



United States  
of America

# Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 113<sup>th</sup> CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

Vol. 160

WASHINGTON, TUESDAY, MARCH 25, 2014

No. 47

## House of Representatives

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

### DESIGNATION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

WASHINGTON, DC,  
March 25, 2014.

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

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

### MORNING-HOUR DEBATE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of January 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.

### AFGHANISTAN

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

Mr. JONES. Mr. Speaker, I am on the House floor today to bring attention to an article from the *World Affairs Journal*, titled, "Money Pit: The Monstrous Failure of U.S. Aid to Afghanistan." This is an eight-page article documenting case after case of American tax dollars being wasted in Afghanistan.

I would like to bring one specific example to your attention, keeping in

mind that many more months have now passed since this article was published and these figures are now even larger.

In a recent quarterly report, the U.S. Inspector General for Afghan Reconstruction said that when security for aid workers is figured, the total amount of nonmilitary funds Washington has appropriated since 2002 is "approximately \$100 billion"—more than the United States has ever spent to rebuild a country.

Since then, Congress has appropriated another \$16.5 billion for "reconstruction." And all that has not brought the United States or the Afghans a single sustainable institution or program.

As I traveled through the Third District of North Carolina last week, I spoke on this subject many times and was met with frustration from the audience at the waste of taxpayer money in Afghanistan.

When I went on to explain that the Afghan Parliament was able to vote on the bilateral strategic agreement that we are in the process of finalizing with Afghanistan, but we have not even debated the issue in the House, the individuals with whom I spoke were incredibly disappointed in Congress.

Mr. Speaker, we cannot blame the American people for wanting a vote on this agreement, which will spend billions of American dollars in Afghanistan with little to no accountability over at least the next 10 years.

This is not a partisan issue. Congressman JIM MCGOVERN and I have signed a letter asking the leadership of both parties for a debate on the expenditure of tax dollars to prop up the corrupt nation of Afghanistan.

To further explain why this debate is necessary, I will briefly read two more examples from the "Money Pit" article.

The Special Inspector General's office, widely known as SIGAR, noted that for the 2012 and 2013 fiscal years the United States has been providing Afghanistan, practically the most corrupt nation on Earth, with \$1.1 billion in fuel for the Afghan military—even

though the United States has made no effort to determine how much fuel the military actually requires.

The article goes on to cite a GAO report, stating that for \$130,000, Afghan contractors built a large shower/bathroom facility, "without holes in the walls or floors for plumbing and drains." What's more, the walls were constructed of "crumbling cinder blocks." The report named insufficient oversight.

Mr. Speaker, it is time that we bring to a close the era of waste, fraud, and abuse of the United States' resources overseas and in Afghanistan.

Mr. Speaker, I hope the leadership of both parties will allow this Congress to debate whether we should stay in Afghanistan for 10 more years. If the Parliament in Afghanistan can have that debate, why can't the United States House of Representatives?

In closing, I would like to ask God to please bless our men and women in uniform and their families.

I will close by saying we have spent enough blood and treasure on this failed policy in Afghanistan. Let's debate the issue and stop spending the taxpayers' money in Afghanistan.

### SPECIAL IMMIGRANT VISAS

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

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, this morning's *New York Times* had a jarring reminder of the fate for those Afghans who put their trust in the United States when they decided to help us as interpreters, as guides, providing a variety of services that made the American mission possible. Indeed, our soldiers, our diplomats, countless Americans have put their lives in the hands of these brave partners. There was a promise, that we would be there for them, just as they were there for us.

This symbol represents the time of day during the House proceedings, e.g.,  1407 is 2:07 p.m.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.



Printed on recycled paper.

H2613

Sadly, this is a promise that has been broken time and time again. For the last 10 years, I have been working on an initiative to have the special immigrant visas to allow these trusted partners, whose lives are now at risk, to escape to safety and freedom in the United States.

Too often we have had a program mostly in name only. Visas were authorized, but through lack of attention, resources, commitment, focus, the paperwork languished. People have been in a bureaucratic hell, impossible conditions created, and to be met by despair and too often threats, injury, and, sadly, death of the people who trusted us. During the height of the government shutdown, we were nonetheless able to come together to bring the program back to life, or at least put it on life support.

I deeply appreciate the staff of Majority Leader CANTOR and Minority Whip HOYER. Their key staff members worked with a bipartisan coalition. Special thanks to ADAM KINZINGER and TULSI GABBARD, two new Members of Congress who served in theater in the Middle East, who know what the problems are and our commitment to those who helped us.

Because of this team we were able not only to keep it alive, we secured some real advances in the Defense Authorization Act. We are hearing noises from the administration and the many bureaucracies involved: the State Department, Homeland Security, FBI. There are lots of places for the system to break down, yet there appears to be some greater commitment but still not enough action.

Again, this morning, there is a reminder of the reality of our government having failed to deliver. For too many of us, it is a story in *The New York Times*. But for the Iraqis and the Afghans left behind, they don't need a story in a foreign newspaper, except the people who are featured in these stories miraculously often get their cases expedited. For the rest of these poor souls, they have a daily reminder of the threats, the assaults, of what it means to be left in the tender mercies of al Qaeda and the Taliban.

Next month, I will be introducing legislation for the next steps. I would strongly urge my colleagues to remember that brief moment when we came together during the shutdown to keep the program alive.

Please join me in cosponsoring the legislation because it is not enough just to keep the program alive. Let's come together to make the program work so those partners of America in Afghanistan and Iraq themselves can be kept alive.

#### THE MEDICAL EVALUATION PARITY FOR SERVICE MEMBERS ACT

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

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, despite the recent military drawdown, our Nation continues to rely upon qualified and well-trained volunteers joining the military in order to regenerate our Armed Forces. Now, some of these young men and women have prepared their entire lives for service, while others found the call to duty some years later. All have chosen to serve their country in uniform and do so with honor and bravery.

When joining the service, new recruits must undergo comprehensive medical and physical examinations in order to certify they are both fully fit and capable of performing the range of rigorous and demanding jobs our military must carry out. However, Mr. Speaker, despite comprehensive physical and medical evaluations, there is no similar examination for mental health competency; meaning, we thoroughly examine knees, backs, eyes, and even the heart, yet leave the most important part of the body—one's mind—off-limits.

