAY IN IMPLEMENTATION OF PENALTY FOR FAILURE TO COMPLY WITH INDIVIDUAL HEALTH INSURANCE MANDATE.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 5000A(c) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

''(5) DELAY IN IMPLEMENTATION OF PENALTY.—Notwithstanding any other provision of this subsection, the monthly penalty amount with respect to any taxpayer for any month beginning before January 1, 2015, shall be zero.''.

(b) DELAY OF CERTAIN PHASE INS AND INDEXING.—

(1) PHASE IN OF PERCENTAGE OF INCOME LIMITATION.—Section 5000A(c)(2)(B) of such Code is amended—

(A) by striking ''2014'' in clause (i) and inserting ''2015'', and

(B) by striking ''2015'' in clauses (ii) and (iii) and inserting ''2016''.

(2) PHASE IN OF APPLICABLE DOLLAR AMOUNT.—Section 5000A(c)(3)(B) of such Code is amended—

(A) by striking ''2014'' and inserting ''2015'', and

(B) by striking ''2015'' (before amendment by subparagraph (A)) and inserting ''2016''.

(3) INDEXING OF APPLICABLE DOLLAR AMOUNT.—Section 5000A(c)(3)(D) of such Code is amended—

(A) by striking ''2016'' in the matter preceding clause (i) and inserting ''2017'', and

(B) by striking ''2015'' in clause (ii) and inserting ''2016''.

(4) INDEXING OF EXEMPTION BASED ON HOUSEHOLD INCOME.—Section 5000A(e)(1)(D) of such Code is amended—

(A) by striking ''2014'' (before amendment by subparagraph (B)) and inserting ''2015'', and

(B) by striking ''2013'' and inserting ''2014''.

(c) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall apply to months beginning after December 31, 2013.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman from Kansas (Ms. JENKINS) and the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. LEVIN) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Kansas.

GENERAL LEAVE

Ms. JENKINS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and to include extraneous materials on H.R. 4118.

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

There was no objection.

Ms. JENKINS. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. CAMP), the illustrious chairman of the House Ways and Means Committee.

□ 1400

Mr. CAMP. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman from Kansas for yielding.

I rise today in support of H.R. 4118, the SIMPLE Fairness Act, which would give Americans some much-needed relief from the added costs of ObamaCare.

I don't need to remind the American people about the failed launch of the health care law, but a failed Web site is the least of Americans' health concerns.

Millions of Americans, including over 200,000 in my home State of Michigan, went out to the mailbox and found that the health care plan they had and liked was canceled.

Millions of Americans are having their hours and wages cut as employers try to struggle with this complex law. Many find that they can no longer access the care that they relied on from their local doctor or hospital. Millions of Americans are left wondering what happened to their promised $2,500 reduction in premiums. And next year, millions more will see their premiums skyrocket again due to the administration's failure to meet their own enrollment goals.

The American people have paid over and over for this health care law. They have paid higher premiums, and they have paid by having their hours cut back and their paychecks decreased. The last thing this law should do is penalize Americans for being unable to purchase a plan on healthcare.gov either because of multiple Web failures or that they were unable to find an affordable plan.

The Obama administration unilaterally exempted businesses from the employer mandate tax for 2014. SIMPLE Fairness demands that Congress provide the same relief to hardworking Americans.

When Congress can act to provide some relief for hardworking Americans, we should. Every Member here has heard from a frustrated constituent. This shouldn't and need not be a partisan fight. Granting relief to hardworking Americans is only fair. Voting ''yes'' on H.R. 4118 is the right thing to do for the people we represent.

Mr. LEVIN. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I shall consume.

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

Mr. LEVIN. Well, here they go again. But this time, it is the 50th time that House Republicans have brought up legislation to repeal or to undermine the Affordable Care Act. But this 50th time is no golden anniversary. It is a House Republican goose egg for millions of Americans. Just look at this—fifty votes, but zero votes to raise the minimum wage, zero votes to renew unemployment insurance, zero votes to guarantee paycheck fairness, and zero votes to pass immigration reform.

So let's spend a minute looking exactly at what would be the impact of this if it became law. In 2014, we would see an additional 1 million uninsured—1 million. In 2015, 2 million more people

would be uninsured than if the individual mandate stayed in effect, and in 2016, another million people.

The irony of this, and I think my colleagues on the Democratic side will speak to this, the irony is the individual mandate was a Republican idea. It was born out of the conservative Heritage Foundation in the eighties. And throughout the nineties, Republicans argued its merits. It was one of the foundations of the Massachusetts law. Its parent, at least in good measure, was Governor Mitt Romney.

I met an hour or so ago with representatives of a major insurance carrier in Massachusetts, and one explained how it is working—97, 98 percent of the people are covered. That law has sparked an improvement in the delivery of health care and in the restructuring of health care delivery systems. So here we are, instead of constructive action, essentially, we have a Republican demolition squad.

Can any law be made perfect? Yes, including this. But that isn't what the Republicans are after today. They have never come up with their own plan. Indeed, they are a wrecking crew. America deserves much better.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. JENKINS. Madam Speaker, I yield myself as much time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, the enforcement of the individual mandate penalty tax is an important issue, an issue of basic fairness, and I look forward to debating this legislation on the House floor.

On February 10 of this year, the Department of the Treasury announced that it would delay enforcement of the employer mandate penalty tax for businesses with 51 to 100 employees until 2016. This delay in the President's health care law comes on the heels of a similar delay the administration announced last July, which exempted all large businesses from the employer mandate penalty until 2015.

Amidst all of these delays, it is easy to forget that the employer mandate, like the individual mandate, was required by the Affordable Care Act to be in effect right now. The President has now acted unilaterally on two separate occasions to give Big Business relief from this tax burden. However, he has not leveled the playing field for the millions of individuals and families who are forced to comply with the individual mandate tax.

Aside from the fact that it is fundamentally unfair to give businesses special treatment that is not extended to these individuals, American families have also been forced to deal with a botched rollout of healthcare.gov and a series of confusing administration delays of the law issued via blog post. This has led to confusion, frustration, and, ultimately, difficulty complying with the law.

Nowhere is this more evident than the fact that only 4 million Americans have enrolled in health coverage on the healthcare.gov Web site. This means that with less than a month to go in this initial open enrollment period, we are still 3 million enrollees short of the original CBO projection of 7 million enrollees—one that even the administration once touted as its goal. Enrollment is still 2 million enrollees short of CBO's new projection of 6 million enrollees.

These millions can be added to the tens of millions of other American individuals and families who will now likely be forced to pay the individual mandate penalty. In my State, Kansas, the latest census information estimates that 356,000 folks are uninsured. At the last count, only 22,000 of those individuals have enrolled on healthcare.gov.

Unlike businesses, the President has offered no relief for these individuals who do not or are unable to comply with the law's mandates. I believe that this is simply not fair and that the House must act to provide parity for these folks. That is why I have introduced this bill under consideration today.

H.R. 4118 would eliminate implementation of the individual mandate penalty by 1 year. This means that the individual mandate penalty would be zeroed out this year. It would rise to $95 or 1 percent of income in 2015, to $325 or 2 percent of income in 2016, and $695 or 2½ percent of income in 2017 and thereafter. I believe this is a simple concept, and considering the circumstances, I applaud this committee for taking up this legislation to provide fairness to all Americans under the President's health care law.

In closing, I would ask this: If the President can delay the employer mandate, where is the relief for everyone else? It is time to give relief to hardworking individuals and families and work toward a legislative solution to eliminate these tax penalties for everyone. Congress must pass this bill today and create simple fairness for all.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LEVIN. Madam Speaker, it is now my special pleasure to yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. WAXMAN) with whom those of us on Ways and Means have worked all of these years on health care reform. He is one of the authors of this bill and the ranking member of Energy and Commerce.

Mr. WAXMAN. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding to me.

The truth of the matter is no matter how many votes the Republicans cast to repeal the Affordable Care Act and no matter how many distortions they spread about the law, there are some facts they cannot change.

They cannot change the fact that, because of the Affordable Care Act, nobody in America can ever again be denied health insurance because they have a preexisting condition. They cannot change the fact that a woman can never be charged more than a man for the same coverage. They cannot change the fact that a family will never again be left without coverage just because their child's hospital bills got too high.

These facts are stubborn and they are inconvenient for my Republican colleagues, so they ignore them and they deny them. Republicans have voted—or will today—50 times to try to take away the basic security and freedom guaranteed by the Affordable Care Act. They offer absolutely no solutions for the tens of millions of Americans who need health care coverage that is secure and affordable. They have voted to repeal the law, but they have never once voted for a replacement.

Madam Speaker, if the Republicans have a solution that will expand coverage, that will end discrimination by insurance companies, and that will reduce the deficit, they need to bring it up for a vote. But they do not have solutions. What they want to do is deny health insurance coverage to millions of Americans. That is a shame, and I think we are wasting our time today voting again to turn our backs on a bill that will offer so much to the American people.

Don't we have anything else to do? All we seem to do is deny science, which is the bill that will be coming up next, when the Republicans want to stop EPA from dealing with the climate change issue or denying the rights of people to get health insurance, which the Republicans have voted over and over again to do.

I urge that we vote ''no'' on this bill.

Ms. JENKINS. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas, Chairman KEVIN BRADY, our chair of the Ways and Means Health Subcommittee.

Mr. BRADY of Texas. Madam Speaker, I rise today in support of the SIMPLE Fairness Act and thank the leadership of the gentlelady from Kansas in this area.

Back home, my people are frightened about the Affordable Care Act. They don't think it is a waste of time to be trying to fix and repeal and stop this. They are paying a very steep price for it.

President Obama made them some big promises when he sold them this health care plan. He promised Americans could keep the plan they like. He promised lower health care costs. He promised a functioning Web site that he said would work as well as Amazon. The White House hasn't delivered on any of these promises.

Where I am from, if you make a mistake, if you don't keep your promise, you step up and fix it. You don't blame those you have hurt. No American should have to pay a penalty because ObamaCare fell short of its promises. No American should have to pay a penalty because the Web site couldn't even accept their application or deliver the correct information. No American should be penalized for trying days on end to purchase a plan only to decide it wasn't worth the effort because it was

too expensive. No American should be penalized because they are concerned about the security of their private information on this government Web site, and no American should be penalized by the IRS because of sticker shock or deciding not to purchase a plan that is so much more expensive than what was promised.

President Obama gave Big Business a break; he deserves to give average Americans the same type of break, as well. SIMPLE Fairness requires that we do the same for the American people. That is all this is about. It is all we are doing today, treating average Americans who are hurt by the Affordable Care Act the way the White House helped Big Business with the same exact problems. The American people deserve the same relief. We ought to give it to them. That is why this bill is called the SIMPLE Fairness Act, and it deserves our support.

Mr. LEVIN. Madam Speaker, I now yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. RANGEL).

I also ask unanimous consent that the balance of my time be managed by the gentleman from Washington (Mr. MCDERMOTT), the ranking member on the Health Subcommittee.

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

There was no objection.

□ 1415

Mr. RANGEL. Madam Speaker, my colleagues, there is a cancer growing in the Republican Party in the House of Representatives, and as much of a Democrat as I am, I hate to see this happen because our government is based on a two-party system. Now this cancer, this small group of people in the Republican Party in the House, have already torn down the credibility of the entire House of Representatives because they are doing the same insane thing 50 times without getting any results, and they are not doing anything else. It is bad enough that all of us have to go down in political favoritism, or our reputations go down, but this small group of people have gone far enough now that the national Republican Party has no credibility.

I will not embarrass anybody by asking them just who do you think nationally should serve our country from, pardon the expression, the Republican Party. You have none. Somewhere along the line, this insanity has to stop because you are not beating up on Democrats, you are beating up on people who have no health insurance.

If you don't like the President, if you don't like this bill, let's talk about the millions of people who have no health insurance instead of just for the 50th time saying you don't like the bill. It is the law. The House and the Senate have signed it. The Supreme Court has verified it. The President can veto anything you do if something did happen.

Why don't we talk about immigration reform? Rebuild the integrity of your great party from past years. Why don't we talk about the minimum wage, where all candidates will say if you work hard in America and do the right thing, then you can achieve anything you want. If you are middle class, you can achieve poverty. If you are in poverty, you can't even get a decent wage for working. There are so many things we can do.

Don't you remember the days before the Affordable Care Act when you had constituents coming in saying: I can't get insurance? How about the days when people would say: My husband was in the hospital and they cut off insurance. Or even worse: I tried to get insurance and they told me I was so sick, so I can't get any more insurance. Or the guy who is working and he is on his parents' insurance, and he is 26 years old. Don't you have any of these people in your congressional districts? Are all of your people well and can do without health insurance?

How do you go home and explain that we do have a bill and instead of perfecting it, supporting it, educating your people how they can get health insurance, that you have tried not once, you have tried 10 times, 20 times, 30 times, 40 times, now 50 times to derail and destroy it.

I don't know how you get away with it. I don't know what you put in the water that you feed your constituents, but it certainly doesn't make sense that you can try to destroy and at the same time not to substitute.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. FORTENBERRY). Members are reminded to address their remarks to the Chair.

Ms. JENKINS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. RENACCI), our colleague and friend on the House Ways and Means Committee.

Mr. RENACCI. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of H.R. 4118, the SIMPLE Fairness Act.

According to a recent Gallup poll, 51 percent of Americans disapprove of the President's health care law, and for good reason.

The rollout of the failed, misguided law was nothing short of disastrous. Its plagued Web site prevented many Americans from purchasing health insurance on the Federal and State exchanges. Though the President promised lower costs, many are facing the reality of higher premiums and a steep penalty if they cannot afford the plans that are offered.

Recently, the administration delayed the employer mandate for a second time, leaving intact the mandate that requires individuals to purchase health insurance or pay a fine.

The bill before us today would ensure that no American will be forced to pay the individual mandate penalty tax in 2014. It is evident to this Chamber and Americans across the country that the President's health care law is too complex, too costly, and completely unworkable. Ultimately, this law should be fully repealed, but I am here today because I believe that all hardworking Americans deserve relief from the President's health care law.

Congress should afford individuals the same advantage the administration is giving to businesses and delay the individual mandate. It is simply common sense. I ask my colleagues to come together and pass this important bill and send it to the President to be signed into law.

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

Madam Speaker, today is a little like ''Groundhog Day.'' The Republican leadership has come out here and tried to decide what the weather is going to be, and they are going to get the same answer that they have gotten 49 times before. They can pass it from here, but it is not going to change anything. We have seen this poorly designed, sadly staged GOP political theater before—50 times. This is the 50th vote of this Tea Party, Koch brothers-led Congress to crash the Affordable Care Act.

It is a waste of time and resources, and ignores the facts. Americans want affordable health care, and ACA delivers it to them. ACA has saved lives and brought down our spending. New fraud measures, including new authorities imposing payment suspensions and more rigorous-provider enrollment procedures put into law by ACA, helped the Federal Government recover $4.3 billion in taxpayer money from individuals and companies that tried to defraud the health care programs. The ACA is delivering historic results for the American people, and yet the Republican leadership is hell-bent on a 50th stroke.

Regardless of the fact that our economic system remains stuck in neutral, nothing has been done about jobs, unemployment insurance, raising the minimum wage, and so forth.

If that was all that was going on here, this would still be insulting and absurd. The bill under consideration today, H.R. 4118, is virtually identical to H.R. 2668, a bill passed on the 17th of July, 2013. The Republicans have already passed this bill to delay the individual mandate, something the CBO knows will result in higher insurance premiums. So beyond wasting time and engaging in stunts designed to make the producers of FOX News happy, Republicans want to return Americans to the days before ACA, when a cancer victim couldn't get covered and seniors couldn't get their prescriptions; to the day when wage workers who had paid hundreds of dollars out of pocket went without; to the days of ever-changing lists of preexisting conditions when companies tried to drop coverage.

The real business of the Congress should be to stand up for those Americans and millions more like them. That is what the American people want. That is what the American people deserve. That is why they want us to vote ''no.''

Jim McCrery, in March, 2000, said in an article in Atlantic Monthly that an

employer mandate and an individual mandate was essential.

I can't understand the Republicans saying we don't want everybody to play. We don't want everybody according to their ability to be in. Why are you so eager to let people out the door because they are going to wind up in the emergency room? Have no doubt, they will be getting health care, but they won't be paying for it. You are saying: That's okay with us, we like people who are free riders. That is not America. We are all supposed to do our part, and that is why everyone here should vote ''no.''

I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. JENKINS. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. YOUNG), our friend and colleague on the Ways and Means Committee.

Mr. YOUNG of Indiana. Madam Speaker, as we approach the deadline for enrolling in ObamaCare-sanctioned insurance, it has become clear the system is not working as its supporters intended. For months, we have been learning about Web site problems, spiking premiums, and lost coverage. For months, we have seen an underwhelming number of signups, not even close to matching the stated enrollment goals of this administration. For months, we have heard heartwrenching stories from our districts about the negative impact this botched rollout has had on hardworking American families.

Unfortunately for those families, the White House and those who helped bring us this law have consistently turned a deaf ear to Americans' concerns. Meanwhile, at the urging of the business community, we had the White House delay the employer mandate tax—twice. What must the constituents in our districts do to be heard by ObamaCare supporters? Should they form trade organizations and hire a lobbyist so maybe President Obama and champions of this law will listen?

Well, guess what? My constituents did hire someone to lobby on their behalf when they elected me to Congress. It is simply not fair when businesses get a break but the people who work at those businesses do not. I am all for delaying the employer mandate tax because it is confusing and it is cumbersome for our businesses. I also feel very strongly that the individual mandate tax is just as cumbersome for individuals and families as the employer mandate tax is for our businesses. I believe that individuals and families deserve the same sort of delay. So on behalf of my constituents in Indiana's Ninth District, and on behalf of all of yours, I encourage all of my colleagues to support this bill and to support simple fairness.

Mr. MCDERMOTT. Madam Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS).

Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois. Madam Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to H.R. 4118, the 50th vote to repeal the Affordable Care Act, which, if passed and implemented, would increase premiums, decrease coverage, and increase the number of people who are not insured by as much as 11 million people in this country. It is unbelievable that we would be on the floor voting for the 50th time to try and turn back the clock on millions of Americans who have been denied health insurance coverage because of a preexisting condition, didn't have enough money, or did not have accessibility to facilities.

In Illinois, over 256,000 individuals benefit from the Affordable Care Act. Nationally, more than 4 million Americans have enrolled in private plans, with 82 percent receiving premium tax credits to make health insurance more affordable. More than 3.1 million young adults have access to health insurance by remaining on their parents' plans until age 26. Millions more Americans have secured new coverage through Medicaid expansion.

Rather than decreasing or taking away, the Republican leadership and all of us ought to be increasing and providing. We ought to be affording individuals the opportunity to get insurance because they are unemployed—to get a check. So it is amazing that rather than giving, we would be talking about taking, taking away, when the law says and all of us know that everybody ought to have access to quality health care.

I oppose this legislation.

Ms. JENKINS. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. ROE), my friend and colleague.

□ 1430

Mr. ROE of Tennessee. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentlelady for yielding to me.

I rise in support of the SIMPLE Fairness Act and a level playing field for all Americans.

In the span of about 7 months, the Obama administration has taken action twice to provide big businesses with relief from the President's disastrous health care law. Working families, however, are still being forced to comply with the individual mandate.

Over the last year, President Obama's broken promises on health care become almost too numerous to count. Americans were told that if they liked their health care plan, they could keep it. Tell that to the 82,000 Tennesseans who were forced out of their coverage by ObamaCare.

Americans were told that ObamaCare would lower the cost of insurance. Explain that to the 11 million people that CMS has determined will have their premiums increase.

We were told by the Democratic leader that ObamaCare would create jobs. I invite her to have a conversation with the workers at Mountain States Health Alliance in my district who lost their jobs. Even the CBO agrees that this law is discouraging work.

Throughout the implementation of ObamaCare, the one thing the President has held firm on is that working families must buy insurance—or else. He has promised a veto on this commonsense legislation simply because it delays individual mandate penalties for 1 year.

Here in the people's House, we should stand for their interests and treat people the same as big businesses. It is only fair.

Madam Speaker, I would argue that if this bill is doing so well, why would only 34 percent of the people in this country approve of it?

I urge my colleagues to support this bill.

Mr. MCDERMOTT. Madam Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER).

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Madam Speaker, it is a pleasure for me to follow my good friend, Dr. PHIL ROE, on the floor because we spent last weekend—speaking of health care—along with Mr. MCDERMOTT—in Houston, Texas, at a fabulous conference by the nonpartisan Commonwealth Fund to be able to deal meaningfully with health care problems and bring people together on a bipartisan basis to discuss them.

I know some things we have to do and have got to come to the floor to repeal this 50 times, but I would hope that, sooner rather than later, we reach a point where we can focus on things that bring Americans together, not divide them, something that will improve the quality of health care and actually has nothing to do with spending money, new mandates, or ObamaCare.

I am referring to the legislation that I am pleased to have cosponsored with my good friend, Dr. ROE, H.R. 1173, the Personalize Your Care bill. It has over 50 bipartisan cosponsors. It would enable, for the first time, to provide voluntary consultation on advanced care planning for Medicare and Medicaid.

Every 5 years or when somebody becomes first eligible, it would provide grants to establish and expand programs for physician-ordered life sustaining treatment. It would require that certified electronic health records could display current advanced directives and physician orders for sustaining treatment.

Bear in mind, right now, every day, there are people who are getting health care at their most critical vulnerable moments, at the end of life, that is not necessarily what they want.

The majority of Americans would rather spend their last hours or days surrounded by their families at home, but very few Americans actually are able to do that. They end up in an ICU, not necessarily because that is their choice, but because their choices haven't been recorded and haven't been respected.

It is fascinating to me that Dr. Billy Graham, in his recent book, talks about the Christian responsibility to spare one's family from impossible decisions like that, that it is a Christian

responsibility to have that conversation in advance, execute the appropriate papers, and make sure nobody has to guess about whether a loved one wants to be in an ICU or at home.

Dr. Bill Frist, a fellow Tennessean of my friend Dr. ROE, had an op-ed in Politico a few months ago talking about his experience. Dr. Frist was a former Republican majority leader in the Senate, but he is also a respected physician.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. FORTENBERRY). The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. MCDERMOTT. I yield the gentleman an additional minute.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. He is also a respected heart surgeon who has faced families in this circumstance, and he knows that they need information, that they need help, and that their wishes need to be respected.

Now, maybe instead of repealing ObamaCare the 51st or the 58th or the 100th time—legislation is not going to go any place—maybe we could take a little bit of a time out and consider the legislation that Dr. ROE and I have worked on that is not partisan, that doesn't have anything to do with ObamaCare, that would enable families in their time of need to know what their choices are and to make sure that their choices, whatever they might be, are respected, they are respected in their city, they are respected across State lines, that they protect their family, and that they get the care they want and they need as they approach end of life.

Mr. Speaker, I hope that we will find time this year from passing post office renaming and whatnot, this is a piece of legislation that could come to the floor on the suspension calendar and would make a difference for families all across America.

Ms. JENKINS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Virginia, ERIC CANTOR, our current Republican House majority leader.

Mr. CANTOR. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentlelady and congratulate her on her leadership for this bill and making sure that we reinsert a notion of fairness back into the law for the people of this country.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the SIMPLE Fairness Act.

For the past few months, the President's health care law has been wreaking havoc on the American people. After the administration's disastrous launch of the exchanges, ObamaCare has been anything but what the President had promised it would be. It has become very clear that this law is doing more harm than good.

We now know that ObamaCare has pushed up to 5 million people off the health care plan they liked, and many are now being denied the care they had. To make matters worse, many of these new plans will force Americans to pay higher premiums and higher deductibles. This leaves them with a limited number of options for health care coverage.

Many folks are also finding out that they cannot keep the doctor or the pediatrician that they want to go to and trusted. To put it simply, this is not how America should work. The American people deserve better.

Yet, time and again, the Obama administration has shown its true colors by putting politics first and unilaterally delaying parts of the law to avoid political repercussions. This has become most evident by the administration's delay in the employee mandate for big businesses and its refusal to delay the individual mandate for working Americans.

Just yesterday, it was reported the administration will announce another major unilateral delay on their minimum coverage requirements to—and I quote the publication The Hill—''ease election pressure on Democrats.''

Doesn't it say something that the authors of this legislation are worried that it is being implemented before they face voters again?

And I ask: Will future Presidents, perhaps of our party, be able to simply delay or cancel all or part of ObamaCare? Will my colleagues on the other side of the aisle withhold complaint then?

There is no greater indictment of this law or proof of its failure than the fear that full implementation invokes in its authors.

It is not fair to pick and choose which parts of an unpopular law should be enforced at the expense of working individuals for political expediency, and it is just not fair that businesses and insurance companies get delays and exemptions and not hardworking Americans. It is not fair.

Millions of Americans all over the country are already living paycheck to paycheck. The last thing they need is another brazen attack on their pocketbooks from a health care law they don't want, they didn't ask for, and that doesn't work for them.

Through this administration's ad hoc implementation of ObamaCare, some people won't have to pay the penalty, but others will. Here is who I am concerned about and who the bill before us today protects, the single mom, who for whatever reason ended up without insurance for several months.

She doesn't need a new tax bill from Uncle Sam for hundreds of dollars because she can't access the coverage that Washington says she must. She could use that money to pay the heating bill or to buy groceries for her children.

All Americans—not just some—but all Americans deserve a delay from the punishing financial penalties of the President's health care law. This is our chance to make it happen. With the legislation before us today, no one in this country would be forced to pay the individual mandate tax in 2014.

This is an opportunity to stop the political games and put working Americans first. Let's stand together and support the SIMPLE Fairness Act in bipartisan fashion and give our constituents some relief from the financial burdens of ObamaCare.

I would like to thank Chairman DAVE CAMP and Representative LYNN JENKINS for their hard work on this issue and on behalf of working Americans.

I urge my colleagues to support this important legislation.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Washington has 12 minutes remaining. The gentlewoman from Kansas has 15½ minutes remaining.

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

Ms. JENKINS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Louisiana, STEVE SCALISE, the chairman of the Republican Study Committee.

Mr. SCALISE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlelady from Kansas for yielding and for her leadership on this bill that I am proud to cosponsor.

The SIMPLE Fairness Act is about just that, providing fairness for hardworking taxpayers. If you look at how the President's health care law is being implemented, Mr. Speaker, you have got the President literally saying he is going to give exemption after exemption after exemption to the political class, to the select few who have special interest protections here in Washington.

The President, by the way, has said: Big businesses can get exemptions from ObamaCare. The President has said: Insurance companies can get exemptions from ObamaCare.

But then, when it comes to hardworking taxpayers, families out there who are struggling under the weight of this law, the President says no, you can't have that same exemption that he has given to everybody else.

So what we are saying here, Mr. Speaker, is if these exemptions are good enough for big businesses and if these exemptions are good enough for insurance companies, shouldn't they also be good enough for hardworking taxpayers who are struggling in this bad economy that the President has given us and under the weight of this unworkable law, that the President himself is acknowledging is unworkable, by giving all these exemptions away to everybody else?

Now, if you look at the law, Mr. Speaker, the President doesn't have the legal authority to just waive a law—to literally take out a pen and change the law.

What the President does have is the ability to work with us in Congress in a bipartisan way, which when you look at the vote on this bill, it will be bipartisan in support of giving these hardworking taxpayers that same exemption.

But this law, ObamaCare, is built on a foundation of broken promises. If you like what you have, you can keep it, of course, is probably the most broken promise in political history; but there is more. The President said insurance

costs will be lower. Insurance costs are higher for families.

The President even said he will meet with anybody who has a better idea. Well, we do have a better idea, Mr. Speaker. Over 120 Members of Congress, including medical doctors, have cosponsored the American Health Care Reform Act.

We took the President up on his promise, now almost 3 months ago, and the President has refused to fulfill that promise of meeting with anybody who has a better idea. He won't even sit down and talk with us about a better idea to put patients back in charge of health care.

There is a better way. We ought to treat people fairly. This bill does it. I urge adoption.

Mr. MCDERMOTT. Is the gentlelady from Kansas ready to close?

Ms. JENKINS. I see no other speakers, so I am prepared to close.

Mr. MCDERMOTT. Mr. Speaker, I have one Member who is in transit, but let me say a few things until he gets here.

□ 1445

I have been in Congress for 25 years, and I have listened to the Republicans talk about what we ought to do about health care. They have never brought a bill to the committee—a chairman's mark—for us to mark up and bring out on the floor.

Now, if you have a solution for the fact that health care costs are the biggest costs driving bankruptcy in this country, where is it since you don't like what we have here?

When I was younger, I lived through the implementation of Medicare. The American Medical Association—everybody—was just up and down, and it was the worst thing. If we put in Medicare, it was going to be the end of the world, and we would never have health care again in this country. We went on and on and on like that. They so poisoned the well that, when people went out to actually recruit people to get into the Medicare program, people said: I am not going to have any of that socialistic medicine in my house.

That is what it was called. That is what people were doing in 1964 and 1965. This is a rerun of that very same movie. The Republicans want to kill the idea and leave the American people out there on their own. It is probably the single best example of the difference between the Republicans and the Democrats.

The Democrats have put something out here, and we are trying to help all Americans. Is it perfect? There isn't anybody on my side who would say it is. If we had had some hearings in the Ways and Means Committee, the subcommittee could have done a whole bunch of things—there are all kinds of problems out there—but there haven't been any hearings on this bill, on how to fix it.

I talked to Bill Frist some months ago. He said: Jim, there is no reason to repeal it. You ought to fix it. Make it work. Make it work for the American people.

One of the interesting things that I hear over and over again—and it must be confusing to folks at home—is that the President said: If you like your health care, you can keep it. Now, implicit in that is that it will still exist. The President didn't say: I am going to tell the insurance companies you have got to keep those plans out there.

That wouldn't be the free enterprise system, what you have. You don't like the free enterprise system.

As soon as the President passed this bill, immediately, we had people in the insurance industry pulling down plans all over the country, sending out mailings, saying: You have lost your health care coverage.

I sometimes wonder if global warming—or climate change—is really not because of Obama's health care. I hear that it is the cause of every evil—of people losing jobs. I don't know. Whatever is going on in the country, it is because of ObamaCare. That is foolishness. When you are trying to change a program for 20 or 30 million people, you are bound to have some problems. We are having them, and we are working them out. It was awful at the beginning, and it is better now. It is better today than it was 3 months ago, and it will be. It will continue to improve because the American people need it. They absolutely need it even with the foolishness coming out of here, of trying again to convince the American people to get rid of this.

I had a woman in my district who was an opera singer. She went to Germany, and she got into the German health care system. Instantly, boom, you are in. Anybody who goes to Germany is in. Her daughter got leukemia. Her daughter was treated for leukemia, and she went into remission. The mother finished her contract and came home to the United States. She could not find an insurance company anyplace in this country that would give her insurance for her daughter—none.

Now, that is what you want to go back to. You want to go back to the time when a parent can't find an insurance company that will take care of his kid, and that is the kind of thing that we have been watching for as long as I have been in Congress and before that, and this bill has begun to stop that.

We had lifetime limits. Some cancers eat up a lot of money real quickly. Bone marrow transplants are $125,000 or more, and people wind up being unable to purchase the medication. All of that is covered by this bill, and you are saying to people: No, we want to go back to 1930. We like the Dust Bowl. We like the hard times of the thirties. We don't want any of this stuff.

In my view, this is a perfect place for Democrats to vote ''no,'' and Republicans, of course, will vote ''yes,'' and the American people will make a judgment in the next election.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. JENKINS. Mr. Speaker, in closing, this bill is about fairness and about providing relief to all hardworking Americans just as the administration keeps giving to businesses. It is about leveling the playing field for the millions of individuals and middle class families who are forced to comply with this health care law.

Just last week, a stunning poll found that only 6 percent of Americans claim ObamaCare is working and want it kept intact. Opposition to this law is at an all-time high, and even the President admitted that the launch of this law was fumbled. Add that to the millions of Americans who are losing their health insurance that they like, are losing access to the doctors they have always seen, are submitting their personal data to an unsecured system, are paying higher premiums they can't afford, and clearly, we have a law that is not working and is not fair to the American people.

The court of public opinion is a powerful thing. The House will listen, and it will continue to listen, and it will continue to provide relief and fairness to middle class families. I hope the Senate and the President will also do the right thing for the American people.

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

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Speaker, I have always said that Congress would need to pass fixes to improve the Affordable Care Act. The original version of the bill that passed the House in 2009, and included my provision to repeal the anti-trust exemption enjoyed by the insurance industry, was much better than the Senate version that ultimately became law. Unfortunately the House Leadership has not allowed us the opportunity to vote on real fixes to the ACA. Instead the Republican leadership continues to engage in an ideological exercise of repeatedly bringing up bills that will never move beyond the House. H.R. 4118 is no different. It won't be taken up by the Senate. The President has threatened to veto it. It is not a real fix.

Instead of bringing up bills that will never become law, Congress should be working on fixes to the Affordable Care Act that will actually help our constituents. Oregonians who want to buy insurance continue to face a state exchange website that does not function. Because of this problem I fought hard to let Oregonians to keep their current insurance plan if they wanted to. Small businesses in Oregon can't use tax credits to help them provide insurance to their employees on the SHOP small business exchange because there still is no SHOP exchange in Oregon, so I am asking for small business tax credits to be available outside of the SHOP exchange.

Americans who want to take personal responsibility for all of their healthcare costs would benefit from an alternative to the individual mandate that I have proposed. My proposal would allow people to opt out of buying insurance without facing a tax penalty as long as they commit to taking full responsibility for any healthcare costs they incur.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition once again to an attempt by the majority to defeat the Affordable Care Act.

This begins the third year that the majority has attempted to put an end to affordable, available and accessible health care for all Americans.

They have ignored the law, a Supreme Court decision and a national presidential election that affirmed the establishment, legality, and popularity of the Affordable Care Act.

I oppose this bill for three reasons: there are much more pressing issues facing our nation, this bill is wrong on the facts, and the Affordable Care Act is working.

There are much more pressing issues facing our nation: unemployment, food security, housing security and access to job training that leads to employment.

We should be debating a bill to restore emergency supplemental unemployment benefits.

We should be restoring cuts the Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program that was cut by nearly $20 billion dollars over several years.

We should be voting to raise the minimum wage to $10.10 an hour over several years and link future increases of the minimum wage to inflation.

We should be taking up the budget process with eagerness to avoid another government shutdown.

In 2013, we had a Federal government shutdown because we lost precious legislative time voting to repeal or seriously diminish the ability of the Affordable Care Act to do what it is currently doing—providing health insurance to millions of Americans.

Every wasted vote—moves this Congress another step closer to another Federal government shutdown.

The budget process takes months of work by over a dozen committees to complete.

Each vote that stops our legislative work and bring us to the floor for a debate on legislation that will not go anywhere—is time taken away from our work to avoid another government shutdown.

The American people were unaware of the cost of over 40 votes to end Obamacare until millions of citizens were put out of work when the government shutdown last year.

They are watching what is happening in Congress very closely and the consequences will fall heaviest on those who were hurt by the last government shutdown.

The 113th Congress has 70 legislative working days left on the calendar before September 30, 2014—the end of the fiscal year for 2014 and the beginning of the fiscal year for 2015.

I call on my colleagues to bring to the floor bills like H.R. 3773, the Unemployment Jobhunters Protection and Assistance Act, a bill I introduced that would extend emergency unemployment compensation (EUC) payments for eligible individuals to weeks of employment ending on or before January 1, 2015.

This Congress would find a better use of its time if it would take up consideration of H.R. 3888, New Chance for a New Start in Life Act of 2014, that would authorize the Secretary of Labor to make grants to States, units of local government, and Indian tribes to carry out employment training programs to assist long-term unemployed job hunters to obtain the skills and training they need to reenter the workforce and fill jobs in high-growth sectors of the economy.

These are just two bills that would improve the lives of people who we all serve, but there are dozens of others introduced by members who came to the Congress to serve the will of the people and not their own will.

I oppose this bill because it is wrong on the facts.

Republicans are claiming that this bill is simply logical because the Administration has already delayed the employer responsibility provision for one year.

This claim is inaccurate and disingenuous.

Nonpartisan experts agree that there is no comparison between the impacts of a delay in the employer responsibility and individual responsibility provisions.

For example, in a report in July, the nonpartisan Urban Institute concluded, ''Delaying or eliminating the individual mandate would significantly decrease insurance coverage relative to the full Affordable Care Act's implementation, whereas delaying or eliminating the employer mandate will have essentially no effect on coverage.''

The Affordable Care Act is good for the American People

The Obamacare is popular and growing in greater popularity everyday as consumers get past the rhetoric and experience the reality of the peace of mind that health insurance for their families and themselves brings.

Thanks to the Affordable Care Act, in Texas:

5,198,000 individuals on private insurance have gained coverage for at least one free preventive health care service such as a mammogram, birth control, or an immunization in 2011 and 2012. In the first eleven months of 2013 alone, an additional 1,683,800 people with Medicare have received at least one preventive service at no out of pocket cost.

The up to 10,695,000 individuals with preexisting conditions such as asthma, cancer, or diabetes—including up to 1,632,000 children—will no longer have to worry about being denied coverage or charged higher prices because of their health status or history.

Approximately 5,189,000 Texans have gained expanded mental health and substance use disorder benefits and/or federal parity protections.

4,889,000 uninsured Texans will have new health insurance options through Medicaid or private health plans in the Marketplace.

As a result of new policies that make sure premium dollars work for the consumer, not just the insurer, in the past year insurance companies have sent rebates averaging $95 per family to approximately 726,200 consumers.

In the first ten months of 2013, 233,100 seniors and people with disabilities have saved on average $866 on prescription medications as the health care law closes Medicare's so called ''donut hole.''

357,000 young adults have gained health insurance because they can now stay on their parents' health plans until age 26.

Individuals no longer have to worry about having their health benefits cut off after they reach a lifetime limit on benefits, and starting in January, 7,536,000 Texans will no longer have to worry about annual limits, either.

Health centers have received $293,038,000 to provide primary care, establish new sites, and renovate existing centers to expand access to quality health care. Texas has approximately 400 health center sites, which served about 1,079,000 individuals in 2012.

Every day more uninsured Americans are signing up for plans as the website gets faster and more people with insurance are benefiting from the law.

I ask my colleagues on the other side of the aisle to not spend any more precious legislative work on efforts to end the Affordable Care Act or ignoring the number of people continuing to vote in favor of the new law with their insurance enrollment dollars.

Mr. Speakers, I urge my colleagues to join me in voting against this bill.

Mr. POSEY. Mr. Speaker, when the health care law was passed on a party line vote people were assured they could keep their current doctors and insurance plans, it would cost them less, it was not a tax, and there would be no rationing of medical care. Those are not my words. They are the words from the supporters of the bill in the Congress and the Obama Administration.

The stark reality is very different for many of my constituents and hundreds of them have shared with me how this health care law has adversely impacted them. I'd like to share just a few of these comments with you. They are from real people, hardworking Americans who I have the privilege of representing and they are begging for relief:

''My group rate insurance increased 100% and my deductible went from $2,500 to $7,500'' wrote Preston in Brevard, and Margaret says her ''insurances costs jumped 300%.''

Paul in Brevard writes, ''It has created a situation where I can't retire safely.''

Norma in Indian River County says her ''premiums increased $600 per year. That's a lot for someone on a fixed income.''

Tom in south Brevard wrote that the law ''increased premiums and inserted unneeded benefits into our policy.''

Rob in Melbourne fears for his kids, writing: ''My kids cannot find a job and the cost of healthcare is three times more for them than it was previously.'' And another constituent wrote: ''My grandchildren lost their insurance due to the exorbitant increase in monthly premiums by their employer.''

A friend wrote: ''My best friend's hours got cut so the company would not have to provide healthcare for him and his family.'' And, Ed in Titusville wrote of the impact on his daughters: ''Both of my daughters have had their work hours cut [so their employers could avoid providing health insurance].''

Christine in Vero shared: ''With no change in my health, my premiums went up 21% with a $2500 deductible.''

Rob in Melbourne says his insurance costs ''doubled''.

Ralph in Brevard says ''I lost my doctor and am paying for things I don't need.''

Chris in Palm Bay says he ''lost his job and was forced to move and pay higher insurance costs.''

Paul in Palm Bay says: ''The policy increased from $50 a month to $350 a month.''

Terri shares that her doctors won't take her private insurance.

Dave in central Brevard shared that: ''It has DOUBLED my premiums!! I am very upset about Obamacare! FIX IT!''

John says he lost his plan, and Norma writes: ''I have to die, because my medical bills will not be covered.''

I could go on.

This bill simply delays the individual mandate tax penalty for a year so that Americans can pick a plan that they want and that they

can afford, rather than one that the government in Washington tells them they must sign up for.

The President has already given large multinational corporations and labor unions the same waiver. We are simply extending this same flexibility to average Americans who want nothing more than to be treated equally.

Ultimately, when you have to pass a bill to find out what's in it, there's a good chance that you're not going to like what it says. The only way to fix this situation is to repeal this law and replace it with a plan that restores individual freedom and makes health insurance more affordable.

Mr. MARCHANT. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to urge my colleagues to support the Simple Fairness Act and eliminate the individual mandate tax penalty under the Affordable Care Act for a year.

Many of my constituents in the 24th District of Texas have lost their health insurance and access to doctors they liked due to the President's healthcare law. The law is hurting millions of Americans.

The President has recognized as much, as he recently issued another delay that protects businesses from his employer mandate tax. In fact, the President has delayed provisions in his own healthcare law over 20 times in the past year.

It is simply not fair for the President to give businesses a one-year delay on the tax penalty, but not give hardworking individuals and families the same relief.

My constituents, and all Americans, deserve the same thing: fairness.

I encourage my colleagues to join me in supporting the Simple Fairness Act.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the 50th time this House of Representatives has tried to repeal, defund or dismantle the Affordable Care Act.

What a sad Golden Anniversary moment for the GOP.

The Affordable Care Act, which has already helped millions of Americans, is the law of the land. Instead of playing politics, let's instead work together to address concerns over its implementation while upholding its mission: to provide quality, affordable healthcare access for all Americans.

With Americans facing so many real, pressing issues every day, I urge this Congress to focus on achieving results and serving our constituents.

Two million Americans, including about 110 thousand Floridians have lost their unemployment insurance. Our immigration system is in dire need of common sense and comprehensive reforms. Women still make less than men while working equal jobs.

The list goes on. We have work to do. We have a duty and responsibility to serve the interests of the American people. These pointless partisan attacks on the Affordable Care Act must stop.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. All time for debate has expired.

Pursuant to House Resolution 497, 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.

MOTION TO RECOMMIT

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

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

Mr. HORSFORD. I am in its current form.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. Horsford moves to recommit the bill H.R. 4118 to the Committee on Ways and Means with instructions to report the same back to the House forthwith with the following amendment:

Add at the end the following new section:

SEC. 3 PROTECTING CONSUMERS FROM PREMIUM INCREASES AND DISCRIMINATION ON THE BASIS OF PRE-EXISTING CONDITIONS.

Nothing in this Act shall be construed to alter, impact, delay, or weaken—

(1) section 1402 of the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act that reduces out-of-pocket costs and cost-sharing for individuals and families,

(2) sections 1001 and 1401 of such Act that provide tax credits and rebates for health insurance, or

(3) section 1201 of such Act that prohibits discrimination on the basis of pre-existing conditions and gender.

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

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

Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Nevada is recognized for 5 minutes in support of his motion.

Mr. HORSFORD. Mr. Speaker, this is the final amendment to the bill, which will not kill the bill or send it back to committee. If adopted, the bill will immediately proceed to final passage, as amended.

This Republican bill represents the 50th attempt to undermine and repeal the Affordable Care Act. The Democratic motion to recommit lowers out-of-pocket costs, secures tax credits and rebates, and ensures no discrimination against those with preexisting conditions.

The bill would delay the individual responsibility provision of the Affordable Care Act to purchase health care by 1 year, which would directly impact the out-of-pocket costs of consumers and threaten the ability of millions of Americans with preexisting conditions to have health coverage.

The nonpartisan CBO estimates that the enactment of the Republican H.R. 4118 would increase the number of uninsured by 1 million in 2014, by 2 million in 2015, and by 1 million in 2016. That is 4 million Americans who would not have access to health insurance otherwise.

The White House pointed out this morning that the individual shared responsibility provision is essential to ensuring that 129 million Americans with preexisting conditions can get coverage without being charged more or losing coverage when they get sick.

Mr. Speaker, this bill is just another example of House Republicans playing political games rather than working together to get things done for the American people. This is no longer about helping people. It never really was for the Republicans. These repeal votes are about ideological purity. They are about politics for the sake of politics. That is why people across America are frustrated and disappointed by this Congress—because this Chamber has become a bubble, and Republicans have stopped listening and have stopped working on anything productive.

It is not just on health care. It is on giving Americans a raise by increasing the Federal minimum wage. It is the refusal to bring up comprehensive immigration reform even though there are votes in the House to pass it. It is on unemployment insurance and on the failure of this Congress to extend benefits to now more than 2 million Americans who have lost coverage. It is about creating jobs and helping to improve and grow our infrastructure.

Now, this vote may seem routine. It may seem like this is just Congress' continuing Groundhog Day, but this is the 50th time that we have done this. We are wasting time, and we have a full docket of things that we need to be doing. This vote is a symptom of something very wrong in Washington, and it is time to wake up and to do something more than play Tea Party politics in this House. The bill offered by my colleagues on the other side would increase out-of-pocket costs to American consumers. It would increase health premiums and the number of uninsured Americans, and it hurts those with preexisting conditions.

Last year, I underwent a six-way bypass. Open heart surgery—no question—was terrifying, and when you are on an operating table in an emergency room, the last thing you should be focusing on is becoming medically bankrupt. You should be focusing on taking care of yourself and your family and on getting them the best care that you can. Whether it is heart disease, cancer, diabetes, or any other preexisting condition, people shouldn't go bankrupt because of an illness or a disease in this country.

Thankfully, my surgery went well. I was able to afford it. My heart condition is now a preexisting condition. There are thousands of my constituents who are in the same or worse boat but who are not financially well off. If we repeal or delay the Affordable Care Act, what are they supposed to do? There is no solution being offered by the House Republicans. It is not repeal and replace. It is repeal and return to a broken health care system. That is it. That is the Republicans' plan.