Now, this is certainly cause for concern and what some view as a serious gap in recruitment evaluation, especially as the military continues to address issues of behavioral health, posttraumatic stress disease, traumatic brain injury, and suicide. According to a recent Army study, nearly one in five Army soldiers enter the service with a psychiatric disorder, and nearly half of all soldiers who tried suicide first attempted it before enlisting. Additionally, the Journal of the American Medical Association found that a large percentage of suicides in the military were individuals who had never been deployed in a combat role.

Mr. Speaker, as policymakers, we have a responsibility to address this challenge. And this week, Ohio Congressman TIM RYAN and I plan to call on our colleagues to do just that and to join as cosponsors of the Medical Evaluation Parity for Service Members, or MEPS, Act. This bipartisan bill will institute a preliminary mental health assessment at the time recruits are first joining the military.

Keeping individual privacy in mind, the MEPS Act will follow all HIPAA guidelines and cannot be used in consideration for promotion or assignments. Additionally, the Congressional Budget Office has found the MEPS Act to have no budgetary effect.

In addition, this legislation requires the National Institute of Mental Health, in conjunction with the Department of Veterans Affairs and other experts, to report their recommendations on the assessment to ensure best practices are done. Now, this common-sense proposal seeks to bring mental health to parity with physical health and recruitment evaluations and will ensure that our incoming troops are both physically and mentally fit to serve.

Additionally, the bill has the support of the American Psychological Association, the Veterans of Foreign Wars,

the National Guard Association of the United States, the Reserve Officers Association, the Reserve Enlisted Association, and the Association of the U.S. Navy.

Mr. Speaker, the MEPS Act is not, alone, the magic silver bullet to solve all of the behavioral health issues the military faces, but it is an important step in better understanding the scope of the challenge that we face. Now, I encourage my fellow colleagues to join us in this effort to protect the safety and security of those in uniform by becoming a cosponsor of the Medical Evaluation Parity for Service Members Act. These brave men and women deserve as much.

#### THE AMERICAN WAY

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

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, this morning I want to take a few moments to share thoughts with my colleagues on a number of items that I believe we should be focused on.

Before I do that, I want to join my friends and colleagues from the great State of Washington to express my concern and my sympathy for the people of Darrington and Oso on Highway 530 that have experienced this terrible devastation of a mudslide. To the families of those who lost their loved ones, we mourn and pray for you; and to those who are still missing, we thank the first responders and pray for their accuracy in discerning and finding those that are alive.

As a member of the Homeland Security Committee, and as we have a hearing this morning on emergency preparedness, I am asking that all of the resources that the delegation from Washington request, and, as well, the Governor of that State, that all of us will embrace them, stand as Americans, unite behind them and provide the resources as we do for our fellow brothers and sisters in this country because it is the American way that we never leave a lonely person along the highway of despair. We always provide for them. And I want those people in Darrington and the city of Oso to know that we will not leave you along the highway of despair.

□ 1015

I want to now challenge this Congress, the other body, as they proceed to move on what actions should be taken in Ukraine. We know that Americans are war-weary, but if we have principles of democracy, if we believe there is an international world order, we cannot sit idly by and not act. So I am grateful that the President has strongly denounced Russia's actions and has begun to move on strong sanctions. I would argue that there should be more.

We should ensure that the new Ukrainian Government that wants to cling to aspects of democracy and

wants to associate with a democratic Europe, that they be allowed to strengthen themselves. We cannot have a timidness on behalf of Europe, so busy worrying about their pocketbook that they will stamp on their principles. Some European countries are now wavering about sanctions. I would suggest to them that they are dangerously providing an opportunity for Russia to continue its aggressive and illegal acts.

You must have principles. You must provide the strength to sanction. One can travel through the years of history in the 20th century and be reminded of those who get one step of aggression and watch as they march across Europe. I am very glad that there will be no meeting of G8 in Sochi, and I would ask that we continue to isolate Russia. Russia violates the human rights of its own people. It does not even recognize the LGBT community, and they are persecuted. What more do we have to hear from Russia and its head of government to not know that they must suffer the consequences of their acts.

I stand with the people of Ukraine because I believe in democracy, I believe in peace and human dignity, and I believe America has those values that we can ensure through the world family that Russia understands that they are not part of the world order of democracy and the freedom of people.

I might also add, Mr. Speaker, as a senior member of the Homeland Security Committee, all of us have watched, some with intensioness the Malaysian aircraft. With great disappointment and sadness, we are told, without all of the facts, not knowing what the recent announcements have been, that this aircraft, this airliner may be lost. But it opens our eyes to the crisis of airline security and technology.

I call upon the aviation industry to stop hiding behind costs and how much it costs and start ensuring that our pilots and our customers, our flying public are safe. Why do we have the capacity to dismantle the transponders? Why wasn't the emergency call already in place that automatically signals when an aircraft goes off its designated destination as relates to its flight pattern? Why does it have to be done manually? The mysterious turn. Homeland Security will be having a hearing on the false passport.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, it is overdue for us to pass comprehensive immigration reform, and I will continue that discussion.

#### COERCIVE CONTRACEPTION MANDATE

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

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Mr. Speaker, there is no shortage of issues here in Washington, and I find it so interesting when people come to our offices and ask: What is going on today?

As you will hear, whether it is talking about foreign affairs, the job issues, the budget, the issues that are of such concern to our constituents, there is always something that is on the front burner, and today is one of those days. The Supreme Court will hear yet another legal challenge to one of the many unconstitutional aspects of ObamaCare, and that is the HHS contraception mandate. Of course, this isn't the first time that the Affordable Care Act, the President's health care law, has been pulled into the Supreme Court, and it is probably not going to be the last, but today the hearing is on the contraception mandate.

No American should have to choose between feeding their family and abiding by their faith. I have to tell you, that is what we see happening right now. It is precisely what this coercive contraception mandate is doing to millions of hardworking people of faith, like the Hahns and the Greens, who simply want to run a business and practice their faith. These family businesses want to take care of their employees and provide them with quality health care coverage. All they ask is to not be forced to pay for the life-ending contraceptives that violate their religious convictions.

Now, ObamaCare's unreasonable mandate has placed them in a bind: violate the tenets of their faith or be fined, fined by the Federal Government, fined by ObamaCare, fined \$100 per employee per day. That is what the fine works out to be. Unbelievably, it would be cheaper to strip their employees of health care coverage altogether and pay a single \$2,000 fine per employee per year. That is what you find in the 20,000 pages of regulation, in the 2,700 pages of the President's health care law.