Last year, they passed H.R. 2668, a virtually identical bill to the one we are considering today. They have run out of ways to repeal this law, so now we are stuck on repeat. We should, instead, be focusing on renewing unemployment insurance benefits for 2 million struggling Americans, on passing comprehensive immigration reform so that we can fix the system that has got families torn apart, and on giving 30 million Americans a raise.

My motion to recommit would protect three of the most important provisions of the Affordable Care Act that are overwhelmingly supported by the American people: lower out-of-pocket costs for consumers, tax credits and rebates to purchase health care, and ensuring that no one in America can be denied coverage due to a preexisting condition in America.

It is time for this Congress to wake up and to do the right thing—to protect Americans and their health care.

I yield back the balance of my time.

□ 1500

Ms. JENKINS. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my point of order and seek time in opposition to the motion.

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

The gentlewoman from Kansas is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. JENKINS. Mr. Speaker, once again, the Democrats are simply missing the point. The President is the one who has delayed the employer mandate, the President has said this law is not ready, and the President has declined to extend the same flexibility to individuals.

This is about basic fairness. It is only fair that hardworking taxpayers are given the same treatment as businesses.

Like so many other provisions of the law that have been delayed, repealed, or declared unworkable, this is just another example that, despite the administration's promises, ObamaCare is not working for the American people.

I reject this motion.

Please support H.R. 4118, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the previous question is ordered on the motion to recommit.

There was no objection.

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

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 and clause 9 of rule XX, this 15-minute vote on the motion to recommit will be followed by 5-minute votes on passage of H.R. 4118, if ordered, and the motion to suspend the rules with regard to H.R. 2126.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 185, nays 227, not voting 18, as follows:

[Roll No. 96]

YEAS—185

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

NAYS—227

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

NOT VOTING—18

Chaffetz
Courtney
Crawford
DeLauro
Duffy
Esty
Frankel (FL)
Gosar
Green, Gene
Himes
Hinojosa
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Larson (CT)
McCarthy (NY)
Negrete McLeod
Pastor (AZ)
Schneider

□ 1529

Mr. ROGERS of Michigan, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Messrs. FARENTHOLD, FRANKS of Arizona, REICHERT, PEARCE, and TERRY changed their vote from ''yea'' to ''nay.''

Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Messrs. BRADY of Pennsylvania, GRIJALVA, and SWALWELL of California changed their vote from ''nay'' to ''yea.''

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated for:

Mr. HIMES. Mr. Speaker, had I been present for the vote on the Motion to Recommit with Instructions, rollcall vote 96, I would have voted "aye."

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 noes appeared to have it.

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 250, nays 160, not voting 20, as follows:

[Roll No. 97]

YEAS—250

Amash
Amodei
Bachmann
Bachus
Barber
Barletta
Barr
Barrow (GA)
Barton
Benishek
Bentivolio
Bera (CA)
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Brownley (CA)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Burgess
Bustos
Byrne
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Cantor
Capito
Carter
Cassidy
Chabot
Coble
Coffman
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Conaway
Cook

Cotton
Cramer
Crenshaw
Culberson
Daines
Davis, Rodney
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Duckworth
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellmers
Enyart
Farenthold
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Garcia
Gardner
Garrett
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gibson
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Grimm
Guthrie
Hall
Hanna
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings (WA)
Heck (NV)
Hensarling
Herrera Beutler
Holding
Hudson
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt
Issa
Jenkins
Johnson (OH)
Jordan
Joyce
Kelly (PA)
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kinzinger (IL)
Kline
Kuster
Labrador
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Lankford
Latham
Latta
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Long
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
Maffei
Marchant
Marino
Massie
Matheson
McAllister
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul
McClintock
McHenry
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
Meadows
Meehan
Messer
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Mullin
Mulvaney
Murphy (FL)
Murphy (PA)
Neugebauer
Noem
Nolan
Nugent
Nunes
Nunnelee
Olson
Owens
Palazzo
Paulsen
Pearce
Perry
Peters (CA)
Peters (MI)
Peterson
Petri
Pittenger
Pitts
Poe (TX)
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Rahall
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rice (SC)
Rigell
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Royce
Ruiz
Runyan
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Sanford
Scalise
Schock
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shea-Porter
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
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)

NAYS—160

Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Broun (GA)
Brown (FL)
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Cárdenas
Carney
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DelBene
Deutch
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Eshoo
Farr
Fattah
Foster
Fudge
Grayson
Green, Al
Grijalva
Gutiérrez
Hahn
Hanabusa
Hastings (FL)
Heck (WA)
Higgins
Holt
Honda
Horsford
Hoyer
Huffman
Israel
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
Kirkpatrick
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis
Loebsack
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Lynch
Maloney, Carolyn
Maloney, Sean
Matsui
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McNerney
Meeks
Meng
Michaud
Miller, George
Moore
Moran
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
O'Rourke
Pallone
Pascrell
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Pingree (ME)
Pocan
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rangel
Richmond
Roybal-Allard
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schrader
Schwartz
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Sherman
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Speier
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Titus
Tonko
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Waxman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—20

Aderholt
Chaffetz
Courtney
Crawford
DeLauro
Duffy
Esty
Frankel (FL)
Gosar
Green, Gene
Himes
Hinojosa
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Larson (CT)
McCarthy (NY)
Negrete McLeod
Pastor (AZ)
Ruppersberger
Schneider

□ 1538

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. RUPPERSBERGER. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 97, H.R. 4118 would increase the number of uninsured. Had I been present, I would have voted "no."

Mr. HIMES. Mr. Speaker, had I been present for the vote On Passage of H.R. 4118, rollcall vote 97, I would have voted "no."

ENERGY EFFICIENCY IMPROVEMENT ACT OF 2014

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 2126) to facilitate better alignment, cooperation, and best practices between commercial real estate landlords and tenants regarding energy efficiency in buildings, and for other purposes, as amended, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. WHITFIELD) 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 375, nays 36, not voting 19, as follows:

[Roll No. 98]

YEAS—375

Aderholt
Amodei
Bachus
Barber
Barletta
Barr
Barrow (GA)
Beatty
Becerra
Benishek
Bentivolio
Bera (CA)
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Boustany
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Burgess
Bustos
Butterfield
Byrne
Calvert
Camp
Cantor
Capito
Capps
Capuano
Cárdenas
Carney
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Cassidy
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chabot
Chu
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Coble
Coffman
Cohen
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Connolly
Conyers
Cook
Cooper
Costa
Cotton
Cramer
Crenshaw
Crowley
Cuellar
Culberson
Cummings
Daines
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
Davis, Rodney
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DelBene
Denham
Dent
DesJarlais
Deutch
Diaz-Balart
Doggett
Doyle
Duckworth
Duncan (TN)
Edwards
Ellison
Ellmers
Engel
Enyart
Eshoo
Farenthold
Farr
Fattah
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foster
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Garcia
Gardner
Garrett
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gibson
Gingrey (GA)
Goodlatte
Gowdy
Graves (MO)
Grayson
Green, Al
Griffin (AR)
Grijalva
Grimm
Guthrie
Gutiérrez
Hahn
Hall
Hanabusa
Hanna
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Heck (NV)
Heck (WA)
Herrera Beutler
Higgins
Holding
Holt
Horsford
Hoyer
Hudson
Huffman
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt
Israel
Issa
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Jenkins
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, E. B.
Jordan
Joyce
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kelly (PA)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kinzinger (IL)
Kirkpatrick
Kline
Kuster
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Latham
Latta
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loebsack
Lofgren
Long
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Lynch
Maffei
Maloney, Carolyn
Maloney, Sean
Marino
Matheson
Matsui
McAllister
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McHenry
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
McNerney
Meadows
Meehan
Meeks
Meng
Messer
Mica
Michaud
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Miller, George
Moore
Moran
Mullin
Mulvaney
Murphy (FL)
Murphy (PA)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Noem
Nolan
Nugent
Nunes
Nunnelee
O'Rourke
Olson
Owens
Palazzo
Pallone
Pascrell
Paulsen
Payne
Pearce
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters (CA)
Peters (MI)
Peterson
Petri
Pingree (ME)
Pittenger
Pitts
Pocan
Poe (TX)
Polis
Pompeo
Price (GA)
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rahall
Rangel
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Rice (SC)
Richmond
Rigell
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Ruiz
Runyan
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sanford
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schock
Schrader
Schwartz
Schweikert
Scott (VA)
Scott, Austin
Scott, David
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sessions

Sewell (AL)
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Sinema
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Southerland
Speier
Stewart
Stivers
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Terry
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thompson (PA)
Tiberi
Tierney
Tipton
Titus
Tonko
Tsongas
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walorski
Walz
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Waxman
Webster (FL)
Welch
Wenstrup
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (FL)
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Woodall
Yarmuth
Yoder
Young (AK)
Young (IN)

NAYS—36

Amash
Bachmann
Barton
Bass
Brady (TX)
Bridenstine
Broun (GA)
Campbell
Carter
Conaway
DeSantis
Dingell
Duncan (SC)
Fleming
Gohmert
Granger
Graves (GA)
Griffith (VA)
Hensarling
Honda
Huelskamp
Labrador
Lankford
Lummis
Marchant
Massie
McClintock
Neugebauer
Perry
Posey
Ribble
Stockman
Stutzman
Thornberry
Weber (TX)
Yoho

NOT VOTING—19

Chaffetz
Courtney
Crawford
DeLauro
Duffy
Esty
Frankel (FL)
Gosar
Green, Gene
Himes
Hinojosa
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Larson (CT)
McCarthy (NY)
Negrete McLeod
Pastor (AZ)
Scalise
Schneider

□ 1546

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

Ms. LEE of California 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.

The title of the bill was amended so as to read: ''A bill to promote energy efficiency, and for other purposes.''.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated for:

Mr. HIMES. Mr. Speakers, had I been present for rollcall vote 98 on passage of H.R. 2126, I would have voted "aye." I am proud of my colleagues on both sides of the aisle for coming together in support of much-needed energy savings measures.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. LARSON of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, on March 5, 2014—I was not present for rollcall votes 93–98 due to an event in Connecticut with President Barack Obama. If I had been present for these votes, I would have voted: "nay" on rollcall vote 93, "nay" on rollcall vote 94, "aye" on rollcall vote 95, "aye" on rollcall vote 96, "nay" on rollcall vote 97, "aye" on rollcall vote 98.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Ms. FRANKEL of Florida. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall vote Nos. 96, 97, and 98, I was not present because of a dental emergency. Had I been present, I would have voted "yea" for rollcall vote No. 96, "nay" on rollcall vote No. 97, and "yea" on rollcall vote No. 98.

ELECTRICITY SECURITY AND AFFORDABILITY ACT

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. WHITFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and to include extraneous material on H.R. 3826.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 497 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. 3826.

The Chair appoints the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. FORTENBERRY) to preside over the Committee of the Whole.

□ 1549

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. 3826) to provide direction to the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency regarding the establishment of standards for emissions of any greenhouse gas from fossil fuel-fired electric utility generating units, and for other purposes, with Mr. FORTENBERRY 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 Kentucky (Mr. WHITFIELD) and the gentleman from California (Mr. WAXMAN) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. WHITFIELD. Mr. Chair, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chair, I rise this afternoon in support of H.R. 3826, the Electricity Security and Affordability Act.

Recently, a constitutional law professor at George Washington University named Jonathan Turley issued a dire warning. Professor Turley said that he voted for President Obama in the last election, that he agrees philosophically with President Obama on many issues, but he said that, if left unchecked, the U.S. President could effectively become a government unto himself. He was referring to the fact that this President has been overly aggressive in the use of executive orders and regulations through various governmental agencies to accomplish his political goals.

The reason that we are here today is, with this legislation, it is our hope that we can overturn one of the most extreme regulations of the Obama administration.

In January of next year, it is anticipated that they will finalize a rule from EPA that will make it impossible to build a new coal-powered plant in America. That is hard to believe that that can be the situation in our great country, particularly since 40 percent of our electricity comes from coal. The reason that it would be impossible to build a new coal-powered plant because of these new EPA regulations is the fact that the emission standards have been set so high, and I might add that it is pretty clear that those emission standards, the way they were set, violates the Energy Security Act of 2005.

We have written a letter to EPA setting out our concerns. They still have not responded to us. We have talked to lawyers throughout the country who are ready to file a lawsuit if this happens because it is impossible to believe that the three plants in America that used to set the emission standards for new coal-powered plants, none of those plants are in existence today. None of them are operating today. So our legislation, we believe, is a reasonable approach to a serious problem for America.

I might add that 41 out of 50 States last year indicated that their electricity rates have gone up under the Obama administration. I know that the President is greatly concerned about the less fortunate in our society. He has talked a lot about the minimum wage bill, for example, but these electricity rates going up hit the most vulnerable in our society the most, particularly those on fixed incomes. Yet it is his policies that are driving up these electricity costs.

So the legislation that we have on the floor today is very simple. First of all, it acknowledges for the first time by legislation that EPA can regulate greenhouse gases. This bill goes farther than any other bill has. So you can regulate greenhouse gases, but when you set the emissions standard, the unit must be in operation for a period of time. It must be commercially available to the utilities to buy it, as opposed to the proposed regulation in which the technology is simply not available.

So our legislation, as I said, we don't anticipate a new coal-powered plant to be built anytime soon in America because our natural gas prices are so low. But in Europe, which it is acknowledged is the green sector of the world, they mothballed 30 gigawatts of gas-powered plants in the last 20 months because the gas prices coming from Russia are so expensive that it is raising their electricity rates to such an extent that it is damaging the area. With our legislation, if those gas prices go up, an option available to the American people, to the American utility sector, is they can go out and build a coal-powered plant with reasonable regulations.

Then the second thing that our legislation does—and when I say ''our,'' I am talking about Senator JOE MANCHIN, a Democrat from West Virginia, has introduced this bill in the U.S. Senate. I, along with Democratic support, was able to get it out of the Energy and Commerce Committee.

So this debate is vitally important today because the President is going so fast, in such an extreme way, that it would make it impossible to use coal in America with a new plant, and we have never had a national debate on the issue. So today we can at least have this debate.

The second thing that our legislation does applies to existing plants. EPA said they are going to regulate existing coal plants. We say go ahead and do it, set the standards, but Congress will set the effective date for that regulation.

It is a very simple piece of legislation, one that I think is necessary to protect the American people and to ensure that America remains competitive in the global marketplace.

In addition to that, I want to make one other comment. Emissions from the energy sector in America are the lowest, CO_2 emissions are the lowest that they have been in 20 years. So America does not have to take a backseat to anyone on having a clean emission standard and regulation.

With that, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. WAXMAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, Kofi Annan, the former Secretary-General of the United Nations wrote in The Washington Post earlier this year:

> Climate change is the biggest challenge of our time. It threatens the well-being of hundreds of millions of people today, and many billions more in time.

Robert Rubin, the former Treasury Secretary, said recently:

> There are a lot of really significant monumental issues facing the global economy, but this supersedes them all.

The Energy and Commerce Committee is the committee in the House that has the power to tackle this monumental issue, the biggest challenge of our time, but we are missing in action. Instead of listening to the scientists and working on a bipartisan basis to protect the planet for our children and future generations, we are considering today a science denial bill that would strip the EPA of authority to stop dangerous carbon pollution.

The venerable JOHN DINGELL, the longtime chairman of the Energy and Commerce Committee, is famously known for pointing to a photo of the Earth, which I have here to the right, to describe the committee's jurisdiction. Under his leadership, the committee was known for listening to the experts, tackling the toughest problems, and crafting responsible science-based policies. But today we need a new symbol to represent what we are doing.

The Energy and Commerce Committee has joined The Flat Earth Society. We considered a very similar bill to this one last Congress.

Here is what Nature, one of the world's leading science journals, said at the time:

> Misinformation was presented as fact, truth was twisted, and nobody showed any inclination to listen to scientists, let alone learn from them. It has been an embarrassing display, not just for the Republican Party, but also for Congress and the U.S. citizens it represents.

□ 1600

It is hard to escape the conclusion that the U.S. Congress has entered the intellectual wilderness—The Flat Earth Society.

The United States is a major contributor to climate change. It cannot be stopped without us. We have a moral responsibility to act, but the Republican majority has brought a bill to the floor that does just the opposite. It makes the problem worse by preventing EPA from acting.

If we pass this terrible bill, we will vote to let China leap ahead of us in the race to build the clean energy economy for the future, and we will be ignoring our moral obligation to protect the planet for our children and grandchildren.

As you might have guessed, I strongly oppose this bill. Future generations will be appalled that we are considering it today. Coal-fired power plants are the largest single source of carbon pollution in the country. Today, there is no limit on how much carbon pollution these power plants can emit. That is why President Obama directed the Environmental Protection Agency to use its existing authority under law, under the Clean Air Act, to require power plants to control carbon pollution. EPA has proposed a rule to require new coal plants to use available pollution control technology to capture and sequester carbon. For existing coal plants, EPA is working with stakeholders to think through the best approach. H.R. 3826, the bill under consideration today, would stop EPA from issuing any rules and allow these plants to continue to keep emitting unlimited amounts of carbon pollution.

Republicans complain they don't like EPA's approach, but they won't even admit climate change is a problem, much less accept the President's invitation to work together on a solution. Instead, they want to pass a bill to deny the problem, block EPA action, and weaken the Clean Air Act.

My message to my Republican colleagues is simple: if you don't like what EPA is doing, tell us your plan. If you have other ideas for reducing carbon pollution to prevent catastrophic climate change, let's hear about them. If you don't, you should step aside and let the President lead.

Today is an embarrassing day for our committee on Energy and Commerce and the U.S. House of Representatives if this bill is to be passed. I hope that does not come about.

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

Mr. WHITFIELD. Mr. Chairman, at this time I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from California (Mr. MCCARTHY), the majority whip.

Mr. MCCARTHY of California. Mr. Chairman, in 2008 in an interview with the San Francisco Chronicle, President Obama warned us that under his policies for energy, ''electricity rates will necessarily skyrocket.'' Now it appears with high electricity costs, that this is a promise that the President chose to keep.

Today, millions of Americans are suffering from one of the coldest winters in recent memory, and in some cases, the most expensive. In New York, some homes are seeing their heating bills double, but it doesn't have to be this way. The U.S. is currently enjoying a revolution in energy production, the energy that heats our homes and keeps us warm during the cold winter nights. Americans across the country should be celebrating this breakthrough. In an economy where the Nation's income today is lower than in the year 2000, abundant energy should provide a sense of relief to strained budgets, but because of this administration's policies, Americans are simply left out in the cold with their energy bills.

First, the Democrats tried cap-and-trade, but that failed in a Democrat-led Congress. Now this administration has proposed arguably the most expensive regulation ever by the EPA, one that would render the construction of any future coal power plant impossible through the mandating of technology that isn't readily attainable.

Today, coal accounts for 37 percent of total U.S. electricity production. The EPA's regulation will cost approximately $1,200 per household per year in lost income. That is $100 more a month. Most importantly, this regulation will cause the greatest amount of harm, lost jobs, diminished incomes, and higher electricity bills in areas where incomes are modest, as are the lifestyles of those who live there. It isn't the rich on Fifth Avenue or in Beverly Hills who will be impacted; it is the American working class. Communities like Indiana's Second District, home to our good friend, Congresswoman JACKIE WALORSKI; or Ohio's Fourth District, home to our friend JIM JORDAN; or the First District, home to Chairman RYAN; or even Wisconsin's Second or Iowa's First District, both represented by my colleagues on the other side. All will be unnecessarily hurt by this regulation.

For all the talk from my colleagues on the other side of the aisle about fairness, this regulation is profoundly unfair. The Electricity Security and Affordability Act sponsored by my friend, ED WHITFIELD, rejects the administration's back door attacks on America's energy bills. This legislation restores opportunity and fairness by ensuring more American paychecks do not unnecessarily go to expanding electricity and heating costs.

Mr. Chairman, at a time when energy production is booming, the cost per family should be dropping, not rising. I suppose the President actually held true to another promise: he has promised an all-the-above energy policy. I

had hoped that meant increasing energy production from all sources, not increasing prices on all consumers.

I urge my colleagues to reject the President's plan for higher energy costs and support this legislation.

Mr. WAXMAN. Mr. Chairman, the previous speaker said that heating oil prices are going up, energy costs are going up. Well, if they are going up, it is not because of what President Obama has done by regulation because he has not adopted any regulations through EPA. The bill before us would stop any regulations from being adopted under current law. They would change the current law and say nothing could be adopted in the future.

The chairman of the Subcommittee on Energy made the statement no coal power plants are being proposed, yet what he is also suggesting is that we not allow them to be built in the future should they want to be built in a way that would reduce the pollution of carbon. What is unfair, it seems to me what is unfair is that coal-burning power plants can burn all the coal they want and put out all the pollution they want, and we are allowing it even though everyone is suffering from the consequences. So I find it amazing to hear the arguments: One, coal burning power plants are not going to be built; on the other hand, we are already paying higher prices and nothing has even been passed by the EPA and put into effect.

At this time I yield 5 minutes to my colleague, the gentleman from California (Mr. MCNERNEY).

Mr. MCNERNEY. Mr. Chairman, I thank the ranking member for yielding to me, and I want to talk about this bill, H.R. 3826. Basically from where I can see, H.R. 3826 will essentially prevent the EPA from limiting coal-fired power plant emissions, including health-endangering pollution as well as carbon. We are all interested in health, but I want to talk about carbon pollution.

Climate change is one of the most important national issues we face right now, and the evidence for climate change is overwhelming, whether it is superstorms that are occurring more regularly, whether it is a record-changing drought, whether it is migration patterns of biological systems, melting of the polar icecaps and the related issue, ocean acidification, all of these current phenomenon are very dangerous and very threatening. The leading scientists of this Nation and around the world agree that this is a threat, that it is a problem. In fact, about 97 percent of planet scientists believe this is a problem, and the predictions and the models for the climate sciences are horrifying enough. Unfortunately, actual measurements and actual predictions and happenings are worse than the predictions, than the actual models are predicting, so we are facing a very dangerous situation.

I ask my colleagues, Why are you willing to take this risk? Climate change is a very big problem. It is a very big risk. Ninety-seven percent of the scientists agree it is a risk, and yet we are going to say it is not really a risk, we can worry about that later. No, we have to worry about it right now, today.

The good news out there is that carbon-capture sequestration technology is coming along pretty well. What this bill would do, unfortunately, is prevent carbon-sequestration technology from being adopted in power plants. I submit that allowing carbon sequestration technology to be developed is in the interest of the coal industry. If the technology is developed and climate change keeps happening, which it is, then the public is going to demand that we incorporate climate change, carbon sequestration technology, and if it is not there, then coal plants are going to be shut down.

So now, when we have the opportunity when technology is being developed, there is money being spent by the Federal Government and by private industry to develop carbon-capture sequestration, let's go ahead and take advantage of that, implement it in our power plants on a limited basis now so when the need is there, it will be available. I don't understand why that is being ignored.

H.R. 3826 ignores that and other possibilities. It prohibits us from using existing carbon capture projects in the United States as a technical basis for implementing that technology in coal-fired power plants. We must take advantage of this technology in the United States and abroad. We shouldn't prevent the development of this technology. CS technology is improving. It is becoming more cost effective, and it is becoming more effective technologically. It is in the best interests of the long-term coal industry, and I strongly urge opposition to this bill.

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

Mr. WHITFIELD. I would just reiterate that America doesn't have to take a backseat to anyone on its emissions from energy sources. Our emissions today are lower than they were 20 years ago. Why should the U.S. unilaterally take this extreme position and other countries around the world, particularly in Europe and in Asia, are using coal and using coal, and we don't even have the flexibility to do that when they finalize this rule. So that is what we are up to today.

At this time I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. ROTHFUS).

Mr. ROTHFUS. Mr. Chairman, many families and businesses have had to spend more to heat their homes this cold and snowy winter. Unfortunately, regulations recently introduced by unelected elites in President Obama's EPA will increase their utility and electricity bills further.

These regulations effectively ban new power plants by forcing them to meet an emissions standard that cannot be achieved with any commercially available technology. They are unworkable and unaffordable, and will result in more lost jobs.

I stand in solidarity with the hard-working coal miners, power plant workers, steelworkers, boilermakers, carpenters, and truckdrivers, but the victims of the President's war on affordable energy are the families and businesses whose energy costs are skyrocketing, and the workers who are losing their jobs and incomes because of these regulations.

I strongly support H.R. 3826, the Electricity Security and Affordability Act. The bill will direct the EPA to adopt new coal-fired power plant emission standards that make sense and subject any new regulations on existing power plants to congressional review, where the people's Representatives can be held accountable.

I urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to approve this job-saving bill.

Mr. WAXMAN. Mr. Chairman, House Republicans are telling us greenhouse gas emissions are falling in the United States. They suggest the U.S. doesn't need to do anything more about climate change, but they couldn't be more wrong.

A couple of years ago when the utilities were switching out of coal and going to natural gas because natural gas was cheaper, we saw some leveling off of those emissions, but what matters most is whether the U.S. emissions are on track to decline in the future by the amount needed to prevent dangerous climate change.

□ 1615

Scientists say we need to reduce carbon pollution by 80 percent by 2050, but will not get anywhere near that level of reductions if we go about business as usual and stop EPA from acting and Congress doing nothing to respond to this emergency.

At this time, I yield 4 minutes to the gentlelady from California (Mrs. CAPPS), a member of our committee.

Mrs. CAPPS. Mr. Chairman, I thank my colleague for yielding.

There is an argument on the other side of the aisle—in fact, we heard it just a few minutes ago—that we shouldn't take action to address climate change because doing so will hurt poor people.

That is a particularly galling statement because the truth is that the world's poorest have the most to lose if we don't take urgent action to cut carbon pollution.

Poor people are on the front lines of climate change. World Bank President Jim Yong Kim says that, unless we address climate change, ''We could witness the rolling back of decades of development gains and force tens of millions more to live in poverty.''

According to the United Nations Development Programme, without coordinated global action to address climate and environmental threats, 3 billion

more people could be pushed into extreme poverty by 2050.

That is the reality. The world's poorest will be the most affected by the impacts of climate change, and yet they have the fewest resources to adapt to or respond to it.

To hear the other side tell it, the only way to protect the health and well-being of poor people is to weaken EPA's ability to cut carbon pollution, and that is nonsense.

It is time to stop denying the science and accept reality. We need to take action now to cut carbon pollution. The longer we wait, the higher the costs will be, especially for the poor.

Indeed, addressing climate change is in the economic self-interest of all of us. Consider recent comments by Robert Rubin, who was a universally respected Treasury secretary.

During his tenure, the budget deficit was reduced from $290 billion to $70 billion, the Dow Jones Industrial Average more than tripled, unemployment decreased to 4.3 percent, and more than 18 million new jobs were created.

Senator Bob Dole described Secretary Rubin as a man of honesty and integrity. Alan Greenspan called him one of the most effective secretaries of the Treasury in this Nation's history. When he resigned in 1999, Secretary Rubin received glowing tributes from Democrats and Republicans alike.

Over the past year, Secretary Rubin has focused on the threat of climate change to our economic well-being. Here is what he said about climate change a few weeks ago: ''There are a lot of really significant monumental issues facing the global economy, but this one supersedes all else.''

Experts are telling us that inaction on climate change threatens the global economy. Responding to this threat isn't about disadvantaging ourselves; it is about seizing opportunities. There are already 143,000 solar jobs and 80,000 wind jobs in the United States.

Winning the global clean energy race will mean millions of jobs and faster economic growth. Our competitors in China and Europe understand this. We risk being left behind if we don't recognize it as well. We should abandon this bill and start getting serious about climate change and the economy.

Mr. WHITFIELD. Mr. Chairman, may I inquire as to how much time is remaining on both sides?

The Acting CHAIR (Mr. YODER). The gentleman from Kentucky has 19 minutes remaining. The gentleman from California has 16 minutes remaining.

Mr. WHITFIELD. At this time, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlelady from Indiana (Mrs. WALORSKI).

Mrs. WALORSKI. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of H.R. 3826. I appreciate Congressman WHITFIELD's leadership on this commonsense bill. I am proud to be an original cosponsor.

This bill addresses President Obama's sweeping proposed rule for new power plants, which set the mediation standard so strict that the creation of a new coal-fired power plant is virtually impossible.

Indiana is the backbone of manufacturing in America, but manufacturing depends on affordable energy. More than 80 percent of Indiana's electricity is coal-powered, and electricity rates in Indiana are expected to rise 32 percent by 2023, partly due to these EPA regulations.

If President Obama is able to implement his radical environmental agenda, energy prices could skyrocket, having a devastating impact on economic growth and job creating and hurting Hoosiers trying to pay their bills.

This bill provides a commonsense way to protect our environment by setting emission standards that are actually achievable.

I urge my colleagues to support this bill.

Mr. WAXMAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from West Virginia (Mr. RAHALL).

Mr. RAHALL. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the ranking member of the Energy and Commerce Committee yielding me this time, especially since we do not see eye to eye on this particular piece of legislation.

We do see eye to eye on numerous other issues before the Congress and the American people, such as protecting the health and safety of our Nation's coal miners and our American workers; and, indeed, we all, both sides of the aisle, share the common goal of wanting to provide clean water, clean air, and health and safety for our families each and every day of the year. In that sense, we all have that common ground.

There is a fear though in the coal fields today. I really wish the distinguished Majority Whip on that side of the aisle had mentioned my home State of West Virginia, one of the largest coal-producing States in the country when he mentioned and was going district by district about the various people that are going to be affected by these proposed regulations.

I do rise in support of H.R. 3826 as a cosponsor. I commend my coal country colleague, ED WHITFIELD, for his leadership on this issue and bringing it through his committee.

Those of us from the coal-producing regions of this country have truly become sick and tired—sick and tired—of this EPA turning out anti-coal regulations, while showing little or no appreciation of how these regulations will affect the lives and the livelihoods of the real people who have to work and live under them.

Granted, some are proposals; but, nevertheless, I remind my colleagues, it strikes fear—it strikes fear—in the very heart and soul of coal country.

Many of our coal companies that are laying off workers, as we speak, have this fear of what is coming down the pike as a main factor in laying off workers today.

Granted, there are many other factors affecting the current slump in the coal fields. I don't deny that for one minute; but we have been frustrated—frustrated—with an EPA that has, time after time and time again, pushed out piles of guidance documents, regulations, using slanted science, and inflating claims about the benefits of their regulatory agenda without any consideration—one iota—of the affects upon jobs—the affects upon jobs in the real America that their regulatory agenda means.

Last September, when the EPA proposed regulations limiting greenhouse gas emissions for future power plants, it did so hinged upon the promise that the technologies required to achieve the new standards were proven and ready.

Based on this claim, we have to question whether this EPA is actually using good, sound science or if it is picking and choosing science that sounds good to meet whatever ends the agency desires.

There are no power plants—there are no power plants in commercial service anywhere in the world that have installed and operated the CCS technologies necessary to comply with the proposed rule—none, nada.

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

Mr. WAXMAN. I yield an additional minute to the gentleman.

Mr. RAHALL. I thank the distinguished ranking member again.

The proposed greenhouse gas rule for new power plants may be the mother of all anti-coal regulatory measures so far promoted by this particular EPA. It spells curtains for the development of new coal-fired capacity in this country. That means decreased energy reliability and increased costs for American families and businesses.

What is more, the agency readily admits that the new regulations will have nearly zero impact on the emissions of greenhouse gases as economies around the globe continue to grow their use of coal power.

That is why this legislation is so important. It would block the EPA from unilaterally imposing these caps, requiring that any such efforts be approved by the Congress.

It would help set a course for the development of cutting-edge CCS technologies needed to ensure reliable, affordable coal-fired energy for America throughout the foreseeable future.

For those of us from coal country, this legislation is fundamental to preserving the jobs of our coal miners, those who work hard every day, going beneath the bowels of this Earth to produce the energy that fuels this Nation and the economies of our communities and, indeed, a national energy security for the United States.

I urge support of this legislation.

Mr. WHITFIELD. At this time, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Illinois (Mr. RODNEY DAVIS).

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, my thanks to Mr. WHITFIELD, my colleague from Kentucky,

and also my thanks to my colleague who I am lucky to follow, Mr. RAHALL from West Virginia, for talking about such an important issue to my district in central Illinois.

One of the reasons I am here, Mr. Chairman, is because I saw the devastation. The largest employer in my home county 20 years ago closed down because of a signature on a piece of paper here in Washington, D.C.

Peabody Mine No. 10 shut down its coal mining families. Families whose children I went to school with and grew up with were forced to move to get a job once again.

Now, we see this attack via the EPA on coal in middle America once again. I stand here today with my colleagues to say this bill is a commonsense proposal that is going to restrict the EPA's ability to overreach and cost families—all families, even the poorest families in this country—it is going to cost them more out of their family budget to turn the light switch on; it is going to cost jobs in my district at existing coal-fired power plants.

They are some of the best jobs in central Illinois. They are organized labor jobs. This is about jobs; this is about the economy; and this is about low-cost power that allows our economy to grow.

That is what we all want, Mr. Chairman, isn't it?

Mr. WAXMAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I want to point out that the speakers in favor of this bill describe themselves as part of the coal-producing regions of the country. They are representing, they think, the coal-producing regions of the country because they fear, if the coal industry had to use some technology that would reduce carbon emissions, that would cost jobs.

I want to dispute that in two respects. One, they claim that no one is using this technology, and that is not accurate. In fact, the control technology is already in effect, being used commercially in the United States for decades. There are seven large commercial CCS—that is carbon capture and sequestration—projects operating today.

Dr. Julio Friedmann, the Deputy Assistant Secretary for Clean Coal at the U.S. Department of Energy, recently testified: ''First generation CCS technology is commercially available today.''

So why are they worried about jobs? They are being told by the coal miners that, if they have to use a technology that costs money, that would raise the price of coal and, therefore, coal will lose out to other technologies.

Well, that hasn't been the case. I have been in Congress for 40 years. I remember the coal industry coming in and saying: If we have to put scrubbers on, we will go broke; they will never burn coal again.

The coal industry uses scrubbers right now. The cost of scrubbers has gone down. They overstated how much it would cost. They cried about the lost jobs. It didn't happen.

The other thing I want to point out is that they talk about the coal jobs that will be lost. Well, coal jobs are being lost now because the utilities realize they can burn natural gas. It is cheaper, so coal is losing out in the market.

If natural gas is cheaper than burning coal now, they are going to burn natural gas. That is called the market. It is like cars replacing horse and buggies.

But the reality is that coal is going to be able to compete if we have new technologies imposed on them, just as they have been able to compete in the future. They can't compete if they are expensive, so they have got to figure out ways to produce coal that is less expensive.

That may happen, but we shouldn't subsidize coal to compete by having the world have to deal with carbon pollution.

□ 1630

We decided years ago that we weren't going to help coal compete by poisoning people with toxic mercury pollution when we required they use the technology to stop toxic mercury pollution. We decided they had to use scrubbers. They said they would go broke, that they couldn't afford it, that people would lose their jobs, but we required it because it reduced pollution that harmed people. Carbon pollution harms people on this planet, as we see the impact of climate change continue, because we refuse to require them to use less carbon and spew it out into the atmosphere.

Let me just say that you don't have to buy all of the arguments on climate change, but consider this: if there is a 10 percent chance that carbon pollution is going to cause greenhouse gases and climate change and do all of the terrible things that the scientists overwhelmingly tell us will happen, how many people want to take that 10 percent chance on the only atmosphere that we share on this planet?

I know that the coal people say they are willing to take that chance. They are afraid their constituents will turn against them because the coal companies will tell them to turn against them. They may lose their next elections. I don't think that is the case, but that is their fear. They are speaking from fear. They are speaking from a fear of jobs being lost, but that hasn't been the experience under the Clean Air Act, and we shouldn't repeal the Clean Air Act now as it relates to giving the EPA the authority to regulate these coal-burning power plants.

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

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

Mr. Chairman, I can assure you we are not speaking from fear today. I can assure you we are not being parochial about coal. Coal is still the base load for this country—for manufacturing, industrial use, electricity at home, and for our ability to compete in the world.

I have great admiration and respect for the gentleman from California, and I am sorry that he has made the decision to leave Congress after having a distinguished career, but I can tell you there is no power plant operating in America today that is using carbon capture and sequestration, because the technology is not available.

Now, there are some plants being built with government support and would not be built without that government support, but they are not in operation. There is a difference. When scrubbers were mandated by the EPA, scrubbers were already being put in plants at private expense. The government didn't pay for those scrubbers. They were already being used. Unlike this proposed regulation, there is no technology available to meet the emission standard, so there is a significant difference in what has happened and what is being proposed.

At this time, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. UPTON), the distinguished chairman of the full Energy and Commerce Committee.

Mr. UPTON. Mr. Chairman, today, we are going to continue our pursuit of an all-of-the-above energy strategy, taking up legislation to address the EPA's pending greenhouse gas rules for power plants, which is the latest threat by the Obama administration to affordable and reliable energy.

While the President may boast support for an all-of-the-above strategy, his policies have been anything but. The President's approach seeks to limit our energy choices, to jeopardize jobs, to raise energy costs, and, indeed, to threaten America's global competitiveness.

Our Nation has become the envy of the world because of recent breakthroughs unlocking vast amounts of oil and natural gas, but the game-changing developments do not give cause to regulate an entire fuel category out of the mix—gone—especially a resource that comprises, today, 40 percent of the fuel that provides affordable electricity for millions of Americans and countless job creators. Given that the U.S. has the world's largest coal reserves and is the largest producer of coal, it should remain a critical contributor to a diverse electricity portfolio for decades to come. We should proudly embrace that we are the Saudi Arabia of coal reserves.

Fuel diversity gives us the flexibility to keep electricity costs low and to ensure reliability, particularly for the most vulnerable. As we have heard from many witnesses in hearings, the coal-fired power plant shutdowns already underway pose a serious threat to reliability in many regions, particularly in the Midwest. That threat will continue to get worse if the shutdowns increase in the years ahead while we will limit our options for new base load power. In sum, fuel diversity gives us a more stable, reliable, and affordable

electricity supply, and any threat to coal, including the EPA's pending rules, is a threat to that diversity and a threat to affordable energy.

I applaud both Chairman WHITFIELD and Senator MANCHIN for their efforts in authoring a workable bipartisan and bicameral alternative to the EPA's pending power plant rules. Their legislation is a good faith effort that requires a critical check on the EPA's misuse of the Clean Air Act to try to accomplish through regulation what was rejected by Congress through legislation.

Their approach does not prohibit the EPA from setting a standard for new plants, but, instead, it focuses on setting standards that have been adequately demonstrated—a key ingredient missing from the EPA's regulatory proposal. Just in the last 2 weeks, as Mr. WHITFIELD indicated, we have heard testimony from administration officials that carbon capture technologies, which are not yet commercially viable, could increase electricity costs by, perhaps, as much as 80 percent. This important legislation provides a role for Congress in setting the effective date for any regulation for existing plants.

Mr. WAXMAN. Mr. Chairman, may I inquire how much time we have on both sides?

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from California has 7 minutes remaining, and the gentleman from Kentucky has 12 minutes remaining.

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

Mr. WHITFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. RENACCI).

Mr. RENACCI. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of H.R. 3826, the Electricity Security and Affordability Act.

The United States is fortunate to have more coal than any other country in the world. This vital resource is currently used to meet nearly half of our electricity needs and to support over 550,000 jobs.

As a Representative of Ohio, a State that produces more than 24 million tons of coal per year and uses it to generate over 50 percent of our electricity, I understand firsthand the importance of keeping this abundant and affordable natural resource a part of America's energy supply. Unfortunately, over the past 5 years, this administration's policies have led to the closure of hundreds of coal-fired plants across the country. In fact, in just 1 year, Ohio's coal-generated electricity dropped nearly 20 percent as a result of the current regulatory environment.

The EPA's recently proposed greenhouse gas standards for new coal-fired plants are only the latest example of the administration's regulatory assault on America's power sector. Not only do these standards rely on a technology that is not even commercially viable at this point, but they will also lead to the loss of thousands of jobs and drive up the price of energy for American families and businesses that are already struggling to make ends meet. Ohio alone stands to lose an estimated 18,000 manufacturing jobs by 2023 as a result of these overreaching regulations. More than 1,000 of these jobs will be in my district. These estimates do not even include job losses by coal miners, utility workers, and all of those impacted directly by plant closures.

Rising energy costs are one of the main problems facing many hardworking Americans. While we are all impacted by these rules, it is the most vulnerable citizens who, unfortunately, will be hit the hardest. It is the 387,000 Ohioans who are living well below the poverty line and who spend almost 30 percent of their incomes on energy costs that these standards will hurt the most. These standards are not just an attack on coal; they are an attack on those individuals who are having to choose between paying their electric bills and providing the basic necessities for their families.

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

Mr. WHITFIELD. I yield the gentleman an additional 1 minute.

Mr. RENACCI. The bill before us today offers a realistic alternative to the EPA's misguided and unachievable approach to regulating new and existing power plants. I applaud Representative WHITFIELD's efforts on this critical piece of legislation, and I urge my colleagues to support it.

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

Mr. WHITFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlelady from Indiana, Congresswoman BROOKS.

Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of H.R. 3826 because, late last year, the EPA Administrator, Gina McCarthy, went on a listening tour through America to hear from the public about reducing carbon pollution from existing power plants. Unfortunately, the Administrator declined to go to those States most affected by the proposed regulations and, instead, opted to visit San Francisco, Seattle, and Boston. It is unfortunate that her stops didn't include places like my home State of Indiana, which stands to lose much from these misguided regulations.

If Ms. McCarthy had taken the time to visit Indiana or other States like Indiana, she would have heard from people like Nina, in Anderson, who wrote me an anxious letter about what penalizing the coal industry would do to families on fixed incomes. She explained her church already has had to help many families pay for their electric bills, and she worries about how her community will cope when the EPA's new regulations are enacted.

I wish I could tell Nina not to worry, but, sadly, her fears are very much warranted because the new regulations will have catastrophic impacts on our Hoosier economy. The State Utility Forecasting Group at Purdue University has estimated that, like Ohio, Indiana's electrical rates will increase 32 percent by 2023 because of EPA rules. The price increase will hurt every Hoosier who turns on a light switch. It will also cost up to 17,000 jobs in Indiana and permanently ruin the prestige that our State enjoys as being one of the Nation's most business-friendly States.

That is why I am proud to be a cosponsor of this important bill, which finally puts the brakes on unchecked EPA regulations and injects much-needed congressional oversight and consultation into the rulemaking agenda. We all have an obligation to leave the world a better place for our children and future generations, but we can't do it when we take away jobs and hurt the economy. That is why I support this bill, and I encourage all of my colleagues to do the same.

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

Mr. WHITFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from North Dakota (Mr. CRAMER).

Mr. CRAMER. Thank you, Chairman WHITFIELD.

Mr. Chairman, I think pretty much everybody I talk to around here is familiar with the fact that North Dakota has 25,000 job openings with fewer than 10,000 people looking for work. It is not an accident. It helps, for sure, to have an 800-year supply of coal under the ground, to have some oil and some gas, but it also is an indication of a regulatory and tax climate that champions work, that champions investment, that doesn't apologize for having the lowest priced electricity rates in the country most times of the year. We also have a robust manufacturing economy as a result of those same policies.

Mr. Chairman, I believe that America's economic security and America's national security depend on America's energy security. I would love to see every Member of this body go to North Dakota and see what that type of development looks like. I would also like to have them breathe some of the cleanest air, see some of the cleanest water and some of the richest topsoil in the world. We are very proud of the fact that we can feed a hungry world while also meeting the growing demands of our economy.

If you really believe that there are several carbon-capture technology projects that are viable on power plants in this country, you should love this bill, because this bill actually prepares the standard for measuring that. It simply states that, for 12 consecutive months, six power plants—six different units—should be able to demonstrate it, with three of them being, of course, lignite, which is what we mine in North Dakota.

We don't have to compromise quality of life for a high standard of living—we don't do it in North Dakota, and we can replicate it across this country—but the EPA's overreach will hurt that.

I think this bill actually helps it, and I am very proud of my colleague Mr. WHITFIELD for his bicameral-bipartisan approach to this problem and to the solution that he has come up with. I urge all of my colleagues to vote for it.

Mr. WHITFIELD. Mr. Chairman, how much time is remaining?

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Kentucky has 5½ minutes remaining, and the gentleman from California has 7 minutes remaining.

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

Mr. Chairman, I just want to say that it was unfortunate to make a reference personally to Gina McCarthy, the head of the Environmental Protection Agency, on her listening tour. The Republicans have not allotted enough money to the EPA to let her go everywhere in the country, so she went to 10 regional offices as well as the Washington headquarters, and she invited people to come in and give their points of view.

□ 1645

That is the full amount of money she had available to her. So it seems to be unfair to criticize her for not going to every nook and cranny in coal country, when she went to every part of the country and had representation for those regions.

At this time I yield 3 minutes to my colleague from the State of California (Mr. PETERS).

Mr. PETERS of California. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Chairman, proponents of this bill are arguing, in part, that EPA's plan to require carbon pollution controls under section 111 is going to hurt electric utilities. But it was just last month in the Utility Air Regulation Group v. EPA case that those same leading utilities argued to the Supreme Court that if EPA intends to address climate carbon pollution, it should act under section 111, which is what this bill would prevent EPA from doing.

The Utility Air Regulatory Group represents about 60 utilities, from Duke Energy, the Southern Company, FirstEnergy, to the Salt River Project. On February 24, they told the Supreme Court that this was the appropriate way for EPA to address carbon pollution from utilities under section 111. That is exactly what the EPA would do, if it were not for this law.

I know there may be some ideological desire to deny climate change and simply hope that the issue goes away, but that is not going to happen.

More fundamentally, what we are getting caught up in today is this false choice that you hear over and over again that you have to choose, on one hand, between a healthy environment and, on the other hand, a prosperous economy. Americans deserve nothing less than both. We have to pay attention to this.

I just offer comments from some of our leading health organizations—the American Academy of Pediatrics, the American College of Preventive Medicine, the American Lung Association, the American Public Health Association, and others—who point out:

> Cleaning up carbon pollution and other greenhouse gases saves lives. Researchers found that efforts enacted now to reduce greenhouse gases, including carbon pollution from all sources in the United States, would prevent more than 16,000 premature deaths by 2030. The lives saved are a result of a reductions in the ozone- and particulate-forming pollution that is also reduced as carbon is reduced. Cleaning up carbon pollution from power plants is essential to saving those lives.