That is not what these family businesses want to do. They really want to do the right thing and take care of the hardworking men and women who are in their employment.

If these family businesses are forced to close or drop health care for their employees, it will be the employees and their families who are made to suffer.

This mandate is just another flawed part of a terribly flawed law, and Americans are growing tired of having to cope with it. Fifty-nine percent of the country opposes the contraception mandate because they know what the Greens and the Hahns know. This is a country founded on religious liberty, and that freedom of conscience is a cherished American tradition. The American people know that and they value that; they value that liberty and they value that tradition.

The Obama administration has already doled out special exemptions to 100 million health care plans from this mandate, and for every reason under the sun except religious liberty. In fact, the HHS mandate only explicitly contains a religious exemption for churches and their affiliates. The

Obama administration even expects hospitals and religious nonprofits to abide by the mandate without complaint, as if the very founding principles of these organizations aren't outright violated by paying for life-ending contraceptives.

Unless it is a religious institution, the Obama administration seems to think no organization, not even a charity, is allowed to exercise the right of conscience, unless it is granted a special waiver from the administration, of course. The administration: What the government gives, the government can delay, and the government can take away. That is their plan.

It is my hope the Court will act to uphold the protections inherent in the First Amendment, respect America's long-held tradition to right of conscience, and let these families operate their businesses in accordance with their religious beliefs and tenets.

#### END HUNGER NOW

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

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, earlier this year the House voted on the farm bill conference report, legislation that reauthorizes our Nation's agriculture policies as well as the preeminent antihunger program known as SNAP. I voted against the conference report both as a conferee and when it came before this House because it contained an \$8.6 billion cut to SNAP. Even worse, it was the second major cut to SNAP in less than 6 months.

I strongly believe in our Nation's antihunger programs. Unfortunately, there are about 49 million hungry people living in our great Nation. Technically known as food insecurity, the truth is that these are low-income people who don't know where their next meal will come from. America's antihunger programs, led by SNAP, provide food to people who otherwise would have difficulty finding it, if they were able to find access to food at all.

For years, I have talked about how SNAP works, and over the past year, I have led these End Hunger Now speeches about how SNAP and other antihunger programs are working to reduce hunger in our country. That is why these two SNAP cuts, the cut in November 2013 and the cut in the farm bill, were not just disappointing, but they were actually damaging. We saw real cuts to real people.

For example, look at Luis Marin, who was profiled in the New York Daily News:

Food stamp cuts have dealt a double blow to Luis Marin and his family. Marin's hours have been cut from 30 to 20 hours a week at Red Apple Deli Supermarket in uptown's Hamilton Heights, where his boss, Ramon Murphy, is losing business because of the food stamp cutbacks. And Marin, 56, his wife, and their two little girls—who subsist on his \$8-an-hour income—also saw their food stamps benefits drop to \$397 a month in November and have had to change their eating habits.

It is not just low-income families in our urban areas; military families are using SNAP more than ever. In fact, military families used food stamps more in fiscal year 2013 than in any other year. Members of the military redeemed almost \$104 million worth of food stamps over that time, about \$5 million more than the previous year.

The thing many of my colleagues don't seem to understand is that cuts to SNAP don't just change the amount of money the Federal Government spends. As you can see from the case that I highlighted with Mr. Marin, these cuts hurt real American people. We are taking food away from children and away from poor families.

That is why I am pleased that seven of our Nation's Governors are taking the courageous stand that this Congress wouldn't take. The cut included in the farm bill was harmful, but it only affected 17 States. That is because it only dealt with a program called Heat and Eat, a program that linked LIHEAP and SNAP together. The farm bill changed the way States could continue participating in that program. Essentially, States could continue if they increased the State contribution from \$1 to \$20 in LIHEAP benefits. These seven States—Connecticut, Massachusetts, Montana, New York, Oregon, Pennsylvania and Rhode Island—are playing by the new rules Congress established in the farm bill, and thankfully, they are saying that they are not going to let low-income food insecure people in their State feel the pain of these cuts, even if Congress is going to cruelly and cowardly cut SNAP in the name of deficit reduction.

I sit on the Agriculture Committee, and I remember when the committee didn't have the votes to abolish the Heat and Eat Program entirely. The \$20 level was supported by the chairman of the committee and is now the law of the land. Yet the distinguished Speaker of this House continues to say that States are somehow cheating when all they are doing is following the law that he shepherded through this House. Perhaps he didn't read the bill, or perhaps he doesn't understand the fact that there are millions and millions of people in this country who are hungry.

I want to commend the Governors of these States, including the Republican Governor of Pennsylvania and the Governor of my home State of Massachusetts, for doing the right thing and taking action to prevent these cuts from taking effect and preventing their citizens from going hungry.

I am grateful to these Governors and the Governors of 10 other States who are still working to enact this change in law, and for taking the actions that many in this Congress simply did not take. I say "thank you" to the Governors for preventing hunger from getting worse in those States. Hopefully, they can be an example for all of us in Congress.

Mr. Speaker, we were elected to help people. These cutbacks in SNAP and

other nutrition programs have hurt our fellow citizens. These cuts are unconscionable. They are a rotten thing to do. We in this Congress and the leadership of this Congress have to stop beating up on poor people, have to stop diminishing their struggle. Surely we can come together in a bipartisan way and agree that hunger is not acceptable in the richest country in the history of the world. We need to end hunger now, not make it worse. So let's come together and end hunger now.

#### CELEBRATING 193RD ANNIVERSARY OF GREEK INDEPENDENCE

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

Mr. BILIRAKIS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to celebrate the 193rd anniversary of Greek independence. Citizens of Greece have always been a proud people in body, mind, and spirit.

□ 1030

From Pericles, Greek statesman and general, dubbed the first citizen of Athens; to Plato, who laid a groundwork in philosophy so vast that the entirety of European philosophical tradition is said to simply be a footnote to his work; to Count Ioannis Kapodistrias, the first head of state of an independent Greece, Greeks have been exceptional, Mr. Speaker.

I am almost certain that Thomas Jefferson cast an eye across the Atlantic towards Greece when he uttered these words in 1821, when Greece declared their independence:

The flames kindled on the 4th of July 1776 have not spread over much of the globe to be extinguished by the feeble engines of despotism—on the contrary, they will consume these engines and all who work them.

It is no coincidence that the Feast of Annunciation, a commemoration of the conception of Jesus Christ, was chosen to ignite the action for independence.

I am blessed to be of two cultures that have been beacons of liberty for all of civilization, the place of my birth, the land of the free, and the home of the brave, the United States of America; and the land of my ancestors, the birthplace of democracy, the Hellenic Republic.

Many Greeks fought for years, clutching to the heritage, culture, and faith. Bishop Germanos of Patras raised the emblem of freedom for Hellenes, the flag bearing a white cross and nine blue and white stripes representing the nine letters in Eleftheria, which means freedom.

Eight years of bloodshed and battle led to the Treaty of Adrianople, the formal declaration of a free and independent Greece.

Greece was the world's first advanced civilization, one that provided a cultural heritage that has influenced the world. Firsts in philosophy, mathematics, politics, sports, and art all stemmed from a free Greece.

Liberty and justice, freedom to determine the path of one's own life, these

are human desires and were embodied by Greece throughout their fight for independence.

Those unyielding Hellenes paid life and limb for those desires, and generations of Greeks—Americans of Greek descent as well—for decades to come owe their ancestors many thanks.

As George Washington once said:

Liberty, when it begins to take root, is a plant of rapid growth.

This held true in Greece in 1821, as it did in America in 1776.

"Freedom or Death"—Eleftheria Thanatos—was the battle cry of the revolutionaries nearly 200 years ago. It rings true today. Freedom is a powerful and beautiful notion. The Greek people achieved that for themselves 193 years ago, and I am proud to celebrate in memory of those who fought bravely to shed the shackles of the Ottoman Empire.

Long live Greece—zito Hellas—and God bless America.

#### WOMEN'S HISTORY MUSEUM

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York (Mr. TONKO) for 5 minutes.

Mr. TONKO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in celebration of Women's History Month. On March 13, my colleagues joined together on the House floor to call for the passage of H.R. 863, which would call for a commission to study the potential creation of a national women's history museum in our Nation's Capital.

They discussed the critical need for the museum and recognized the many women who have shaped our Nation. My colleagues are historic women in their own right. Today, I am proud to join them in voicing my support for H.R. 863.

H.R. 863 would establish a commission to study and recommend a plan of action for the establishment and maintenance of a national women's history museum here in Washington, D.C.

The National Women's History Museum will be the first of its kind to celebrate women's history and women's contributions to the United States. It will not cost the Federal Government a dime since every cent will be privately raised.

Why is it necessary? Well, from our Nation's founding, women have played a crucial role, providing numerous contributions to help create and reinforce this great foundation of our Nation. Women have changed the course of history, and we are long overdue in celebrating and recognizing them and their accomplishments.

Women's history is largely missing from textbooks, from memorials, from museum exhibits, and from many other venues. Of the 210 statues in the United States Capitol, only nine are of female leaders.

Less than 5 percent of the 2,400 national historic landmarks chronicle women's achievement, and a recent survey of some 18 history textbooks

found that only 10 percent of the individuals identified in the text were women.

What about New York and its role—my home State? Well, the women’s suffrage movement had its roots in upstate New York that I proudly represent. Certainly, the start of what would become a nationwide movement for women’s rights in the United States was staked in Seneca Falls, New York, and began in 1848.

Elizabeth Cady Stanton, Lucretia Mott, and Susan B. Anthony, all who have made their voices heard for the empowerment of women, claim New York as their home State. Let’s make sure their stories continue to be told.

Countless outstanding women in the capital region have stories that every American should know. Let me cite one, Shirley Ann Jackson, in the capital region of New York that I represent.

Shirley Ann Jackson—Dr. Jackson, President Jackson of RPI—is a renowned American physicist, who in 1973 graduated from MIT with a Ph.D. in theoretical elementary particle physics, becoming the very first African American woman to receive a Ph.D. in MIT’s history.

She currently serves as President of Rensselaer Polytechnic Institute, or RPI, and she continues to advocate on behalf of women and minorities in the sciences. Her story should be told.

There are countless stories that need to be told. I will continue to proudly support the creation of a national women’s history museum and H.R. 863.

When visitors from the capital region of New York come to our Nation’s Capital, they should have the opportunity to learn about, to celebrate, and, yes, to be inspired by women’s history.

I thank the gentlewoman from New York, CAROLYN MALONEY, and the gentlewoman from Tennessee, MARSHA BLACKBURN, for their continued efforts on behalf of this endeavor.

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 37 minutes a.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1200

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. WOODALL) at noon.

PRAYER

Reverend John Rosenberg, Lutheran Church of the Good Shepherd, Olympia, Washington, offered the following prayer:

Holy one, we know You in an infinite variety of ways. By whatever name we

call You, You are the one in whom we live and move and have our being.

We ask Your blessing upon the Members of this House as they carry on the business of our Nation at this critical time in our history.

Give them courage in the face of immense challenges, a spirit of cooperation despite their differences, and trust in Your divine guidance as they work together for the common good.

When the path ahead is unclear, remind them that throughout the ages, Your prophets and holy ones have shown us what is good; that You require nothing more of us—but nothing less—than to do justice, to have compassion for one another, and to walk humbly with You, the beginning and the end of all things.

Amen.

THE JOURNAL

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

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

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to clause 1, rule I, I demand a vote on agreeing to the Speaker’s approval of the Journal.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the Speaker’s approval of the Journal.

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

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

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

The point of no quorum is considered withdrawn.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

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

Mr. CRAWFORD led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

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

WELCOMING REVEREND JOHN ROSENBERG

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the gentleman from Washington (Mr. HECK) is recognized for 1 minute.

There was no objection.

Mr. HECK of Washington. Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure today to welcome to the Nation’s Capital Pastor John Rosenberg of the Lutheran Church of the Good Shepherd in Olympia, Wash-

ington, where he is the lead pastor. He is my pastor; today it is personal with me.

Pastor Rosenberg is a graduate of Concordia Senior College of Luther Seminary and even has a graduate degree from one of my alma maters, Portland State University.

It is personal with me today because, in part, Pastor Rosenberg has announced his retirement on June 30. We will miss him greatly.

I have no fear for how he will spend his retirement time because he is an obsessive, compulsive fisherman, which is a good thing to be in the Pacific Northwest, as a matter of fact.