We know, in turn, that will save money.

So it is important to remember, too, the economic effect of unregulated carbon does not just extend to the climate but also to the by-products of clean air that come and help our economy and help people be healthy and ultimately contribute to the economy.

Mr. WHITFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. SENSENBRENNER).

Mr. SENSENBRENNER. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of H.R. 3826. I appreciate the work that the bills's sponsor, Mr. WHITFIELD, has done on this issue, and I am proud to be an original cosponsor of this bill.

Wisconsin relies on coal for roughly two-thirds of our electricity production. Energy costs are consistently one of the many concerns my constituents share with me. The cold winter has made high energy bills the norm throughout Wisconsin. Instead of trying to alleviate these high costs, the EPA is pursuing policies that will drive energy prices even higher.

The EPA's New Source Performance Standards require that now power plants capture, compress, and store about 40 percent of the CO_2 produced in order to be compliant. However, the CCS technology required has not been adequately demonstrated. Ignoring the realities of today's technologies, the EPA is plowing full speed ahead.

This action clearly marks yet another salvo in the Obama administration's war on coal. The next volley will be the rules concerning existing power plants. If done incorrectly, these new rules could effectively make it too expensive for our coal-fired power plants to continue operating. While this might be the dream of some, my constituents and yours simply cannot afford it.

Fortunately, this bill restores common sense to the EPA's rulemaking process for power plants. By setting reasonable guidelines on the rules concerning new plants and subjecting any rules for current plants to congressional oversight, the bill will ensure that our constituents are able to afford their energy costs.

I urge my colleagues to support this bill and prevent the EPA from unleashing chaos in the energy sector and picking the pockets of consumers.

Mr. WAXMAN. Mr. Chairman, may I inquire how much time we have remaining on each side?

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from California has 4 minutes remaining, and the gentleman from Kentucky has 4 minutes remaining.

Mr. WAXMAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from the State of Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER), a great champion of environmental protection.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Thank you, Mr. WAXMAN. I appreciate your leadership and courtesy in permitting me to speak on this bill.

Mr. Chair, I would like to reference the comments a moment ago that somehow there isn't available large commercial carbon capture sequestration and that this is somehow a figment. As a matter of fact, in the United States today, there are seven large commercial carbon capture sequestration projects operating today. The projects at large commercial coal-fired power plants will come online in the United States and Canada this year.

Dr. Julio Friedmann, Deputy Assistant Secretary for Clean Coal at the U.S. Department of Energy, recently testified that:

> First generation CCS technology is commercially available today. You can call up a number of U.S. and international manufacturers, and they will sell you a unit at a large scale for capture of more than a million tons per year.

The idea that CCS technologies for coal are unavailable is simply not true. I would deeply suggest that this is one of the reasons we are having this bizarre conversation today. We are just sort of out of sync with reality.

I strongly oppose H.R. 3826. The debate on this bill is about the reality of dangerous climate change.

If you accept modern science, you cannot deny the combined weight of over 10,000 peer-reviewed, published scientific studies which tell us climate change is happening, is caused by humans, and will have extremely serious impacts. If you fight wildfires, farm, run a ski resort, or live in a low-lying coastal area, you are already living with the impacts of climate change on a daily basis.

All these studies and experiences are telling us the same thing: carbon pollution produced by human activities is warming the Earth. It is driving more extreme weather events, more heat waves and droughts, longer and more intense wildfire seasons, rising sea levels, melting permafrost, and ocean acidification.

Climate disruption is harming economic activities in my State such as agriculture and ski resorts. It is affecting the insurance industry. It is beginning to impose huge costs on those least able to bear them—people living in the poorest and most vulnerable parts of the world.

The United States is a major contributor to climate change and it cannot be mitigated without us. We have a moral responsibility to act, but H.R. 3826 does just the opposite. It makes

the problem worse by preventing EPA from acting in the interest of the environment and our country.

Coal-fired plants are the largest single source of carbon pollution. Today, there is no limit on how much carbon pollution they can emit. That is why President Obama directed EPA to use its existing authority under the Clean Air Act to require power plants to control carbon pollution, something long overdue.

EPA has proposed a rule to require new coal plants to use available pollution control technology to capture and sequester carbon pollution. For existing coal plants, EPA is working with stakeholders to think through the best approach. EPA has not yet even issued a proposal, but industries are moving on.

In my region, a major utility made the decision on sound economics and environment to shut down a coal-powered plant.

H.R. 3826 would stop EPA from issuing any rules and allow these plants to keep emitting unlimited amounts of carbon pollution. For existing plants, the bill would be straightout prohibition of any EPA rule from becoming effective unless Congress somehow passed a new law to implement the rule. As a practical matter, this repeals the EPA's existing authority to act.

Mr. Chairman, this bill is a dead letter. The Senate will never pass it, and even if it did, the President would veto it, as well he should. Let's spare him the agony and reject this misguided proposal now.

Mr. WHITFIELD. At this time I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. KELLY).

Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I am a cosponsor of the Electricity Security and Affordability Act. We have heard a lot of rhetoric on the floor about what is going on, but I want you to understand something. In Pennsylvania, over 40 percent of the electricity is generated by coal-fired power plants.

If you go back to the election, during his candidacy the President said very clearly that if you want to continue to produce electricity using coal-powered power plants, you can, but we will bankrupt you. The only thing he didn't add to that was ''period.''

That is the war on coal. That is where we are going.

When we talk about these things, and we talk about the numbers of people in our society right now, not just the middle- and the lower middle-income, but the low-income people, what are we affecting? Everything that they put in their mouth, everything they put on their backs, everything that they do to heat and light their homes.

The sum total of the cost of anything is everything that goes into it.

The cost of energy and using coal to get there just makes sense. Coal has done so much for this country for so many years. I am not just talking about a few people. If you do not believe this is affecting people, please come back to western Pennsylvania. Walk with me. Go into these little towns where there no longer is a coal mine open. Not only that—their towns are shut down.

Now isn't that a marvelous thing to accomplish and champion and say we are doing the right thing for America? We are going to drive your energy costs up and make it impossible for you to heat and light your homes. We are going to change the cost of everything you use to raise your children. It affects the cost of everything. The sum total is made up of energy costs also.

What we will do is we will raise the bar so high that it will no longer be possible for these people to operate at a profitable level and then we will back off and say, My goodness, they just couldn't meet the standard.

We ask, What does the standard have to be? Just a little bit better than it is now.

We say, How would we begin to measure it? Well, we haven't determined that yet. We have set standards for you, but we don't have any way of doing it. We can't get to the point where we can measure the metrics on it.

I would just ask you for one thing: I want you to think about those thousands and millions of people who have forever relied on coal and the electricity that we can supply and the energy we can supply at a unit that is low enough that they can continue to live a normal life. That is all we are asking.

This bill is common sense, which is so devoid in this House.

Mr. WAXMAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. WHITFIELD. Mr. Chairman, to conclude, I would point out to my friends on the other side of the aisle there has been a lot of discussion today about the availability of carbon capture and sequestration. Let's not forget that the Energy Policy Act of 2005 said:

> Emission standards will not be set by plants receiving funds from the Clean Energy Initiative at the Department of Energy.

To my friend from the west coast, it is costing $5 billion, and the president of the Southern Company said:

> This plant cannot be consistently replicated on a national level and cannot be the primary basis for new emission standards.

That is because they are artificially concocted.

So our legislation simply says, in the future, if natural gas prices go up, America, like most every other country in the world, will have the option of building a new coal-powered plant.

I think it is a reasonable approach. It has bipartisan support.

This is the first time that we have been able to have a national debate with this President, who has already made up his mind he does not want coal for America. This is our opportunity to express the opinion of the American people that we need coal moving into the future.

I would urge the adoption of H.R. 3826, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. ESHOO. Mr. Chair, I rise in opposition to H.R. 3826 because it would prevent the Environmental Protection Agency from ever regulating carbon emissions to stem climate change.

H.R. 3826 moves the goalposts on the EPA's carbon emissions rules and would effectively guarantee that our nation's dirtiest power plants continue to spew carbon into the atmosphere and further exacerbate global warming.

This bill is clearly a response to the President's Climate Action Plan, a series of executive actions designed to protect future generations from the harmful effects of climate change. I welcome the President's plan, and I regret the fact that House Leadership continues to steadfastly block action on climate change. Beyond the benefits to our air and climate, the EPA's proposed rules will provide regulatory certainty to fossil-fuel generators and would spur further development of renewable energy technologies that are our best chance to turn the tide of climate change.

Simply denying that climate change is occurring is not a policy and is completely out of touch with reality. The Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change recently concluded with 95 to 100 percent certainty that humans are the principal cause of climate change. Such findings of the world's most highly regarded scientists cannot be more certain than this.

The American people know that climate change is not a ''hoax'' or a ''fraud,'' as some of our colleagues claim, because they are experiencing the hottest years on record, as well as the most severe floods, wildfires and droughts in modern history. My home state of California is currently facing an unprecedented drought which is threatening the prosperity of everyone from urban and rural communities to farmers, fishermen, wildlife, and large and small businesses.

Steps to halt and reverse the effects of climate change are well overdue, and our window to act is quickly closing. H.R. 3826 does the exact opposite, and for all these reasons, I urge my colleagues to oppose this legislation.

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.

It shall be in order to consider as an original bill for the purpose of amendment under the 5-minute rule an amendment in thenature of a substitute consisting of the text of Rules Committee Print 113–40. That amendment in the nature of a substitute shall be considered as read.

The text of the amendment in the nature of a substitute is as follows:

H.R. 3826

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 ''Electricity Security and Affordability Act''.

SEC. 2. STANDARDS OF PERFORMANCE FOR NEW FOSSIL FUEL-FIRED ELECTRIC UTILITY GENERATING UNITS.

(a) LIMITATION.—The Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency may not

issue, implement, or enforce any proposed or final rule under section 111 of the Clean Air Act (42 U.S.C. 7411) that establishes a standard of performance for emissions of any greenhouse gas from any new source that is a fossil fuel-fired electric utility generating unit unless such rule meets the requirements under subsections (b) and (c).

(b) REQUIREMENTS.—In issuing any rule under section 111 of the Clean Air Act (42 U.S.C. 7411) establishing standards of performance for emissions of any greenhouse gas from new sources that are fossil fuel-fired electric utility generating units, the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency (for purposes of establishing such standards)—

(1) shall separate sources fueled with coal and natural gas into separate categories; and

(2) shall not set a standard based on the best system of emission reduction for new sources within the coal category unless—

(A) such standard has been achieved on average for at least one continuous 12-month period (excluding planned outages) by each of at least 6 units within such category—

(i) each of which is located at a different electric generating station in the United States;

(ii) which, collectively, are representative of the operating characteristics of electric generation at different locations in the United States; and

(iii) each of which is operated for the entire 12-month period on a full commercial basis; and

(B) no results obtained from any demonstration project are used in setting such standard.

(c) COAL HAVING A HEAT CONTENT OF 8300 OR LESS BRITISH THERMAL UNITS PER POUND.—

(1) SEPARATE SUBCATEGORY.—In carrying out subsection (b)(1), the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency shall establish a separate subcategory for new sources that are fossil fuel-fired electric utility generating units using coal with an average heat content of 8300 or less British Thermal Units per pound.

(2) STANDARD.—Notwithstanding subsection (b)(2), in issuing any rule under section 111 of the Clean Air Act (42 U.S.C. 7411) establishing standards of performance for emissions of any greenhouse gas from new sources in such subcategory, the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency shall not set a standard based on the best system of emission reduction unless—

(A) such standard has been achieved on average for at least one continuous 12-month period (excluding planned outages) by each of at least 3 units within such subcategory—

(i) each of which is located at a different electric generating station in the United States;

(ii) which, collectively, are representative of the operating characteristics of electric generation at different locations in the United States; and

(iii) each of which is operated for the entire 12-month period on a full commercial basis; and

(B) no results obtained from any demonstration project are used in setting such standard.

SEC. 3. CONGRESS TO SET EFFECTIVE DATE FOR STANDARDS OF PERFORMANCE FOR EXISTING, MODIFIED, AND RECONSTRUCTED FOSSIL FUEL-FIRED ELECTRIC UTILITY GENERATING UNITS.

(a) APPLICABILITY.—This section applies with respect to any rule or guidelines issued by the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency under section 111 of the Clean Air Act (42 U.S.C. 7411) that—

(1) establish any standard of performance for emissions of any greenhouse gas from any modified or reconstructed source that is a fossil fuel-fired electric utility generating unit; or

(2) apply to the emissions of any greenhouse gas from an existing source that is a fossil fuel-fired electric utility generating unit.

(b) CONGRESS TO SET EFFECTIVE DATE.—A rule or guidelines described in subsection (a) shall not take effect unless a Federal law is enacted specifying such rule's or guidelines' effective date.

(c) REPORTING.—A rule or guidelines described in subsection (a) shall not take effect unless the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency has submitted to Congress a report containing each of the following:

(1) The text of such rule or guidelines.

(2) The economic impacts of such rule or guidelines, including the potential effects on—

(A) economic growth, competitiveness, and jobs in the United States; and

(B) electricity ratepayers, including low-income ratepayers in affected States.

(3) The amount of greenhouse gas emissions that such rule or guidelines are projected to reduce as compared to overall global greenhouse gas emissions.

SEC. 4. REPEAL OF EARLIER RULES AND GUIDELINES.

The following rules and guidelines shall be of no force or effect, and shall be treated as though such rules and guidelines had never been issued:

(1) The proposed rule—

(A) entitled ''Standards of Performance for Greenhouse Gas Emissions for New Stationary Sources: Electric Utility Generating Units'', published at 77 Fed. Reg. 22392 (April 13, 2012); and

(B) withdrawn pursuant to the notice entitled ''Withdrawal of Proposed Standards of Performance for Greenhouse Gas Emissions for New Stationary Sources: Electric Utility Generating Units'', signed by the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency on September 20, 2013, and identified by docket ID number EPA–HQ–OAR–2011–0660.

(2) The proposed rule entitled ''Standards of Performance for Greenhouse Gas Emissions from New Stationary Sources: Electric Utility Generating Units'', signed by the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency on September 20, 2013, and identified by docket ID number EPA–HQ–OAR–2013–0495.

(3) With respect to the proposed rule described in paragraph (1), any successor or substantially similar proposed or final rule that—

(A) is issued prior to the date of the enactment of this Act;

(B) is applicable to any new source that is a fossil fuel-fired electric utility generating unit; and

(C) does not meet the requirements under subsections (b) and (c) of section 2.

(4) Any proposed or final rule or guidelines under section 111 of the Clean Air Act (42 U.S.C. 7411) that—

(A) are issued prior to the date of the enactment of this Act; and

(B) establish any standard of performance for emissions of any greenhouse gas from any modified or reconstructed source that is a fossil fuel-fired electric utility generating unit or apply to the emissions of any greenhouse gas from an existing source that is a fossil fuel-fired electric utility generating unit.

SEC. 5. DEFINITIONS.

In this Act:

(1) DEMONSTRATION PROJECT.—The term ''demonstration project'' means a project to test or demonstrate the feasibility of carbon capture and storage technologies that has received government funding or financial assistance.

(2) EXISTING SOURCE.—The term ''existing source'' has the meaning given such term in section 111(a) of the Clean Air Act (42 U.S.C. 7411(a)), except such term shall not include any modified source.

(3) GREENHOUSE GAS.—The term ''greenhouse gas'' means any of the following:

(A) Carbon dioxide.

(B) Methane.

(C) Nitrous oxide.

(D) Sulfur hexafluoride.

(E) Hydrofluorocarbons.

(F) Perfluorocarbons.

(4) MODIFICATION.—The term ''modification'' has the meaning given such term in section 111(a) of the Clean Air Act (42 U.S.C. 7411(a)).

(5) MODIFIED SOURCE.—The term ''modified source'' means any stationary source, the modification of which is commenced after the date of the enactment of this Act.

(6) NEW SOURCE.—The term ''new source'' has the meaning given such term in section 111(a) of the Clean Air Act (42 U.S.C. 7411(a)), except that such term shall not include any modified source.

The Acting CHAIR. No amendment to that amendment in the nature of a substitute shall be in order except those printed in House Report 113–373. 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 be not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question.

□ 1700

AMENDMENT NO. 1 OFFERED BY MR. SMITH OF TEXAS

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 1 printed in House Report 113–373.

Mr. SMITH of Texas. 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 7 to 8, strike ''within the coal category'' and insert ''within a fossil-fuel category''.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 497, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. SMITH) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, we should not stand by and let the EPA tear down America one regulation at a time, so I thank the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. WHITFIELD) for his work on H.R. 3826, the Electricity Security and Affordability Act.

Economic growth depends on job creators, not Federal regulators. We need to increase access to affordable energy, not take energy options off the table.

Now is the time to ensure a robust ''all-of-the-above'' energy strategy that includes our abundant fossil energies, as well as nuclear and renewables.

But by requiring carbon capture and storage technology that doesn't even exist, the EPA's new power proposal effectively bans new coal power. There is no coal power plant anywhere in the world that can meet the EPA's radical proposal.

What is equally troubling is that the EPA is planning to require this same unproven technology for new natural gas power.

This amendment stops the EPA's attack on natural gas. It prevents the

EPA from using make-believe technologies when setting standards.

I am interested in protecting all forms of affordable energy from EPA overreach, including coal, natural gas, and renewables, and that is what this amendment does.

Under the Clean Air Act, the EPA is required to rely on a technology that has been ''adequately demonstrated'' in the words of the law, but once again, the EPA is trying to twist the law to suit its extremist agenda.

The EPA does this by using an old legal trick: if you can't win the argument as it stands, start arguing about definition of words. By redefining what the term ''adequately demonstrated'' means, the agency is requiring the use of an unproven technology. In so doing, the EPA is making a tremendous power grab, one that reaches well beyond coal.

Only in Washington can you call something ''adequately demonstrated'' that doesn't even exist.

Over the past few months, it has become increasingly clear that the EPA isn't just going after coal. The administration has no intention of stopping there. Coal may be taking the hardest hit today, but the EPA is gearing up to take down natural gas.

This administration has tried to demonize hydraulic fracturing and prevent the construction of the Keystone XL pipeline, which would create thousands of jobs and provide many Americans with affordable energy.

As America is finding hope in an energy renaissance, the EPA plans to impose harsh power plant requirements on all forms of fossil energy. The EPA and the Department of Energy have already begun to tout these plans around the world.

This amendment requires the EPA to rely on proven technologies when it sets rules for any power plant. I urge my colleagues to join me in support of H.R. 3826, and help prevent the EPA from implementing reckless regulations that disregard the facts.

This amendment promotes an all-of-the-above-energy strategy, supports good-paying jobs, American manufacturing, and helps us secure energy independence. I urge my colleagues to support this amendment.

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

Mr. WAXMAN. Mr. Chairman, I claim the time in opposition to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR (Mr. HULTGREN). The gentleman from California is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. WAXMAN. Mr. Chair, the underlying bill, H.R. 3826, is a radical rewrite of the Clean Air Act. It effectively repeals the EPA's existing authority to address carbon pollution from coal-powered plants.

It says that EPA cannot set a standard for new plants unless the standard is already being met by power plants using technologies that can achieve that standard.

Well, why would any power plant want to spend the money to use technology to achieve a standard that their competitors do not have to achieve?

So it is a chicken and egg problem. You cannot require them to do what they are not already doing.

Well, this amendment goes a step further and it says, for natural gas-fired power plants, they shouldn't have to do anything that they are not already doing either. They would block EPA from requiring natural gas-fired power plants to install pollution controls.

The problem is, EPA's current proposal for new natural gas plants doesn't require any pollution control technology. EPA is going to set a standard, and then let that standard be achieved however the industry would accomplish it.

So this amendment would preemptively block EPA from ever considering rules that might further reduce carbon pollution from any future power plants, whether they be coal or natural gas.

I think it makes no sense. It is a disaster for the climate. I urge my colleagues to vote against this amendment.

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

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Mr. Chairman, how much time remains on either side?

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Texas has 1½ minutes remaining. The gentleman from California has 3 minutes remaining.

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Mr. Chairman, let me say to my friend from California, we have one more speaker on this side, and if he is prepared to close, then we will go to our last speaker.

Mr. WAXMAN. Mr. Chairman, I am not prepared to close. I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Mr. WAXMAN. Mr. Chairman, if you look at what is happening with this bill and this amendment, if both were passed, combined, coal and natural gas power plants emit a third of all carbon pollution in this country. They are responsible for virtually all carbon pollution from the electricity sector.

This amendment would ensure that industry can keep building new fossil fuel power plants without modern pollution controls, whether they be natural gas or coal.

So, in effect, if this amendment is agreed to, and the underlying bill is adopted, it would say, in effect, we are not going to control any of the carbon pollution coming from any power plant.

Now, if we don't control the pollution from any power plant, and we let them emit whatever pollution they choose to emit, and it is obviously cheaper to pollute than to stop polluting, we will, in effect, condemn us to all that pollution which happens to be—let me repeat this again—it happens to be a third of the carbon pollution in this country today.

That would mean there is no chance in hell that we will ever reduce the pollution in this country that we can reduce that is adding to climate change pollution, in addition to all the other pollutants coming from around the world.

Those pollutants don't go away; they accumulate in the atmosphere, and when they accumulate in the atmosphere, we see the impact on the climate.

At some point, we are going to have so many pollutants in the atmosphere from carbon that scientists are telling us we won't be able to do anything. We won't be able to continue to contribute to that pollution without making it impossible to do anything about climate change.

We have a chance to do something about climate change now. We should not lose that chance by adopting this amendment and the underlying bill. So, I would urge that we vote against the amendment and the underlying bill.

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

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. SCHWEIKERT), who is the chairman of the Environment Subcommittee of the Science, Space, and Technology Committee.

Mr. SCHWEIKERT. Mr. Chairman, I thank the chairman of the Science and Technology Committee, congratulations on yesterday.

Sort of a one step off, I lost the ranking member. I was going to congratulate him on his years of service now that his decision is to leave the body.

I am obviously standing here with two separate points I want to make. One is, I actually believe the underlying bill has been substantially misrepresented.

If you take the totality of the Clean Air Act, NO_X, and all the other pollutants that are regulated, that is not what this piece of legislation touches and does.

Be that as it may, I am here to stand up and advocate for amendment No. 1, which is very simple in its elegance. It does a very simple thing. It says, this bill is not only a discussion about coal, but it is actually a discussion about all fossil fuels.

If we are going to have a regime mechanic that says this technology, once it is properly demonstrated is appropriate to adopt, should not that demonstration be on other forms of fossil fuels that may be generating power?

In many ways it is that concept of sort of optionality. If we are going to create a silo that says hey, these mechanics are only about coal, that is unfair. It should be about all forms of energy, because you would hate to find out, a year or two from now, that the bright, shiny object that I believe the EPA is often chasing has moved to something else, and we have allowed a hole here in our amendment process.

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Mr. Chair, I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. SMITH of Texas. 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 Texas will be postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 2 OFFERED BY MRS. CAPPS

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 2 printed in House Report 113–373.

Mrs. CAPPS. 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:

In section 2(b)(2)(A)(i), insert ''or elsewhere'' after ''in the United States''.

In section 2(c)(2)(A)(i), insert ''or elsewhere'' after ''in the United States''.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 497, the gentlewoman from California (Mrs. CAPPS) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from California.

Mrs. CAPPS. Mr. Chairman, H.R. 3826 is about denial. It denies the realities of climate change. It denies EPA the ability to do its job.

The Supreme Court has clearly stated that the EPA has the authority to regulate carbon emissions from power plants, and EPA has used that authority under the Clean Air Act to propose rules to improve the quality and safety of our air.

These EPA rules are crucial to mitigating the harmful impacts of climate change, especially given the majority's refusal to take meaningful action to reduce greenhouse gas emissions.

H.R. 3826 would nullify these proposed rules and restrict EPA's ability to write new ones. This not only does nothing to address climate change, it also creates tremendous uncertainty for the power sector.

The bill also bizarrely restricts EPA to considering only pollution control technologies being used in the United States when setting new power plant standards. In other words, if a viable technology is being used abroad, EPA must pretend it doesn't exist.

Under the Clean Air Act, EPA must determine the best system of emission reduction for new coal-fired power plants, and it must set standards based on this best technology. This bill would block EPA from considering pollution controls used outside of the U.S., even if such systems are readily available and proven abroad.

As the global leader in innovation and technology, it is absurd that we would bar the EPA from even looking at the best technologies available just because of where it is being used.

My amendment would make a commonsense correction to this problem. If adopted, it would simply allow the EPA to consider all existing pollution control technologies, regardless of where they are being used.

For example, the EPA has proposed standards for new coal-fired power plants that would achieve greater carbon pollution reduction through the use of carbon capture and sequestration technology, commonly called CCS. If coal is going to be part of the clean energy future, CCS is precisely the kind of technology that we need to encourage.

Understanding this, EPA and others have provided evidence to our committee that CCS is both feasible and available, and that coal-fired power plants with CCS are moving forward.

□ 1715

Some of these projects are in the United States, but some of them are being pursued abroad; but without my amendment, these improvements or projects abroad would not be considered by this innovation. This is ridiculous and wrong.

I want to be clear. This amendment will not make this a sensible or reasonable bill, and I will be voting ''no'' even if my amendment should be adopted; but my amendment would at least avoid the embarrassment of the United States Congress requiring a science-based agency to pretend that technologies operating in other countries simply don't exist.

I know that some of my colleagues like to deny the science of climate change, but I hope there can be bipartisan agreement that we shouldn't deny science just because it is being used by someone else.

Effective CCS technologies are already being installed and used in other countries, including our neighbor to the north; and EPA surely should be allowed to consider these technologies. My amendment would simply ensure that EPA can do its job and consider all available technologies when setting pollution control standards.

So I ask my colleagues to support this simple and sensible change and support my amendment.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. WHITFIELD. I rise in opposition to the amendment.

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

Mr. WHITFIELD. Mr. Chair, I certainly have a great deal of respect for the gentlelady from California, and I might add, we have heard a lot today about climate change.

Former EPA Administrator Lisa Jackson, herself, stated in a hearing:

We will not ultimately be able to change the amount of CO_2 that is accumulating in the atmosphere alone.

By that, she meant the United States, and there are a couple of reasons she said that. First of all, 96 percent of CO_2 emissions are naturally occurring; manmade is around 4 percent.

I might also point out that, in the recent fifth assessment report of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change, they acknowledged a lack of warming since 1998, and they acknowledged the growing discrepancy between their climate model projections versus actual readings.

So it is not that people are denying. It is that there is a significant difference among the scientific community about what is manmade CO_2 contributing and what is naturally occurring CO_2.

To the gentlelady's amendment, the Premier of Saskatchewan was in my office today, talking about the Canadian project that the gentlewoman from California referred to. It is not in operation yet.

He did say that it would not have been built without government funds; and her amendment would simply say that, if it is working in Canada, the EPA could apply that and make it mandatory here.

We believe that the Energy Policy Act of 2005 made it illegal for EPA to even set the emissions standard that they have set in their proposed rule, and certainly, what the gentlelady's amendment would allow is the governments to put in large sums of money to make some projects work that may not, in reality, be able to be accomplished in the U.S. because of a lack of private capital.

So if technology is working in another country, it can be brought to America, and if it meets our standards set in paragraphs B and C, it would be able to be utilized; so for that reason, I would make the argument that the gentlelady's amendment should be rejected.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mrs. CAPPS. Mr. Chair, I would just make the comment that I think there is a little bit of a misunderstanding here. I was not implying that, if there was a technology in another country, such as Canada, it would automatically have to be used in this country.

I would just propose, in my amendment, that we wouldn't want to deny a scientist the opportunity to be able to examine other technologies just because they came from a different country, such as Canada.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. WHITFIELD. Mr. Chair, what I object to is that the EPA would use that and mandate that private industry build that technology here in the U.S. And I think that your amendment would allow them to do that, and that is what I object to.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mrs. CAPPS. Mr. Chairman, I will just add that I don't believe the word ''mandate'' or ''require'' is in my amendment. It would just be allowing the consideration of proposals and technologies from other countries, not just the United States, as far as my amendment was concerned.

Mr. Chairman, my amendment is simple and straightforward. It makes a

small change to the bill, as I just said, which would allow EPA to consider all available technologies when developing pollution controlled systems. This is an idea that really should have bipartisan support.

My colleagues across the aisle often say how the government shouldn't be picking winners and losers, yet that is precisely what this bill does. It not only declares which technologies can be winners, but it doesn't even allow all available technologies to be considered. The bill allows polluters to keep polluting while our children and grandchildren will suffer the consequences down the road.

My amendment won't make this deeply flawed legislation something I can support, but it will at least allow EPA to look at the full picture when making its decision.

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

Mr. WHITFIELD. Mr. Chair, the purpose of our legislation is, whenever EPA sets the standard, we want the technology to be in the U.S. for at least a year—operating for a year, and six units have the proof of that; so that is why we object to the gentlelady's amendment, and I would urge Members to vote against her amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from California (Mrs. CAPPS).

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

Mrs. CAPPS. Mr. Chair, 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 California will be postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 3 OFFERED BY MRS. CAPITO

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 3 printed in House Report 113–373.

Mrs. CAPITO. I have an amendment at the desk, Mr. Chair.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of section 2, add the following:

(d) TECHNOLOGIES.—Nothing in this section shall be construed to preclude the issuance, implementation, or enforcement of a standard of performance that—

(1) is based on the use of one or more technologies that are developed in a foreign country, but has been demonstrated to be achievable at fossil fuel-fired electric utility generating units in the United States; and

(2) meets the requirements of subsection (b) and (c), as applicable.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 497, the gentlewoman from West Virginia (Mrs. CAPITO) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from West Virginia.

Mrs. CAPITO. Mr. Chair, I rise to say that my amendment is a simple clarifying amendment that goes right along the discussion we were just having with the previous amendment.

It makes clear that the underlying bill does not stop the EPA from relying on foreign technologies to establish a performance standard, so long as that foreign technology has been adequately demonstrated at power plants here in the United States, and I think my colleague from Kentucky was making that point in his rebuttal.

The Electricity Security and Affordability Act is necessary because the EPA has taken the unprecedented step of requiring the use of technology that has not been demonstrated on a large commercial scale here in the United States. The rule is, therefore, a de facto ban on new coal plants anywhere in the United States.

Well, why is this significant? As our existing coal fleet retires, either due to regulations or because plants have reached the end of their useful life, what takes their place to provide affordable and reliable electricity to families and businesses?

In January, when temperatures dropped across the Eastern part of the United States, American Electric Power, AEP, which provides power in my region of the country, was operating 89 percent of the coal capacity that will retire in 2015.

When that capacity is no longer available, our electric grid will be less reliable, and the energy prices paid by individuals and small businesses will increase.

West Virginia has vast supplies of both natural gas and coal, so I fully support the development and use of all our domestic energy resources. We need a diverse energy policy that includes coal, natural gas, nuclear, and renewable to support our economic growth and keep the energy bills that families pay each month from skyrocketing.

But we cannot turn away from coal, which provides 40 percent of our Nation's electricity and 95 percent of the electricity in my home State of West Virginia.

Other countries understand that coal provides the energy necessary to power their own economies. The International Energy Agency released a report in December, stating that global coal consumption will continue to rise and increase by more than 2 percent through 2018. Between 2007 and 2012, global coal consumption increased faster than oil or natural gas.

China and India are constructing new coal plants. Even Germany is increasing its coal capacity in 2013.

The rest of the world is willing to use coal. We, in the United States, have a strong competitive advantage because we have hundreds of years of supply. Increasingly, we are exporting coal for use abroad. West Virginia exports more coal than any other State.

While we are glad the coal exports allow for production that provides jobs—real jobs in our State, it is difficult to understand why we would turn away from using our own domestic resources at the same time other countries are turning towards our domestic resources.

Importantly, unilateral action by the United States will do virtually nothing to address the global problem of carbon dioxide emissions. In 2012, carbon dioxide emissions from energy production in the United States fell by 3.8 percent to their lower level since the mid-90s.

Despite this drop, carbon dioxide emissions from energy globally increased to their highest level on record. China's carbon dioxide emissions alone more than offset the decreased emissions from the United States.

That is why I introduced legislation that would delay the implementation of the U.S. carbon dioxide regulations until other countries comprising 80 percent of non-U.S. emissions enact equally stringent regulations. Acting in concert with our global competitors would minimize the economic consequences and maximize the environmental benefits.

Instead, the administration has chosen the opposite course, imposing a unilateral regulation that maximizes our economic pain and minimizes the environmental benefits. EPA's regulation means absolutely fewer West Virginia jobs and higher energy prices for consumers.

Let's be clear about what today's legislation does. This legislation does not stop the EPA from regulating greenhouse gas emissions from new coal plants. The bill simply requires EPA to base its regulations on the best performing existing coal plants.

We should encourage the implementation of newer, cleaner burning coal technologies, but a de facto ban on new coal plants won't encourage new technologies. It will leave promising research on the shelf while energy prices increase and the economic advantage offered by our natural resources is lost.

This is a good straightforward piece of legislation. My amendment makes it clear that we want the best commercially available technology to set the standards for new plants, regardless of where that technology is developed, as long as that technology is demonstrated in the United States coal plants.

I urge the amendment's adoption and reserve the balance of my time.

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

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. I don't know how to oppose this amendment because it doesn't seem to make the underlying bill any worse.

The problem is this: The bill requires that, before a new standard for coal-powered plants is set, there has to be six coal-powered plants in this country

that are already using this technology; and we have argued: Well, that is not going to happen because no one is going to use the technology if their competitors aren't going to use the technology.

And if there is technology outside of this country that is being used successfully, EPA can't rely on that. Mrs. CAPPS' amendment would have changed that. That is still going to be voted on later.

Mrs. CAPITO's amendment says EPA could consider technologies developed in other countries, but only if those technologies are also being broadly adopted in the United States, as I understand it.

Well, in fact, that will lead to the exact same problem as we have in the underlying bill. Under both the amendment and the bill, EPA would still be prevented from proposing a standard based on cleaner coal technologies, such as ultrasupercritical boilers, which can reduce pollution by improving efficiency.

That kind of technology is already being used in more than 100 ultracritical coal units generating power in China, but the United States has only installed one. Well, we can't let that one and all the others that are being used in China allow the EPA to set a standard that would require that technology.

□ 1730

Under the bill and the amendment, that one U.S. plant won't be sufficient for EPA to set a new standard. So even if this amendment passes, EPA will still be prohibited from setting pollution control standards based on effective pollution controls that have been deployed overseas.

Well, I guess if you are going to pretend that climate change isn't happening, why not pretend that clean air technologies used in other countries don't exist, either? So I can't oppose—I am not going to ask for a rollcall vote. I am not going to even—I will even vote against your amendment. I am not going to vote for it. But it seems to me the amendment has a problem that the underlying bill already has, and it doesn't fix anything.

So if people want to vote for this amendment, vote for the amendment because it doesn't make anything any different than the problems that I see with the underlying bill.

With those comments, Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from West Virginia (Mrs. CAPITO).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 4 OFFERED BY MR. MCKINLEY

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 4 printed in House Report 113–373.

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:

At the end of section 3, add the following new subsection:

(d) CONSULTATION.—In carrying out subsection (c), the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency shall consult with the Administrator of the Energy Information Administration, the Comptroller General of the United States, the Director of the National Energy Technology Laboratory, and the Under Secretary of Commerce for Standards and Technology.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 497, 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, under this legislation, the EPA is required to submit a report to Congress regarding the impacts this proposed regulation will have on the economy, our competitiveness, our job losses, and electricity rates.

Quite frankly, many here in Congress and the constituents we represent across America have come not to trust the EPA to tell the truth about the impacts the proposed New Source Performance Standard rule or the upcoming existing source rule will have on our Nation.

The amendment before us adds stakeholders with whom the EPA should consult when finalizing this report. This includes the Energy Information Agency, who will provide the EPA with the necessary statistics and background. It includes the Comptroller General who oversees the Government Accountability Office because the GAO's reports have led to hearings and legislation, billions of dollars in taxpayer savings and improvements to a wide range of government programs and services.

It also includes the National Institute of Standards and Technology, who works with industry to develop and apply our Nation's technology, measurements, and standards, and, finally, the National Energy Technology Laboratory, under the direction of the Department of Energy. NETL has been leading the charge in working with the private sector and academia in developing carbon capture and sequestration technologies.

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

The Acting CHAIR. Does anyone seek recognition in opposition to the amendment? If not, the gentleman from West Virginia is recognized to close.

Mr. MCKINLEY. Mr. Chairman, during the House debate recently on Congressman GARDNER's House bill H.R. 4480, the Domestic Energy and Jobs bill, I offered a similar amendment. This amendment passed by voice vote and ensured that NETL had a seat at the table.

As background and for those of you who are unaware, NETL is our only government research, design, and development laboratory dedicated to domestic energy sources. Last year alone, NETL worked with academia and the private sector on over 1,000 projects. This represented over 55,000 jobs and $12 billion in project funding in every State and nearly every congressional district. It is only fitting that they, along with others, are included in this process.

Let's be clear here. If we support transparency by having relevant agencies consult with the EPA, these same agencies who provide us with statistics, develop our standards, develop our technology, and keep our agencies and Congress in line and accountable, then you would support this amendment. Members of Congress consult with their staffs, their respective committees, other Members' offices, and their constituents, so it is fitting the EPA should do the same under this amendment.

Chairman WHITFIELD and his staff are to be commended for their hard work to put together such an incredible bipartisan effort in this legislation. I am a proud cosponsor to work with him and encourage all my colleagues to support this amendment and, more importantly, the underlying bill.

With that, 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.

AMENDMENT NO. 5 OFFERED BY MR. MCKINLEY

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 5 printed in House Report 113–373.

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 5, line 17, strike ''; and'' and insert a semicolon.

Page 5, line 19, strike ''States.'' and insert ''States;''.

Page 5, after line 19, insert the following:

(C) required capital investments and projected costs for operation and maintenance of new equipment required to be installed; and

(D) the global economic competitiveness of the United States.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 497, 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. Chair, once again, I would like to reference section 3 of the underlying bill. The amendment would strengthen the analysis and reporting the EPA is required to develop under this legislation.

One of the problems our coal, gas, and oil industries face is the vast ideologically motivated regulations they must endure, such as the New Source Performance Standards. However, other nations don't seem to impose

such burdensome policies and regulations on their industries. Instead, countries in the Middle East and Asia promote their fossil fuel businesses and work to make it easier for those countries to get their fossil fuels to market. Mr. Chairman, it is called fairness.

Now, I am sure you will hear that some of the opponents of this in the past have falsely claimed that this amendment is flawed and too broad. We have heard that this amendment might open up a Pandora's box of issues as we heard from our friends 2 years ago when I offered a similar amendment. That is simply not true, not accurate.

This amendment and legislation will make certain that the United States remains viable in its manufacturing on a global scale, ensures that we don't put more people and their families or children out on the street or with uncertainty, and we can provide them with certainty and access to abundant and affordable electricity. This amendment is about protecting our liberties and providing transparency.

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

Mr. WAXMAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment so I can make a few points about this.

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

Mr. WAXMAN. I didn't speak on the last amendment. I didn't think that last amendment did anything worse than the bill already does. This amendment modifies a section of the underlying bill which requires EPA to report to Congress on the economic impacts of any regulation of carbon pollution from existing fossil fuel-fired power plants.

Well, this reporting requirement is largely meaningless because EPA already does this analysis, and if this bill were adopted, EPA wouldn't issue any rules to trigger the reporting requirement anyway. But this amendment would add more items to be considered in EPA's report on a rule regulating carbon pollution from existing power plants.

For example, this bill would require EPA to look at the rule's potential effects on capital, operation, and maintenance costs for pollution control equipment. But that is exactly what EPA already does for every significant rule that requires pollution controls. The amendment also requires EPA to analyze how our particular pollution control requirement may affect the global economic competitiveness of the United States. I don't think that makes any sense to add this because it is questionable whether we even have reliable economic models to make this assessment.

If this bill were adopted, EPA wouldn't be doing this report anyway, so it doesn't really matter. I am not going to object to the amendment, and I am not going to vote for the amendment, but it won't have any effect because the underlying bill is going to prevent the EPA from acting whether it is a new power plant or existing power plants.

But I did want to single out this provision which I think is unreasonable to expect EPA to be able to do this global economic competitiveness analysis. That is not what EPA does. They are not in the position to do it, and to add that requirement, I think, is a very bad precedent.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. MCKINLEY. Mr. Chairman, I thank Congressman WAXMAN.

Under this amendment, the EPA is required, as he just stated, is required to take into account the economic impacts this rule could have on our global competitiveness and the required capital investments and costs for operations and maintenance of new equipment.

We know that, under the New Source Performance Standards rule, the cost of electricity could skyrocket by as much as 70 percent. This cost will be passed on to the consumers. Consequently, American manufacturers will indeed be put at a global disadvantage, and many will lose their business.

We have seen testimony by economists, academics, and scientists who say that, under this proposed regulation, capital costs will increase by as much as 110 percent. This is unconscionable. At a time when Saudi Arabia, China, and India are helping their job creators thrive and open up global opportunities for them, this administration and its ideologically motivated EPA are exporting jobs, trading uncertainty, and trying to decarbonize America with little to show for health and economic benefits.

The EPA needs to look at what other nations are doing to grow, stabilize, and sustain their fossil fuel industries. This amendment will help us show how we can improve and stop hindering the development of our natural resources.

Ultimately, I offered this amendment because we are supposed to be a nation leading by example over the rest of the world. With nearly 23 million people underemployed or unemployed, we really ought to be saying to our regulators: Just because you can doesn't mean you should.

Mr. Chairman, again, I wish to thank Mr. UPTON and Mr. WHITFIELD for their support of this amendment and the underlying bill that goes with it. Mr. WHITFIELD's work on the overall bill shows his true leadership and caring for the people of Appalachia and all across America.

This country is a leader of the world, an innovator, and a job creator. It is time that it reins in the excessive regulations that create burdens resulting in families, children, husbands, and spouses worried about tomorrow. It is time their regulators pull back in. This amendment and this legislation overall will create that ability that we have in the American Dream again, but not an American Dream that is driven by regulations.

I urge all my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to support this amendment, and 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.

AMENDMENT NO. 6 OFFERED BY MS. SCHAKOWSKY

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 6 printed in House Report 113–373.

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY. Mr. Chair, I offer an amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Redesignate section 5 as section 6 and insert after section 4 the following:

SEC. 5. CONGRESSIONAL ACCEPTANCE OF SCIENTIFIC FINDINGS.

Congress accepts the scientific finding (contained in the proposed rule referred to in section 4(2)) that greenhouse gas pollution is ''contributing to long-lasting changes in our climate that can have a range of negative effects''.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 497, the gentlewoman from Illinois (Ms. SCHAKOWSKY) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Illinois.

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 4 minutes.

My dear colleagues, this is the simplest of simple amendments. It asks of this House only one thing, to acknowledge the truth of these words:

Greenhouse gas pollution is contributing to long-lasting changes in our climate that can have a range of negative effects.

Our country and this Congress are at a critical moment in the history of our small planet. We are privileged as leaders of the most powerful country on Earth to be in a position to lead the world in combating climate change. There is still time.

□ 1745

If we act now, we can protect our natural resources, like water, promote job growth, and ensure that our descendants are able to live healthy lives on this planet long after we are gone.

Making the right choice begins with accepting the fact of climate change. It is hard to ignore this reality. The 10 hottest years in human history all occurred since 1998. This time last year, we had just completed the hottest year ever in the United States, a full degree hotter in terms of average temperature than the previous record. Though we are dealing with cold in many parts of the U.S. this year, the scientists tell us global temperatures are continuing to warm.

Micronesia, the Marshall Islands, and Palau, among others, will be submerged during this century unless meaningful action is taken. Here at home, we are seeing more and more severe droughts, wildfires, storms, and hurricanes—often all in the same year.

There are tremendous economic incentives for the United States to take climate change seriously. In December, the Pew Charitable Trust estimated that the clean energy sector could generate $1.9 trillion in revenue from 2012 to 2018. We also know that there are three times as many jobs created per dollar spent on renewable energy than on fossil fuel. As we work to create an economy that supports 21st century jobs, how can we overlook one of the world's fastest-growing industrial sectors and the millions of jobs it would support?

Large multinational corporations have joined environmentalists, scientists, and the vast majority of the American public who recognize the impact of carbon pollution on our world. For example, Coca-Cola has already suffered from a global water shortage that is driving up costs, and Coke has recognized climate change as a challenge to its future profitability.

The business plans of ExxonMobil and other Big Five oil companies assume they will have to pay for the cost of carbon in the future. This Congress should recognize the same facts that these business leaders have accepted: climate change is real and requires a different game plan. History will not be kind to climate change deniers.

The Schakowsky-Lowenthal amendment doesn't ask for much. It doesn't change the bill's provisions. It simply asks us as 21st century leaders of the most powerful country in the world to say ''yes'' to this simple fact: climate change is real and can have negative consequences.

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

Mr. WHITFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I rise to oppose the gentlelady's amendment.

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

Mr. WHITFIELD. I have a great deal of respect and admiration for the gentlelady from Illinois. I might say, this legislation would never have been necessary if EPA had adopted a standard that had been adequately demonstrated and was not in violation of the Energy Policy Act of 2005.

I would also say in wanting to add this language to the bill, EPA itself, in discussing its proposed regulation, projected that its rule would result in almost zero CO_2 emission changes or quantified benefits in cost by 2022. So even EPA does not think that their regulation is going to really significantly reduce CO_2 emissions because 96 percent of CO_2 emissions are naturally occurring; less than 4 percent are manmade.

I might also point out once again that no one is a denier of climate change, but more and more scientists seem to be disagreeing with the impact of manmade CO_2 versus naturally occurring CO_2.