I deeply appreciate him for his presence here today. More importantly, for living the example of the Scripture which he quoted today, by far my favorite, that which I believe is the most holy and that which I believe is the wisest, and that is Micah 6:8: Do justly, love mercy, and walk humbly with your Lord.

All these things Pastor John Rosenberg does. Thank you so much for being here today, my good friend.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

BETTY CLARK-DICKEY

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

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in recognition of National Women’s History Month, honoring Arkansas’ first female Supreme Court Chief Justice, Betty Clark-Dickey.

Born and raised within Arkansas’ First Congressional District, Mrs. Dickey has served as an educator, attorney, prosecutor, commissioner, and chief legal counselor to the Governor.

In 2004, former Arkansas Governor Mike Huckabee appointed Dickey to fill the position of chief justice for the Arkansas Supreme Court, making her the first woman to ever occupy that position.

Mrs. Dickey has not only succeeded professionally, but she has done it all while raising a family. She reared four biological children and one foster child: John, Laura, Ted, Rachel, and Cindy; and she has 11 grandchildren.

Mrs. Dickey’s son, Ted, called her a “high achiever who is never afraid of big things,” and said of his mother, “She embodies love and justice simultaneously.”

A little more than a decade after Mrs. Dickey first took office, Arkansas will have its first Supreme Court female majority in 2015, further cementing Dickey’s status as a pioneer in a multitude of areas in the State of Arkansas.

Mr. Speaker, please join me and the entire State of Arkansas in honoring

the service of all women, including Betty Clark-Dickey.

#### WELCOMING COMMISSIONER KERLIKOWSKE

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

Mr. HIGGINS. Mr. Speaker, I rise to welcome Gil Kerlikowske, recently confirmed as Commissioner of the United States Customs and Border Protection.

I am pleased to welcome a Commissioner who has an understanding of the needs of the northern border, as he previously served as police commissioner for the city of Buffalo. His firsthand experience comes at a critical time as we work to advance the United States-Canada Beyond the Border initiative.

In western New York, this cross-border relationship is especially critical to the local economy. I worked with Customs and Border Protection in the past to advocate for increased border staffing levels along the border. At the Peace Bridge, there is also a pre-inspection pilot currently underway that hopes to ease congestion and shorten wait times. In the coming year, we hope to continue moving forward on plans to construct a new border station at the Niagara Falls Air Reserve Base.

Mr. Speaker, I congratulate Commissioner Kerlikowske. I look forward to working closely with him and his staff on issues important to the Buffalo-Niagara region and the entire Nation.

#### NATIONAL DEVELOPMENTAL DISABILITIES AWARENESS MONTH

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

Mr. MCKINLEY. Mr. Speaker, March is National Developmental Disabilities Awareness Month. Every year at this time we all bring attention and understanding to the needs and the potential of people with developmental disabilities.

As an individual with a hearing disability and a grandfather of a child who has CHARGE syndrome, I am very familiar with the hardships of overcoming these disabilities.

We must all think of ways that would be more inclusive, respectful for our communities, schools, and our workforce.

Interning for us in our Washington office we are fortunate to have a young woman who happens to have Down syndrome. She is also attending a local university. We look forward to those days we have her in our office. Her cheery disposition and her work ethic is infectious.

I encourage everyone to engage with people in our communities who have developmental disabilities and recognize their talents and abilities that will make this a better Nation.

#### WOMEN'S HISTORY MONTH AND MINIMUM WAGE

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

Mrs. DAVIS of California. Mr. Speaker, Women's History Month is a time for us to reflect on what women have done for America and what America can do for its women.

If we really look at the history of women in this country, we see that they have done far more than we give them credit for. I am not just talking about extraordinary figures like Susan B. Anthony and Rosa Parks. I am talking about the countless women who have worked day in and day out since this country was founded.

The idea that women are new to working is a myth. The truth is women have always worked to better their families and their communities, but too often the work that they do is undervalued.

Almost two-thirds of minimum wage workers are women, and although more families than ever rely on female breadwinners, women's wages still lag behind men's. For these women it isn't about having it all; it's about having enough to get by.

This Women's History Month, let's give women and their families the raise they deserve. Let's show all Americans that their work is worth a living wage. After all, when women succeed, America succeeds.

#### HONORING THE MEMORY OF DEP- UTY SHERIFF WILLIAM R. MAST, JR.

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

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the memory of Watauga County Deputy Sheriff William R. Mast, Jr. Deputy Mast was shot and killed while responding to a 911 call in Deep Gap, North Carolina, in 2012.

Deputy Mast was only 23 years old when he was killed 20 months ago, and his first child was born shortly thereafter.

Today, at a ceremony at the Perkinsville Baptist Church in Boone, the bridge spanning the south fork of the New River on U.S. Highway 421 will be named for Deputy Mast. This is a small token of gratitude from the community which Deputy Mast served so ably and honorably.

Our thoughts and prayers today are with Deputy Mast's widow, young son, and all those who continue to mourn his passing.

#### COMPREHENSIVE IMMIGRATION REFORM

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

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to address a question that

the American people have been raising for more than a decade: When will we address the question of human dignity of so many who are in our country who desire the status of citizenship? When will we pass a sensible, reasonable immigration reform legislation or package? Will we combine our concern for national security with border security, along with human dignity?

The question is being asked by constituents from my 18th Congressional District in Houston. It is being asked by the American Jewish Committee. It is being asked by Cardinal DiNardo in the most eloquent and passionate way as they met last week to hear from voices of those who have not heard the answer. Or the 139 who showed up at a press conference some weeks ago, standing with me, demanding that people be given their human dignity. Or the leadership from Ireland who was here at a St. Patrick's Day luncheon who stood up and asked the Speaker, When are we going to put comprehensive immigration reform on the floor of the House.

This is a multicultural challenge to America. This is an economic challenge. This is from the Irish. This is from South Asians, from Asians. This is from people from Bangladesh, from Poland. It is all over America. Let's pass comprehensive immigration reform.

#### AMERICAN RED CROSS MONTH

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

Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, March is Red Cross Month across the country, and as chairman of the House Committee on Homeland Security's Subcommittee on Emergency Preparedness, Response, and Communications, I would like to take some time to recognize the accomplishments of the American Red Cross and its volunteers, everyday heroes.

Last year, Red Cross and volunteers responded to over 60,000 emergencies and provided over 900 shelters to people forced from their homes. Following the Boston Marathon bombing last April, the Red Cross provided 500 units of blood products to Boston-area hospitals. They played a pivotal role in sheltering families in my district in Indiana during last year's winter holiday floods.

I visited the Red Cross national headquarters, where I toured the digital operations center and saw how they are utilizing social media in their operations.

I am grateful for their achievements in educating Americans on how to prepare for and respond to emergencies and disasters. This organization and their volunteers exemplify the everyday heroes as they lead the way in disaster preparedness and response, and we must all thank Red Cross. I urge my fellow Members to visit chapters and to follow them on Facebook and Twitter.

Please visit and thank them for all the work they are doing in our communities.

#### AFFORDABLE HEALTH INSURANCE

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

Mr. VEASEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise to remind Americans today to hurry: they have 6 days left to sign up for the Affordable Care Act through their Federal and State exchanges and marketplaces. Don't believe the hype from the Republicans. The Affordable Care Act is working to improve the lives of millions of Americans. More than 5 million Americans have signed up so far through the marketplace, and they will continue to do so.

This weekend, I hosted two enrollment events in my district, both in Dallas and Fort Worth, and attended two additional ones to ensure that constituents in my district get the affordable health care they deserve. What I saw when I visited those events were rooms filled with men, women, and children looking to provide insurance for their families, looking to ensure that they are protected from unforeseen sickness and health issues.

Let's stop playing politics with people's health care. Let's work together to get every American covered.

□ 1215

#### DEFENDING RELIGIOUS LIBERTY FROM THE ACA

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

Mr. BILIRAKIS. I rise today, Mr. Speaker, in support of religious liberty.

The Affordable Care Act, better known as ObamaCare, forces businesses to provide services like the morning-after pill as part of their health insurance. For businessowners who believe that life begins at conception, this aspect of the ACA violates their religious principles.

The First Amendment is sacred to Americans. At the time of its creation, the First Amendment was completely unique. God, not government, gave unalienable rights to women and men, including freedom to practice their religion without interference.

No individual should be forced to violate their religious beliefs. Opponents will say that this is restricting access to health care. I disagree. This is about ensuring the integrity of religious freedom for all Americans, regardless of religion. That is a founding American principle.

#### INVESTING IN SPACE EXPLORATION AND SCIENTIFIC RESEARCH

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

Mr. MCNERNEY. Mr. Speaker, the U.S. has always been the world leader in space exploration. We were the first and only nation to put humans safely on the Moon and the only nation to send unmanned ships to Mars, among other extraordinary missions.

In 2011, NASA flew its last space shuttle mission. Without any new human lift system ready, the U.S. has had to depend on Russia to send our astronauts to space. This arrangement has worked because of a sense of cooperation and mutual respect between our two great nations' space programs.

But American innovation cannot be stopped. Several private companies are working with NASA to ensure that Americans can once again fly on American spaceships.

As a Nation, we should support this effort and encourage private American companies to accelerate their programs. These public-private partnerships will ensure that the U.S. does not rely solely on Russian spacecraft.

I urge my colleagues to consider the long-term benefits of investing in space exploration and scientific research.

#### RECOGNIZING BRANDI BRULEY

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

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Ms. Brandi Bruley, principal of North Elementary School in my hometown of Taylorville, Illinois.

Ms. Bruley was recently named the Illinois Principals Association's 2014-2015 Elementary School Principal of the Year in recognition of her positive impact on her students and the entire educational community.

She has worked hard to improve communication between teachers and parents with a goal of raising student achievement. As a result of her efforts, North Elementary School has been awarded the Illinois State Board of Education's Spotlight Award for the last 3 years and made the ISBE Honor Roll in 2013.

Ms. Bruley has a long-standing and deep commitment to serving her students, faculty, and our entire community. Her experience and innovation enable her to bring creative ideas that focus on high standards for our local schools.

Congratulations and thank you to Brandi. This is a well-deserved award to recognize all that you do for our students and the entire Taylorville community.

#### IN HONOR OF THE ANNIVERSARY OF GREECE'S DECLARATION OF INDEPENDENCE FROM THE OTTOMAN EMPIRE

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

Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to cele-

brate the 193rd anniversary of Greece's declaration of independence from the Ottoman Empire.

The ancient Greeks forged the notion of democracy. They believed in the right of self-governance, one of the foundations of our great Nation; yet, for centuries, the Greek people—the people whose ancestors inspired our own country's founding, the people who Thomas Jefferson called the light which led ourselves out of Gothic darkness, the Greek people were denied this right.

Today, Greeks celebrate March 25 as the day when the Greeks began the long, hard battle for independence.

I recently met with Ambassador John Koenig, ambassador to Cyprus, to discuss the latest on our Cyprus negotiations. He was hopeful that real progress could be made in unifying the island and stopping the illegal Turkish occupation.

The U.S. must also continue to work to find a mutually agreeable name for the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia.

Greece is an important ally to the United States. I am proud to stand with American Greeks today to celebrate their independence and aspirations.

#### HOBBY LOBBY

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

Mr. PETERS of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise to bring attention to the Hobby Lobby case, which is being argued today at the Supreme Court.

In this case, a for-profit company is refusing to cover the birth control of its female employees, citing the owners' personal religious objections.

In 2014, the idea that a woman has to fight for access to birth control is astonishing. Ninety-nine percent of American women will use contraception at some point in their lives.

As I have said before, all health care decisions, including birth control and women's reproductive rights, should be between a woman and her doctor, not involving her boss or a politician here in Washington, D.C.

The wide availability of birth control has been an enormous benefit for millions of women and the American economy, enabling generations of women to support themselves financially, complete their education, and plan for the right time to start a family.

It is a basic, preventative health care option. It should not be available only at the discretion of a woman's employer, nor should a woman have to choose between her job and her health.

As a husband of nearly 28 years and a father of two, it seems pretty simple to me. Women, not bosses, should be in charge of their personal health care decisions.

## HOBBY LOBBY

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

Ms. HANABUSA. Mr. Speaker, today, the United States Supreme Court, just down the street, heard the arguments for Hobby Lobby, Inc., a for-profit corporation, which is refusing some or all contraceptive services in health plans offered to their employees.

The issue here is whether the religious beliefs of a shareholder, the owner, can dictate what type of contraceptive services a health plan will offer.