After the Fifth Assessment Report of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change in the fall of last year, a group of scientists from the non-governmental Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change in a 1,200-page report with thousands of references to peer reviewed papers made the argument that natural forces, not man-made forces, are really driving the Earth's climate. So we are particularly concerned that this regulation would prevent America from flexibility. In the future if natural gas prices go up, we would not have the option, like most every other country in the world, of building a coal plant, and so that is why we respectfully oppose her amendment.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY. Mr. Chairman, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from California (Mr. LOWENTHAL).

Mr. LOWENTHAL. I thank the gentlewoman from Illinois for yielding and for being a steadfast leader on this issue.

Mr. Chairman, this amendment simply confirms what world's scientists already know: that greenhouse gases contribute to long-lasting changes in our climate that can have a range of harmful effects.

Disinformation by entities with conflicts of interest have fueled reports of scientific disagreement. However, the scientific community is not divided because there is no compelling scientific evidence denying human's role in climate change, period. Case closed.

Every minute we waste on the myth of disagreement is a minute longer we wait to take concrete action, making our inevitable energy transition even more expensive.

Mr. Chairman, we will be judged by our children for what we do here today. I urge an ''aye ''vote.

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY. I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. WHITFIELD. I yield myself the balance of my time.

In reply to this case closed argument, I would just point out that the Fifth Assessment Report of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change, which came out in the fall, acknowledged a lack of warming since 1998 and a growing discrepancy between the model projections and the reality of the observations actually made; that the discrepancy between the models and reality was increasing. It also acknowledged the evidence of decreased climate sensitivity to the increases in atmospheric CO_2 concentrations. It also acknowledged that sea level rising during the period 1920–1950 was the same as in 1995 to 2012. Now that is the United Nations Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change.

With that, I respectfully request that we defeat the gentlelady's amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Illinois (Ms. SCHAKOWSKY).

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

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY. 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 Illinois will be postponed.

Mr. WHITFIELD. 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. MCKINLEY) 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. 3826) to provide direction to the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency regarding the establishment of standards for emissions of any greenhouse gas from fossil fuel-fired electric utility generating units, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 2824, PREVENTING GOVERNMENT WASTE AND PROTECTING COAL MINING JOBS IN AMERICA; PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 2641, RESPONSIBLY AND PROFESSIONALLY INVIGORATING DEVELOPMENT ACT OF 2013; AND PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF MOTIONS TO SUSPEND THE RULES

Mr. WEBSTER of Florida, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 113–374) on the resolution (H. Res. 501) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 2824) to amend the Surface Mining Control and Reclamation Act of 1977 to stop the ongoing waste by the Department of the Interior of taxpayer resources and implement the final rule on excess spoil, mining waste, and buffers for perennial and intermittent streams, and for other purposes; providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 2641) to provide for improved coordination of agency actions in the preparation and adoption of environmental documents for permitting determinations, and for other purposes; and providing for consideration of motions to suspend the rules, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

ELECTRICITY SECURITY AND AFFORDABILITY ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 497 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. 3826.

Will the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HULTGREN) kindly resume the chair.

□ 1756

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. 3826) to provide direction to the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency regarding the establishment of standards for emissions of any greenhouse gas from fossil fuel-fired electric utility generating units, and for other purposes, with Mr. HULTGREN (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 House Report 113–373 offered by the gentlewoman from Illinois (Ms. SCHAKOWSKY) had been postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 7 OFFERED BY MR. LATTA

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 7 printed in House Report 113–373.

Mr. LATTA. Mr. Chairman, I rise to offer my amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 8, line 4, strike ''government'' and insert ''Federal Government''.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 497, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. LATTA) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. LATTA. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of my amendment to H.R. 3826. This amendment would make a clarification to the bill to make explicit that ''demonstration projects'' refer to projects that have received Federal Government funding or assistance. This responds to comments raised when the bill was marked up that the definition of ''demonstration project'' could be construed to sweep in any project receiving government support, including local tax assistance.

This amendment helps clarify the bill and also highlights the provisions of the Energy Policy Act of 2005 which apply to the EPA's proposed standards for new plants. The Energy Policy Act expressly prohibits EPA from considering technologies at Federally funded projects under DOE's Clean Coal Power Initiative to be adequately demonstrated. The purpose of this is to prevent the premature mandating of technologies that are commercially viable.

EPA's determination that ''carbon capture and storage'' or CCS, technologies for new coal-fired power plants have been ''adequately demonstrated'' is not borne out in the real world. In the agency's proposed rule, the EPA cites four government-subsidized CCS power plant demonstration projects that are in various stages of planning development.

First, Southern Company's Kemper County, Mississippi, project is still under construction, subject to delays and cost overruns. In the company running the project's own words, this plant ''cannot be consistently replicated on a national level'' and ''should not serve as a primary basis for new emissions standards impacting all new coal-fired power plants.''

Next, Summit's Texas clean energy project is still in the planning stage. It does not yet have financing and has also been subject to multiple delays.

The third project, Hydrogen Energy California LLC's project, is still in the planning and permitting stages.

Lastly, SaskPower's Boundary Dam CCS project, a government funded, small 110-megawatt facility rebuild project in Canada is still under construction and reportedly $115 million over budget.

It seems very clear to the companies and institutions most involved with these CCS projects that they are not yet ready to be considered for commercial deployment. As one former Assistant Secretary for Fossil Energy in the Obama administration suggested, it is disingenuous for the EPA to say that CCS is ready.

□ 1800

It should be very clear to the American taxpayers that this administration is working day and night to eliminate the use of coal in this country. In places like my home State of Ohio, where 78 percent of our energy comes from coal, the result will be higher electric bills for our families and seniors already dealing with increased health care costs as a result of ObamaCare.

We should be pursuing energy policies that will lead to more energy that is less expensive for people, rather than less energy that is more expensive for our citizens. As we know, increased energy costs impact the most vulnerable citizens in our country.

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to support the amendment, and 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. Mr. Chairman, the underlying bill prevents EPA from setting a standard or requirements for new—new coal-powered plants.

Instead of telling a new coal-powered plant they have to use technology to reduce their carbon emissions, this bill says they can't require that of new plants, unless new plants are already using technology to reduce emissions.

Well, okay, if they are already using technology, we can say everybody ought to use that technology; but then the underlying bill goes further and says: Well, not only are they using technology that accomplishes the goal, but there has got to be six plants represented all over the country that are achieving the standard using technologies, and then EPA can consider a standard for new power plants.

This is like the belts and suspenders. They can't look at foreign technology. They have to use six plants that are using technology.

Of course, one would ask: Why would anybody spend money to use technology to reduce carbon pollution if they are not required to do it? It costs money.

So it is so unlikely that they are ever going to be able to set a new standard at the Environmental Protection Agency, given the underlying bill.

But the bill also says, if there are six plants that are using technology, they better not use technology that has been funded by the government. Well, why not? That is what the government does.

We provide DOE grants to have demonstrations of new technologies. That is what the underlying bill says. If they are achieving reductions in carbon pollution because it is involving government funds, we are not going to count those.

Well, now, we have the Latta amendment that says: Well, wait a second. What if it is funds for demonstrations that are not using Federal dollars, but local dollars?

Well, fine. I don't have any objection to that, but I don't know why we would say Federal dollars can't be used to demonstrate technologies that are successful, so the Latta amendment narrows the underlying bill, but really doesn't accomplish much.

Why, I would ask: Would we want to say that the Department of Energy, using taxpayer dollars for projects to find new and better ways to improve air quality for the American people, should not be used by EPA to set a standard for future power plants?

These projects funded by the Federal Government help companies figure out how to reduce air pollution more effectively and at a lower cost. The whole point is to develop technologies that can be applied across the industry to reduce air pollution.

So if the Federal Government funds those new technologies and they are successful, we are not going to let a standard be based on that; but if the State funds the development of the new technologies that accomplish these goals, oh, we can use that, but they better be part of six, and they better fit this underlying standard—this underlying requirement that there be six in different parts of the country and on and on and on.

Well, I don't object to this amendment. I don't see what the amendment particularly does to make the bill any better. It doesn't solve any particular problem that I see, but I just want to point out how offensive this underlying bill is to not let EPA set standards for new plants when we know that technologies can reduce the carbon pollution.

But we are not going to look at it for real, unless they meet a higher standard, which is six plants; but they better not be using government-funded technologies from the Federal Government, which would be the case if this amendment is adopted.

So I just want to make these points rhetorically because I think people ought to understand how offensive this bill is.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LATTA. Mr. Chairman, does the gentleman have anything further?

Mr. WAXMAN. Mr. Chairman, may I inquire who closes the debate on this amendment?

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from California has the right to close.

Mr. LATTA. Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. WAXMAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

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

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 8 OFFERED BY MR. WAXMAN

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 8 printed in House Report 113–373.

Mr. WAXMAN. 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 bill, add the following:

SEC. 6. EFFECTIVE DATE.

This Act shall take effect when the Administrator of the Energy Information Administration certifies that a Federal program, other than a program under section 111 of the Clean Air Act (42 U.S.C. 7411), will reduce carbon pollution in at least equivalent quantities to, with similar timing, and from the same sources as the carbon pollution reductions required in the aggregate by the rules and guidelines listed in paragraphs (2), (3), and (4) of section 4.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 497, the gentleman from California (Mr. WAXMAN) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California.

Mr. WAXMAN. Mr. Chairman, President Obama reached out to the Congress, to the Republican majority of this House, and he said: Let's work on ideas that could help us deal with this problem of climate change.

But he also said he wanted to make it very clear that, if the Republicans won't act because this House majority won't do anything to address climate change, he will.

The bill we are considering today shows that the Republicans' plan on climate change is to give up hope. Their plan is to let our children and grandchildren suffer the effects of climate change without lifting a finger to protect them; worse, the Republicans' plan is to stop any meaningful action to slow climate change. I think this position is indefensible.

Today's bill would amend the Clean Air Act to ensure that coal-fired power plants are able to pollute indefinitely with impunity. This bill would condition EPA's authority on conditions that simply can never be met or at least not as long as it is cheaper to dump pollution into the air rather than clean it up.

Republicans complain they don't like EPA's approach. Well, what is their plan to address climate change? For years, Democratic Members have shown that we are willing to consider any suggestion to reduce carbon pollution and to slow climate change.

We could put a price on carbon. We could put a limit on carbon pollution. We could support the development of clean energy. In the bill that I authored with now-Senator MARKEY, we dedicated $60 billion to deploy carbon capture and sequestration technology on new coal power plants.

But what Congress can't do is simply say no to everything, no to a price on carbon, no to a limit on carbon, no to regulation on carbon.

What my amendment suggests is, if they don't want EPA to act to reduce the pollution from carbon coming from coal-burning power plants, we are saying: All right, address this problem, make sure we have some other alternative that will work.

Because if they don't have an alternative that will work, in effect, the Republicans are saying: We are not going to do anything, either we don't believe there is a problem called climate change, the scientists are all lying to us—of course, we will never let them come before our committee and testify because they will only lie to us about it—the science is wrong, we don't have to worry about it.

We have heard over and over again from Mr. WHITFIELD that 96 percent of the problem is naturally occurring carbon. Well, naturally occurring carbon is balanced; it is absorbed by photosynthesis and other processes.

But that 4 percent is upsetting the balance, and that balance that is being upset is a threat to this planet. It is a threat to our atmosphere. It is a threat to our Nation when we see hurricanes, floods, droughts, all these climate events that we hear about every night in the evening news.

So what is their alternative? If they don't want coal-burning power plants regulated, give us an alternative that will reduce that 4 percent that is upsetting the balance.

I would suggest that they are telling us they have no alternative whatsoever. I don't think that is an adequate answer to what many experts believe is the leading threat to our survival on this planet.

I would urge that we adopt this amendment. If they don't like what EPA is doing, tell us their plan. If they have other ideas for reducing carbon pollution to prevent catastrophic climate change, let's hear them; but if they don't, they should step aside and let the President lead.

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

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

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

Mr. WHITFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I would point out once again, as I did in the beginning of this debate, that the Constitutional law professor Jonathan Turley, testifying before the Judiciary Committee, recently made the statement that:

> If left unchecked, the United States President could effectively become a government unto himself because of excessive executive orders and excessive regulations.

The only reason that we are here today is that the President, without any really national debate, went to Copenhagen and other international groups and made commitments for the U.S. on the reduction of CO_2 emissions.

In the energy sector, our emissions are the lowest that they have been in 20 years. If EPA had adopted emission standards and technology was available that had been adequately demonstrated to meet those standards, we wouldn't have any problem, but they did not do that. In fact, they violated the 2005 Energy Policy Act in setting these emission standards.

We tried to talk to EPA; we tried to talk to the President; we tried to talk to his representatives; and we got the cold shoulder. So the only option available to us in trying to overcome these executive orders and regulations is to adopt some legislation.

In our legislation, we don't expect a coal plant to be built, but if natural gas prices go up, America—like every other country in the world practically—will be able to build a coal plant, and the technology will be available to meet those emission standards.

With that, I would respectfully oppose the gentleman's amendment, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. WAXMAN. Mr. Chairman, my amendment doesn't stop EPA from acting if we can get an alternative, an alternative that would reduce the carbon pollution to the same level the EPA is proposing.

My friend and colleague, Mr. WHITFIELD, said the President, if left unchecked, would make these commitments. Well, President George H. W. Bush made a commitment on behalf of this country that we would try to achieve reduction of carbon to 1990 levels.

If the Republicans want to do something on their own and not let the President do it, tell us how you can accomplish these goals. If you don't want to achieve these goals, it is either because you don't believe we need to achieve them or you are not willing to do anything about the problem.

I urge support for the amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. WHITFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I would just say that we believe the President's views are extreme when he sets a goal of reducing by 83 percent below the 2005 emission levels.

For that, we think this legislation is absolutely essential to give the American people the flexibility in the future to build a coal plant to help meet the electricity needs of this great country.

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

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

The question was taken; and the Acting Chair announced that the noes 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 California will be postponed.

□ 1815

Mr. WHITFIELD. Mr. Chair, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. YOHO) 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. 3826) to provide direction to the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency regarding the establishment of standards for emissions of any greenhouse gas from fossil fuel-fired electric utility generating units, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

HOUR OF MEETING ON TOMORROW

Mr. WHITFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet at 9:00 a.m. tomorrow.

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

There was no objection.

THE ULTIMATE PRICE FOR FREEDOM

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

Mr. OLSON. Mr. Speaker, on March 6, 1836, nearly 200 Texans took their last breaths at the Alamo. A week before that, their commander, William Barret Travis, sent a final plea for help. Here are parts of that inspiring letter:

> To the people of Texas and all Americans in the world, I am besieged by a thousand or more Mexicans under Santa Anna. I have sustained a continual bombardment and cannonade for 24 hours and have not lost a man. The enemy has demanded a surrender at discretion; otherwise, the Garrison are to be put to the sword.
>
> I call on you in the name of liberty, of patriotism, of everything dear to the American character to come to our aid. If this call is neglected, I am determined to sustain myself as long as possible and die like a soldier who never forgets what is due to his own honor, that of his country, victory or death.

May God and history always remember the Alamo.

CONGRATULATIONS TO THE HIGH SCHOOLS IN ALABAMA's SEVENTH DISTRICT THAT WON THE STATE BASKETBALL CHAMPIONSHIPS IN 2014

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

Ms. SEWELL of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to declare Alabama's Seventh Congressional District to be the district of high school basketball champions.

This year, in 2014, at the State tournament held by the Alabama High School Athletic Association, teams from the Seventh Congressional District of Alabama dominated, winning four boys basketball State championship titles and one girls.

I ask my colleagues to join me in congratulating Class 1A boys basketball State champions, St. Jude Educational Institute of Montgomery, Alabama; Class 3A boys basketball State champions, Midfield High School of Midfield, Alabama; Class 4A boys basketball State champions, Dallas County High School of Plantersville, Alabama; Class 5A boys basketball State champions, Parker High School of Birmingham; Class 5A girls basketball champions, Wenonah High School of Birmingham, Alabama.

No doubt that in the Seventh Congressional District of Alabama we breed winners. I plan to provide individual remarks about each school's victory so that each school is recognized in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. For now, I ask my colleagues in the House of Representatives to join me in congratulating and honoring the State of Alabama high school basketball champions from Alabama's Seventh Congressional District, the district of high school basketball champions.

HONORING HENRY WILLIS NEAL

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

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, it is with heavy heart but a joy for his life that I rise today to honor Henry Willis ''Hanq'' Neal of Houston, Texas, who lost his battle in life last week. He was the music minister at the Wheeler Avenue Baptist Church, an awesome tenor voice anointed by God.

Mr. Speaker, I rise to pay tribute to Henry Willis ''Hanq'' Neal, the legendary minister of music at Houston's Wheeler Avenue Baptist Church, who was called home by the Lord on Thursday, February 27, 2014. He was 57 years old.

The attack that took his life occurred the Sunday preceding, after a number of church services where he led the music ministry, and then concluding at another church a few miles away, never stopping, never ceasing to lead to the glory the Lord.

Hanq Neal possessed a distinctive singing voice that enthralled all audiences, the churched and the unchurched. According to the Reverend Marcus D. Cosby, Wheeler Avenue Baptist Church's senior pastor, because of Hanq, people's lives have been comforted and we have been enriched by his musical genius.

Hanq Neal was born on September 4, 1956, one of eight children. He was raised in Ft. Wayne, Indiana, where he began to play the organ at 4 and took up the violin at 7. He performed in school orchestras and sang in the church on Sunday. He dreamed of becoming a teacher, a gifted musician, and vocalist.

Hanq Neal and two church friends formed a gospel trio, the Pentecostal Ambassadors. The group was discovered at a Gospel Music Workshop of America conference and signed to a recording contract by the gospel legend, Reverend James Cleveland.

Hanq Neal sang the lead on ''If You Move Yourself,'' the title track of the 1980 gospel album recorded live in Detroit by the Donald Vails Choraleers.

The main thing that I want to share with all of you is that Hanq Neal was a friend. He sang at Erica Lee's, my daughter's wedding. And he sang this song, Mr. Speaker, for the late Congressman Mickey Leland, ''There Is Hope.''

Hanq Neal gave hope to the world. We loved Hanq Neal. He was a hero, an American hero. We have lost a unique talent. We wish our deepest sympathy to his family, and he will be missed. You may not know him, Congress, but he is an American hero.

Mr. Speaker, I rise to pay tribute to Henry Willis 'Hanq' Neal, the legendary Minister of Music at Houston's Wheeler Baptist Church, who was called home by the Lord on Thursday, February 27, 2014. He was 57 years old.

Hanq Neal possessed a distinctive singing voice that enthralled all audiences, the churched and unchurched. According to the Rev. Marcus D. Cosby, Wheeler Baptist Church's senior pastor, because of Hanq, "people's lives have been comforted and we have been enriched by a musical genius."

Hanq Neal was born September 4, 1956, one of eight children. He was raised in Fort Wayne, Indiana, where he began playing the organ at 4 and took up the violin at 7. He performed in school orchestras and sang in church on Sunday. He dreamed of becoming a teacher.

A gifted musician and vocalist, Hanq Neal and two church friends formed a gospel trio, the Pentecostal Ambassadors. The group was discovered at a Gospel Music Workshop of America conference and signed to a recording contract by gospel legend, Rev. James Cleveland.

Hanq Neal sang the lead on "If You Move Yourself," the title track of the 1980 gospel album recorded live in Detroit by The Donald Vails Choraleers.

In 1984, Hanq joined the Windsor Village United Methodist Church, a small-but-growing Houston congregation, and eventually established five choirs with a total membership of 600. He served there until 2001 and helped Windsor become the denomination's largest congregation.

Hanq Neal ''had an awesome tenor voice anointed by God,'' according to Kathy Taylor, the nationally known gospel artist who succeeded him as Windsor Village's music minister.

Mr. Speaker, Hanq Neal was the preferred vocalist for Houston public occasions. He performed at mayoral inaugurations and for Queen Elizabeth II when she visited the city in 1991.

It was at the memorial service for the late Congressman Mickey Leland in 1989 that Hanq Neal gained national recognition and critical acclaim for his rendition of ''There Is Hope,'' which became one of his signature songs.

When Hanq finished that song there were no dry eyes in the room every heart was lifted.

Hanq Neal's operatic rendition of ''The Lord's Prayer'' made him a popular soloist at funerals and other solemn occasions.

Hanq Neal was a unique talent and an American original. He was genuine. He broke and crossed barriers. His music brought the church to the community and the community to the church.

Mr. Speaker, Hanq Neal was a great man who touched the lives of all who heard him. He will be missed but never forgotten.

I ask a moment of silence in memory of Henry Willis 'Hanq' Neal.

THE RUSSIAN INVASION OF UKRAINE

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

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, the Russians are invading Ukraine. I think a history lesson is in order.

I take you back to 1938. Adolph Hitler annexes a neighbor, Austria. Just took them. Took them over. The West, the world, the freedom-loving people watched. He got away with that. He took them over because he wanted to, in his statement, unify the German-speaking peoples.

That was in March of 1938. Then in October of 1938, Adolph Hitler just decided that he wanted part of Czechoslovakia, the Sudetenland, saying the same thing, that German-speaking people were being persecuted and that he wanted to help them, and he annexed the Sudetenland.

The West really agreed to that. We have heard about the appeasement of Chamberlain. Agreed to it, waived his paper, peace in our time. Not long after that, Hitler decided he wanted more Czechoslovakia. Then he invaded Poland, and then World War II started, and he invaded other countries. That was in the beginning of 1938.

Now take you to today. Vladimir Putin, Russia. He invades the Republic of Georgia, and he did so in August of 2008, and he took one-third of the country.

I happened to be in the Republic of Georgia shortly after the Russians invaded. I saw the Russian tanks on the horizon. Remember, Mr. Speaker, Putin invaded Georgia, took one-third of the land, and the Russians are still there. The world just moved on.

The Georgians are trying to figure out some way to deal with Putin's imperialistic attitude, but the Russians were there, are there—no consequences for that action.

Now that brings us to March of 2014. Of course, Georgia as we all know was a former Soviet Republic. Now Putin has his eyes on another former Soviet Republic, Ukraine. The Russian military, even though they went in with unmarked uniforms, just decided to move in and take over part of Ukraine—Crimea. That is the latest activity.

This is similar to what Adolf Hitler did back in the thirties and the forties. So, yes, Putin is similar to Adolph Hitler in that he has this appetite for other people's land, and he tries to justify it some way and he just waits to see if anybody is going to do anything about it.

This is a photograph taken by the Associated Press, Mr. Speaker, and it is some Ukrainian women that are holding up signs. Here is a photograph of Adolph Hitler over here on the far right. They are holding a sign. This is a Russian flag with a swastika in the middle. Here is another poster being held up showing the Russian flag, comparing Putin to Hitler and the Nazis' quest and their appetite to take other people's sovereign land.

I think the analogy is in order. I think the world should understand that Putin has it somewhere in his brain that he can just, on his own, justify the taking of other people's sovereign land. I think it is important that we recognize the obvious. And what we will do about it, we shall see.

When the Russians moved into Georgia, I personally don't think much happened to the world, other than the Georgians didn't complain too much. So the Russians understood that they could do it and get away with it, Putin did. Six years later, deja vu, it is all over again. He believes that he can get away with the invading of sovereign nations because of this reason: these nations, to some extent, depend on Russia for their energy, including, specifically, natural gas.