Note, this is not a religious institution or an employer like a church or a religious institution of any kind. It is a for-profit corporation.

The issue here is also whether an employer can pick and choose what type of services female employees can avail themselves of; and remember—remember—women in childbearing age actually pay 68 percent more for their medical coverage now—68 percent more. That is just not fair.

I hope the Supreme Court will reverse the Hobby Lobby decision and say that the Constitution and the laws of this great Nation support women.

---

HIDDEN TAXES INCLUDED IN THE AFFORDABLE CARE ACT

(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, you wouldn't know it by the weather, but it will soon be April, and tax day is right around the corner. As Americans scramble to gather their W-2s and other important tax documents, many are unaware of the extra hidden taxes included in the Affordable Care Act that will ultimately fall on them.

These hidden taxes will surprise and catch hardworking families and small businesses off guard and put a strain on family budgets that are already stretched thin.

A 3.5 percent tax on insurance premiums, a 2.3 percent medical device tax—raising the cost of pacemakers, prosthetics, stents, and more—a tanning tax, an investment income and Medicare payroll surtax, the list goes on and on; and all these costs are passed on to Americans and families in our communities.

That is hundreds and hundreds of billions of dollars leaving our communities, out of the pockets of hardworking families in States like Kansas and heading to Washington, D.C.

Mr. Speaker, with the many challenges Americans face today, the last thing they need this tax season is to carry a heavier government tax burden on their backs.

---

VIETNAM VETERANS DAY

(Mr. LIPINSKI asked and was given permission to address the House for 1

minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. LIPINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to remember and honor the more than 3 million Americans who served in the Vietnam war. This weekend, we will observe Vietnam Veterans Day to pay tribute to these brave Americans who were called to serve during one of our Nation's longest and most difficult conflicts.

Lasting more than a decade, Vietnam defined a generation. Over 58,000 Americans were killed, and those who did return home were not treated as the American heroes that they are.

In recent years, I am grateful that most Americans have been able to put aside their opinions about specific military missions and have an unwavering commitment to our courageous men and women operating in dangerous places around the world.

Vietnam Veterans Day is meant to reaffirm our respecting gratitude for those that served our Nation in that war and show a generation of soldiers our immense gratitude. I will be doing so this Saturday at the VFW Post in Lemont, Illinois.

I ask my colleagues to join me in doing the same, not just this weekend, but every day, because our Vietnam veterans, and all our veterans, deserve this.

---

IMMIGRATION REFORM

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

Mr. KILDEE. Mr. Speaker, for far too long, comprehensive immigration reform has been a low priority for the Speaker and for the Republican leadership. Americans have spoken loud and clear. They want comprehensive immigration reform.

Just last year, as the Senate was considering comprehensive reform, the Speaker implied that the House would take it up after the Senate did. The Senate acted in a bipartisan fashion and passed comprehensive reform on a vote of 68–32.

Then we were told that the House would take up comprehensive immigration reform after the Speaker brought to his conference his immigration reform principles. That happened at the end of January; yet nothing—nothing has been brought to the floor.

If there is not a reason for us to do this on the basis of the policy, which I think is clear, it is consistent with our national interest and our national values to institute comprehensive immigration reform.

I just would direct Members of the other side to take a look at the bipartisan CBO report that was published that shows that comprehensive immigration reform would reduce our national deficit by \$900 billion.

It is the right policy, it is good economics, and we should bring it up right away.

## CONGRESS MUST REVERSE GOP ELIMINATION OF CRITICAL LIFE-LINE FOR THE UNEMPLOYED

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

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, during Women's History Month, I rise to recognize and pay tribute to the life of Joyce Wise of Sandusky County, Ohio, a remarkable, sparkling, witty, intelligent, generous, and kind woman who loved her family, her community, and her country.

She was a political activist. Her indefatigable efforts improved our State, improved our community, and broadened representation for women and men across our country.

Joyce would have been the first person to speak up here on behalf of the 2 million American job seekers who have lost their unemployment benefits and the 72,000 Americans who lose their benefits every single week, one every 8 seconds due to Republican obstruction.

She would have been the first to point out it is the Republican's failure to extend unemployment insurance that has actually put millions and millions of our families out to sea.

If the Republicans want to limit unemployment benefits, they should start by creating more jobs. I am waiting for the first good jobs bill to come to this floor from the other side of the aisle.

Joyce Wise understood that every citizen matters and those who work hard for a living shall be respected. May her family and friends draw strength from her unbelievable spirit and may her legacy live on in fighting for justice for all.

---

UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE

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

Ms. BROWN of Florida. Mr. Speaker, you can fool some of the people some of the time, but you can't fool all of the people all of the time.

The Republicans have turned a blind eye to the plight of more than 2 million Americans whose unemployment benefits have been cut off.

In my State of Florida, we have over 100,000 Floridians struggling to find work and are unable to collect insurance, which has also led to nearly \$130 million in lost revenue for the State of Florida; yet in spite of repeated attempts time and time again, Republicans in Congress have coldheartedly refused to restore this vital economic lifeline that helps people support their families and pay their bills while they look for a new job during this very difficult time, the worst time since the Great Depression.

To whom God has given much, much is expected. I urge my House and Senate Republican colleagues to look inside their hearts and do the right thing for the American people and pass an

unemployment insurance extension today.

□ 1230

ELECTING A MEMBER TO CERTAIN  
STANDING COMMITTEES OF THE  
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Mrs. McMORRIS RODGERS. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the House Republican Conference, I send to the desk a privileged resolution and ask for its immediate consideration by the House.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 523

*Resolved*, That the following named Member be, and is hereby, elected to the following standing committees of the House of Representatives:

COMMITTEE ON TRANSPORTATION AND INFRASTRUCTURE—Mr. Jolly.

COMMITTEE ON VETERANS' AFFAIRS—Mr. Jolly.

Mrs. McMORRIS RODGERS (during the reading). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to dispense with the reading.

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

There was no objection.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PREVENTING GOVERNMENT  
WASTE AND PROTECTING COAL  
MINING JOBS IN AMERICA

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on the bill H.R. 2824.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 501 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. 2824.

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

□ 1231

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. 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, with Mr. WOODALL 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 Washington (Mr. HASTINGS) and the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. HOLT) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Washington.