The Kremlin is working to reestablish its empire by bullying countries like Ukraine, its neighbor who broke away from the Soviet Union years ago but never was quite able to get away from the influence and intimidation of Putin.

Russia has used its competitive advantage to maintain a stronghold over Eastern Europe and the European states that were formerly aligned to the Soviet Union. This is my opinion: that Russia—Putin—has its goal to try to rebring in those former Soviet Republics under the sphere of influence of Russia under some new name. That is my opinion. It looks like they have already started this.

Seventy percent of the gas that goes to Ukraine comes from Russia. Six nations in the European Union rely on Russia for 100 percent of their natural gas.

□ 1830

Much of Europe relies on the Kremlin for natural gas, although they don't get 100 percent of their gas from them.

So you have got Europe, the former Soviet Republics, and Ukraine depending on energy, natural gas, from Russia. The Russians know that. Reliance on the Russian gas shapes the foreign policy of Eastern European countries, Western European countries, and especially the former Soviet Republics, and jeopardizes, I think, political and economic reforms.

Russia understands the stranglehold and the monopoly. They can get away with the bullying because they are the source of natural gas. Two times in the last 10 years, for political reasons, they have been punished economically—that is, the Ukrainians—by the Russians turning off the gas.

I happened to be in the Ukraine when the Russians turned off the gas one winter. Mr. Speaker, it gets cold in the Ukraine without heat. The Russians did that to make sure that the Ukrainians, I believe, come around and support Russian politics.

This past weekend, the Russians warned that the Ukrainians were not going to be able to continue to get some kind of discounted rate unless they reinstated the former Ukrainian President. They are blackmailing the Ukrainians. They want a president different than the one the Russians support.

So we can change that. People back home in Texas, like most Americans, don't think it is legal or right for the Russians to invade another country and just start moving in and taking over, but they ask this question: What are we going to do about it?

Remember, back when Hitler was in charge, it took a while for the West to react—and finally had to react militarily. Maybe we should try to react sooner and not have to react militarily, and we should do it economically.

The way to do that, I believe, is to give the Ukrainians, the former Soviet Republics, and Eastern and Western Europe an alternative to being held hostage by Putin because of their energy issues and the lack of natural gas and the lack of having an alternative.

Where should they look? They should look to the United States, and the United States should look to helping out these countries. Also, it would help us economically. We should be ready and eager to export our abundant natural gas to our European friends.

I think very few people in the energy industry would have believed 5 years ago that the United States would have so much natural gas that we would be able to export it; that we can produce it in such an efficient and clean way that we can export it to foreign countries. This is an opportunity to do so, and we should do so.

There is an ice cream company down in Texas that makes the best ice cream in the world. It is Blue Bell Ice Cream from Brenham, Texas. Their slogan is:

We eat all we can and we sell the rest.

That should be our slogan with natural gas. We use all we can in the United States and we sell the rest.

Who should we sell it to? We could start with these Eastern European Nations that are being intimidated by the Russians. We should help them economically, but also help the United States, and we should start with the Ukrainians.

An abundant and steady supply of natural gas exported from the United States would be beneficial to our allies, Eastern Europe, and let the world know that they are not going to be held hostage by the kleptocratic Kremlin any longer.

We can export natural gas in several ways. That debate has already taken place here in the House of Representatives and in the Department of Energy about whether or not we should or could export natural gas, setting aside the Ukrainian issue.

I think that we should. We have that opportunity. It is something that we can do to relieve the pressure of the intimidation by Putin and his attitude about moving in and taking over other people's property. The demand is there in Europe and the supply is overwhelming in the United States. The only thing that stands in the way is our own government.

So what do we do about that?

For the first time in our history, we can export natural gas to foreign countries. The United States has so much, we could not use all of it in our lifetime. It is beneficial to the United States to sell natural gas abroad. It will create jobs in the United States. It will create an income. It will make us—and we have heard this phrase since we were children—''energy independent'' by using natural gas, but also by selling it to our allies and our friends. The only thing that is stopping it, as I mentioned, is bureaucratic red tape.

It is ironic we talked about the year 1938. In 1938, Congress passed a law that required that any company that wanted to export natural gas had to get approval from the Department of Energy. That is in addition to the other permitting requirements that are required by FERC.

Over the last 70 years, this bureaucratic requirement that began in 1938, ironically, was hardly noticed anywhere in the United States because we were importing natural gas into the United States. By exporting, the United States can now become the Saudi Arabia of natural gas.

So technology has changed and we have an abundant amount of natural gas here in our own country. We can update the 1938 law and dismantle the bureaucratic roadblocks and take the Department of Energy out of the export license-granting process altogether. I think this country should be supporting and not stonewalling the development of this valuable resource. We can do that by legislation.

I have introduced legislation today, in fact, that would have the Department of Energy expedite the approval process for exporting natural gas to the Ukraine, former Soviet Republics, and to Europe. Let's get on with it.

Sure, it will take some time to get all of the logistics set up so we can actually send it to these countries, but we should help them. We should give them an alternative. We can do it on an economically good basis for these countries and for the United States. We can encourage folks to look to the West, as many of the Ukrainians already do, and give them an alternative.

The second thing that we can do to let the Russians know that we don't really approve of Putin moving into other people's countries—just like Hitler moved into other people's countries—is to look at it diplomatically, in the sense that until the Russians move out of somebody else's land—the Ukrainians—they shouldn't be getting any diplomatic visas into the United States. You stay out of the United States. You respect the international rule of law. Don't be an aggressor nation. Come into the world community of non-aggressing nations, like Russia says they are.

So there should be some consequences for this activity of invading other countries. What are the consequences? No visas for Russian diplomats to come to the United States. That is a good place to start. Meanwhile, let's approve exporting natural gas to the former Soviet Republics.

So I have introduced two bills that would do both of these things. They are something we can do immediately. Let the Ukrainians know that they have a friend in the United States, and we really do believe in supporting freedom and letting a nation itself figure out what they want to do, who they want to rule over them. Let them figure out that process.

It is difficult, and they disagree, as I am speaking tonight, on what course they should take, but let them decide, not let the Russians force them into becoming another puppet of Putin.

I hope we can move this legislation as fast as we possibly can.

And that's just the way it is.

I yield back the balance of my time.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Ms. ESTY (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for today on account of official business in her district.

SENATE ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The Speaker announced his signature to an enrolled bill of the Senate of the following title:

S. 23. An act to designate as wilderness certain land and inland water within the Sleeping Bear Dunes National Lakeshore in the State of Michigan, and for other purposes.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 6 o'clock and 41 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, March 6, 2014, 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:

4889. A letter from the Chief Counsel, FEMA, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Suspension of Community Eligibility, Rockland County, NY, et al. [Docket ID: FEMA-2013-0002] [Internal Agency Docket No.: FEMA-8319] received February 14, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Financial Services.

4890. A letter from the Program Manager, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the Department's final rule — World Trade Center Health Program; Amendments to List of WTC-Related Health Conditions; Cancer; Revision [Docket No.: CDC-2014-0004; NIOSH-268] (RIN: 0920-AA50) received February 18, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

4891. A letter from the Acting Director, Directorate of Whistleblower Protection Programs, Department of Labor, transmitting the Department's final rule — Procedures for Handling Retaliation Complaints Under Section 402 of the FDA Food Safety Modernization Act [Docket Number: OSHA-2011-0859] (RIN: 1218-AC58) received February 20, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

4892. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans; Texas; Revisions to the New Source Review (NSR) State Implementation Plan (SIP); Standard Permit for Oil and Gas Facilities and Standard Permit Applicability [EPA-R06-OAR-2011-0528; FRL-9906-60-Region 6] received February 11, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

4893. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Bacillus thuringiensis Cry1F Protein in Soybean; Exemption from the Requirement of a Tolerance [EPA-HQ-OPP-2013-0704; FRL-9905-59] received February 11, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

4894. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Fenpropidin; Pesticide Tolerances [EPA-HQ-OPP-2012-0454; FRL-9904-31] received February 11, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

4895. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Linuron; Pesticide Tolerances [EPA-HQ-OPP-2012-0791; FRL-9905-22] received February 11, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

4896. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Revisions to Test Methods

and Testing Regulations [EPA-HQ-OAR-2010-0114; FRL-9906-23-OAR] (RIN: 2060-AQ01) received February 11, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

4897. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Significant New Use Rules on Certain Chemical Substances [EPA-HQ-OPPT-2013-0739; FRL-9903-70] (RIN: 2070-AB27) received February 11, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

4898. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Thiram; Pesticide Tolerances [EPA-HQ-OPP-2012-0925; FRL-9904-22] received February 11, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

4899. A letter from the Chief of Staff, Media Bureau, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule — Amendment of Section 73.622(i), Post-Transition Table of DTV Allotments, Television Broadcast Stations, Oklahoma City, Oklahoma [MB Docket No.: 13-302] [RM-11709] received February 19, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

4900. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting Transmittal of D.C. Act 20-281, ''Annie's Way Designation Act of 2014''; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

4901. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting Transmittal of D.C. Act 20-279, ''Expedited Partner Therapy Act of 2014''; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

4902. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting Transmittal of D.C. Act 20-280, ''Closing of a Public Alley in Square 150, S.O. 13-10218, Act of 2014''; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

4903. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting the Department's final rule — Visas: Wavier by Joint Action of Visa and Passport Requirements for Members of Armed Forces and Coast Guards of Foreign Countries (RIN: 1400-AD51) received February 10, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

4904. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Transportation, transmitting Annual Report on Disability-Related Air Travel Complaints Pursuant to the Wendell H. Ford Aviation Investment and Reform Act for the 21st Century (AIR-21); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

4905. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule — Amount of the life insurance reserves taken into account under section 807 of the IRC for variable contracts (Rev. Rul. 2014-7) received February 24, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

4906. A letter from the Acting Commissioner, Social Security Administration, transmitting the November 2013 Annual Report of Payment Recapture Audits in Compliance with Section 2(h)(2)(D)(ii) of the Improper Payments Elimination and Recovery Act of 2010; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. WEBSTER of Florida: Committee on Rules. H. Res. 501. Resolution providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 2824) to amend the Surface Mining Control and Reclamation Act of 1977 to stop the ongoing waste by the Department of the Interior of taxpayer resources and implement the final rule on excess spoil, mining waste, and buffers for perennial and intermittent streams, and for other purposes; providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 2641) to provide for improved coordination of agency actions in the preparation and adoption of environmental documents for permitting determinations, and for other purposes; and providing for consideration of motions to suspend the rules (Rept. 113–374). Referred to the House Calendar.

DISCHARGE OF COMMITTEE

[Omitted from the Record of March 4, 2014]

Pursuant to clause 2 of rule XIII, the Committee on Agriculture discharged from further consideration. H.R. 3189 referred to the Committee of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, and ordered to be printed.

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. MORAN:

H.R. 4148. A bill to phase out cosmetic animal testing and the sale of cosmetics tested on animals; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Ms. BROWNLEY of California (for herself and Mr. TAKANO):

H.R. 4149. A bill to amend the VOW to Hire Heroes Act of 2011 to extend the Veterans Retraining Assistance Program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, and in addition to the Committees on Ways and Means, and Energy and Commerce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. COOK (for himself and Ms. TITUS):

H.R. 4150. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to direct the Secretary of Labor to enter into a contract for the conduct of a longitudinal study of the job counseling, training, and placement services for veterans provided by the Secretary, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, 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. BILIRAKIS (for himself and Mrs. KIRKPATRICK):

H.R. 4151. A bill to direct the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to enter into a contract with a non-government entity to conduct a survey of individuals who have use or are using their entitlement to educational assistance under the educational assistance programs administered by the Secretary of Veterans Affairs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky (for himself and Mrs. LOWEY):

H.R. 4152. A bill to provide for the costs of loan guarantees for Ukraine; to the Committee on Appropriations, and in addition to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. FORBES:

H.R. 4153. A bill to expedite the deployment of highway construction projects, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. POE of Texas:

H.R. 4154. A bill to deny visas and entry to the United States to officials and employees of the Government of the Russian Federation due to the Russian military intervention in Ukraine, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. POE of Texas:

H.R. 4155. A bill to authorize natural gas exports to certain foreign countries, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. ROYCE (for himself and Mr. ENGEL):

H.J. Res. 112. A joint resolution providing for the approval of the Congress of the proposed Third Amendment to the Agreement for Co-operation Between the United States of America and the International Atomic Energy Agency that was transmitted to Congress on January 29, 2014; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. MEADOWS:

H. Con. Res. 89. Concurrent resolution expressing support for designation of October 28, annually, as ''Honoring the Nation's First Responders Day''; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. ROYCE (for himself, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. COOK, Mr. MARINO, Mr. KEATING, Mr. KINZINGER of Illinois, Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, Mr. SHERMAN, Mr. DEUTCH, Mr. HOLDING, Mr. HOLT, Mr. MESSER, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. CHABOT, Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania, Mr. PERRY, Mr. POE of Texas, and Mr. SIRES):

H. Res. 499. A resolution condemning the violation of Ukrainian sovereignty, independence, and territorial integrity by military forces of the Russian Federation; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, 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 Ms. LEE of California (for herself, Mr. BURGESS, and Mr. VAN HOLLEN):

H. Res. 500. A resolution supporting the goals and ideals of Multiple Sclerosis Awareness Week; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. RUSH:

H. Res. 502. A resolution congratulating the Minority Business Development Agency on its 45th anniversary and commending its achievements in fostering the establishment and growth of minority businesses in the United States; to the Committee on Financial Services, 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. SMITH of New Jersey (for himself, Ms. BASS, Mr. MCCAUL, Mr. WOLF, and Mr. WEBER of Texas):

H. Res. 503. A resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives regarding the need to bring the South Sudan conflict to a sustainable and lasting end and to promote reconciliation of longstanding and

recent grievances to allow for a peaceful society with good governance; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

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. MORAN:

H.R. 4148.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 of the United States Constitution.

By Ms. BROWNLEY of California:

H.R. 4149.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8 of the United States Constitution

By Mr. COOK:

H.R. 4150.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1 Section 8 of the U.S. Constitution.

By Mr. BILIRAKIS:

H.R. 4151.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, section 8, clause XII—XIV of the Constitution of the United States, which gives Congress the authority to:

To raise and support Armies, but no Appropriation of Money to that Use shall be for a longer Term than two Years;

To provide and maintain a Navy;

To make Rules for the Government and Regulation of the land and naval Forces;

By Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky:

H.R. 4152.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The principal constitutional authority for this legislation is clause 7 of section 9 of article I of the Constitution of the United States (the appropriation power), which states: ''No Money shall be drawn from the Treasury, but in Consequence of Appropriations made by Law . . . .'' In addition, clause 1 of section 8 of article I of the Constitution (the spending power) provides: ''The Congress shall have the Power . . . to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defence and general Welfare of the United States . . . .'' Together, these specific constitutional provisions establish the congressional power of the purse, granting Congress the authority to appropriate funds, to determine their purpose, amount, and period of availability, and to set forth terms and conditions governing their use.

By Mr. FORBES:

H.R. 4153.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clauses 1 and 18

By Mr. POE of Texas:

H.R. 4154.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 3

By Mr. POE of Texas:

H.R. 4155.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 3

By Mr. ROYCE:

H.J. Res. 112.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, section 8 of the U.S. Constitution

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions, as follows:

H.R. 118: Ms. JACKSON LEE.
H.R. 184: Mr. GARAMENDI.
H.R. 198: Ms. LOFGREN.
H.R. 411: Mr. NEAL.
H.R. 564: Ms. PINGREE of Maine.
H.R. 594: Mr. FINCHER, Mr. WOLF, and Mr. DAINES.
H.R. 630: Mr. MORAN.
H.R. 715: Ms. TITUS, Mr. DELANEY, and Mr. AL GREEN of Texas.
H.R. 719: Mrs. NEGRETE MCLEOD.
H.R. 732: Mr. SMITH of Nebraska.
H.R. 736: Ms. SHEA-PORTER.
H.R. 755: Ms. DELBENE.
H.R. 861: Ms. LOFGREN.
H.R. 921: Mr. BRIDENSTINE.
H.R. 938: Mr. SCOTT of Virginia.
H.R. 1094: Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts.
H.R. 1240: Mrs. NAPOLITANO and Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois.
H.R. 1249: Mr. GRAVES of Georgia, Mr. WHITFIELD, Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana, and Mrs. LUMMIS.
H.R. 1250: Mr. DENT.
H.R. 1263: Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia and Ms. DELBENE.
H.R. 1461: Mr. CRENSHAW.
H.R. 1462: Mr. ROSS and Mr. BILIRAKIS.
H.R. 1507: Ms. ESTY.
H.R. 1523: Mr. PERLMUTTER and Mr. SHERMAN.
H.R. 1563: Mr. ISRAEL.
H.R. 1579: Mr. NOLAN.
H.R. 1726: Mr. MCINTYRE.
H.R. 1798: Mr. FARR.
H.R. 1812: Mr. MCCARTHY of California.
H.R. 1852: Mr. MEADOWS.
H.R. 2001: Mr. CARSON of Indiana and Mr. COHEN.
H.R. 2016: Mr. COOPER.
H.R. 2328: Mrs. ELLMERS, Ms. HERRERA BEUTLER, and Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky.
H.R. 2377: Mr. HUNTER.
H.R. 2413: Mr. STUTZMAN, Mr. SALMON, and Mr. YOHO.
H.R. 2444: Ms. JACKSON LEE.
H.R. 2575: Mr. LAMBORN.
H.R. 2591: Mr. RUPPERSBERGER.
H.R. 2663: Mr. POCAN.
H.R. 2734: Mr. HECK of Washington.
H.R. 2745: Mr. OLSON.
H.R. 2772: Mr. FARENTHOLD.
H.R. 2812: Ms. CLARKE of New York.
H.R. 2852: Ms. LOFGREN.
H.R. 2882: Ms. HERRERA BEUTLER.
H.R. 2994: Mr. HIGGINS, Mrs. NEGRETE MCLEOD, and Mr. GRAYSON.
H.R. 2996: Mr. RENACCI, Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. GRIFFIN of Arkansas, and Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania.
H.R. 3086: Mr. HOLT, Mr. FINCHER, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Mr. MCKEON, Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California, Mr. LATTA, Mr. BARR, and Ms. WILSON of Florida.
H.R. 3121: Mr. CRENSHAW.
H.R. 3211: Mr. COTTON.
H.R. 3240: Ms. NORTON, Mrs. NEGRETE MCLEOD, and Mr. HUFFMAN.
H.R. 3318: Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana.
H.R. 3344: Mr. COTTON, Mr. SCHOCK, and Mr. PITTENGER.
H.R. 3352: Mr. CARTWRIGHT and Mr. BARBER.
H.R. 3361: Mr. NEAL.
H.R. 3383: Mr. COHEN and Ms. BROWNLEY of California.
H.R. 3435: Mr. COHEN.
H.R. 3445: Mr. COHEN.
H.R. 3529: Mr. KING of New York.
H.R. 3543: Ms. BASS.
H.R. 3549: Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana.
H.R. 3556: Mr. TIERNEY and Mr. ELLISON.
H.R. 3571: Mr. MEEHAN and Mr. VAN HOLLEN.
H.R. 3600: Ms. BORDALLO, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, and Mrs. LOWEY.
H.R. 3658: Mr. GARAMENDI and Mr. O'ROURKE.
H.R. 3698: Mr. GRIFFIN of Arkansas.
H.R. 3708: Mr. YOUNG of Indiana and Mr. ROHRABACHER.
H.R. 3833: Mr. COFFMAN.
H.R. 3872: Mr. CARSON of Indiana and Ms. SHEA-PORTER.
H.R. 3879: Mr. NOLAN.
H.R. 3914: Mr. DOGGETT.
H.R. 3973: Mr. POE of Texas.
H.R. 3991: Mr. MESSER and Mr. SCHOCK.
H.R. 3992: Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. COLE, and Ms. HERRERA BEUTLER.
H.R. 4007: Mr. MARINO.
H.R. 4015: Mr. PETERS of Michigan, Mr. HECK of Nevada, Mr. SCHRADER, Mr. TIBERI, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. BUCHANAN, Ms. DEGETTE, Mr. RUPPERSBERGER, Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. MATHESON, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Mr. STIVERS, Mr. SABLAN, Mr. LONG, Mr. GUTHRIE, Mr. PRICE of Georgia, Ms. MATSUI, Mr. WHITFIELD, Mrs. BLACKURN, Mrs. NEGRETE MCLEOD, Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio, Mr. WESTMORELAND, Mr. DINGELL, Mr. BARR, Mr. HUFFMAN, Mr. HECK of Washington, Mr. PETRI, Mr. THOMPSON of California, Mr. HUDSON, Mr. DENT, and Ms. EDWARDS.
H.R. 4026: Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi and Mr. RICHMOND.
H.R. 4031: Mr. BENTIVOLIO, Mr. ROSS, and Mr. DESANTIS.
H.R. 4064: Mr. NEUGEBAUER, Mr. BRIDENSTINE, Mr. FLEMING, Mr. COLE, Mr. CRAMER, Mrs. LUMMIS, Mr. LAMALFA, Mr. GIBBS, and Mr. PRICE of Georgia.
H.R. 4065: Mr. RANGEL, Mr. GRAYSON, Mr. BISHOP of New York, Mr. PASCRELL, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. FARR, Mr. VARGAS, Mr. GUTIÉRREZ, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Mr. MEEKS, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Mr. FATTAH, and Mr. LANGEVIN.
H.R. 4080: Mr. CUELLAR.
H.R. 4118: Mr. SCALISE, Mr. JONES, and Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania.
H.R. 4132: Mr. FOSTER.
H.R. 4133: Mr. FOSTER.
H.R. 4137: Mr. NUNES.
H.R. 4139: Mr. CRAMER, Mr. COTTON, Mr. HALL, Mr. GINGREY of Georgia, Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio, and Mr. MCCAUL.
H.R. 4142: Mr. COOK.
H. J. Res. 68: Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana.
H. Con. Res. 86: Mr. NOLAN, Mr. BRALEY of Iowa, Ms. KUSTER, Mr. CONAWAY, Mr. KING of Iowa, Mr. RIBBLE, and Mr. FORTENBERRY.
H. Res. 109: Mr. GIBSON.
H. Res. 221: Mr. HIMES.
H. Res. 231: Mr. SMITH of Texas.
H. Res. 422: Mr. ELLISON.
H. Res. 456: Mr. O'ROURKE.
H. Res. 480: Mr. KING of New York.

CONGRESSIONAL EARMARKS, LIMITED TAX BENEFITS, OR LIMITED TARIFF BENEFITS

Under clause 9 of rule XXI, lists or statements on congressional earmarks, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits were submitted as follows:

The amendment to be offered by Representative JACKSON LEE, or a designee, to H.R. 2641, the Amendment numbered 4, does not contain any congressional earmarks, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits as defined in clause 9 of rule XXI.

The amendment to be offered by Representative LOWENTHAL, or a designee, to H.R. 2824, the Preventing Government Waste and Protecting Coal Mining Jobs in America, does not contain any congressional earmarks, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits as defined in clause 9 of rule XXI.

OFFERED BY MR. ROGERS OF KENTUCKY

H.R. 4152, to provide for the costs of loan guarantees for Ukraine, does not contain any congressional earmarks, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits as defined in clause 9 of rule XXI.