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

It is well-known the Obama administration has waged a long-running war on coal, which last year a White House adviser admitted "is exactly what's needed," but this is not only a war on coal. It is a war on jobs, our economy, affordable energy, small businesses, and the household budgets of American families. Already faced with higher home heating costs, middle class families will be further squeezed if the Obama administration is successful in its attempts to shut down coal production.

One of the ways the administration has carried out this war on coal is through the reckless rewrite of a coal production regulation, the 2008 Stream Buffer Zone Rule. Shortly after taking office, the Obama administration discarded the 2008 rule that went through 5 years of extensive public comment and environmental review. Since then, the administration has spent over 10 million taxpayer dollars in working to rewrite this rule, including hiring new contractors, then only to dismiss those same contractors once it was publicly revealed that the administration's proposed rewrite would cost 7,000 jobs and cause economic harm in 22 States. A report released by our House Natural Resources Committee staff in September of 2012, following years of oversight and investigations, exposed the gross mismanagement of the rule-making process, potential political interference, and widespread economic harm the proposed regulation would cause.

Earlier this year, the U.S. Department of the Interior's Office of Inspector General, or IG, released a report with similar findings. However, what is more troubling is that the IG has identified significant ongoing problems with the rulemaking process. To make matters worse, they are refusing to disclose those problems to us here in Congress. For example, there is an entire section of the report that we have received, entitled "Issues with the New Contract," that have been almost completely blacked out. Despite our repeated requests, Deputy Inspector General Mary Kendall has refused to give Congress an unredacted copy of this report. In a letter, she states that the Department of the Interior decided that it should be withheld from the committee.

The IG is charged with being an independent watchdog for Congress. It is completely unacceptable and inappropriate for the IG to be taking orders from the Interior Department, espe-

cially about what information to withhold from us here in Congress.

Mr. Chairman, I don't take what I am going to say lightly. That is why, today, I have issued a subpoena to the Department's Inspector General Kendall for this information that she has withheld from us. If the IG discovered ongoing issues with the way the Department is currently conducting this rulemaking process, they have a responsibility and a duty to share that information with Congress now. The committee is not asking the IG for materials produced by the Department, but we are asking for materials and interviews produced by the IG's staff.

The Obama administration's rule-making process has been and continues to be an unmitigated disaster. Despite having spent millions of taxpayer dollars, they have absolutely nothing to show for it and, to date, haven't even produced a draft. Meanwhile, States, industry, and America's coal miners are left in limbo, unsure of what the operating rules are on the ground. Without the 2008 rule, we are left with a rule that was put in place in 1983.

That is why we are here today—to consider H.R. 2824, the Preventing Government Waste and Protecting Coal Mining Jobs in America Act. This legislation will put an end to the years of ongoing waste and dysfunction. It will put in place a responsible process to ensure there is no rush to recklessly regulate.

First, Mr. Chairman, it stops the administration's unnecessary rewrite and implements the 2008 Stream Buffer Zone Rule that I mentioned took 5 years to put in place. It then directs the Department to responsibly study the impact of the rule for a prescribed period of time prior to initiating another new rule. This will provide certainty to the economy, to the individual States, and allow a clear examination of what may be needed and changed in the future. This bill will make certain that a new rule is written properly.

Now, some will attempt to criticize this bill for the fact that it puts in place the 2008 rule that was vacated on a very narrow technical ground by a Federal judge last month. There is really nothing new here, however, because this is the exact outcome that the administration has been seeking for over 5 years—to get rid of the 2008 rule. But let's be clear what the court ruling and, subsequently, the Department's actions really mean.

The court ruling strikes down the more protective 2008 rule and sets us back 30 years to a less restrictive 1983 rule. The 2008 rule is more modern and more protective in limiting the impacts of coal mining than the 1983 rule, but one Federal judge ruled that the 2008 rule must be set aside due to a narrow procedural technicality. This judge ruled, because the 2008 rule didn't have formal consultation with the Fish and Wildlife Service on possible impacts to endangered species, the entire rule

should be set aside and, thus, revert back to the 1983 rule.

Mr. Chairman, for the record, there were multiple meetings and discussions and consultations with Fish and Wildlife in proposing the 2008 rule regarding species when the 2008 rule was written, and it was done in a published and transparent fashion over a multiple-year period. Comments were taken and recommendations were made, but the bureaucratic process wasn't done precisely so, and as a result, this judge struck it down. Compare this conscientious effort, which was done to protect species in the 2008 rule, with the fact that there was absolutely zero consultation of protecting species in the 1983 rule.

What could be the responsible thing to do? Clearly, it would be to implement the more modern and protective 2008 rule. What does the Obama administration say? It says let's go back to 1983. Why should we go back? It simply makes no sense to discard a modern rule, where we know the ESA consultation took place, for a 30-year-old rule that we know had no ESA consultations.

Perhaps we should look to the people whom the Obama administration hired to write a rule of its own. In case notes that the committee obtained from the IG's office during their investigation, it quotes one of the current contractors, admitting, "The 1983 rule was less restrictive than the 2008 rule." In the same case notes, it also states about the current contractor that, although she is a Democrat, the Stream Protection Rule appears to be an "effort to kill coal mining." There you have it—straight from the mouth of the person who is working on the current rewrite—an admission that the new rule is an effort to "kill coal mining."

That is why we must take action today to stop this administration. Not only are they attempting to impose a new coal regulation that will destroy thousands of American mining jobs, but they have also wasted 5 years and over 10 million taxpayer dollars on a process that has been completely dysfunctional and misguided.

Enough is enough. Republicans want to create an America that works, and that requires access to affordable energy. If we do not stop the administration from implementing its new coal regulation, thousands of Americans will be out of work, and home heating costs for working middle class families will rise.

Let's pass this legislation to protect American taxpayer dollars, to protect American jobs, and to end this administration's reckless, wasteful rewrite by putting in place a responsible process that will allow a proper new rule to be written.

With that, I reserve the balance of my time.

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

I rise in strong opposition to this legislation that would ignore the poi-

sonous environmental impacts of mountaintop removal mining and would attempt to force States to adopt a discredited and vacated midnight Bush administration rule.

Mountaintop removal mining is a serious environmental health threat in Appalachia. Companies literally blast the tops off of mountains, scoop out the coal, and dump what is left over—what used to be the mountaintop and the mining residue—into the valley below. In the process, landscapes are scarred; wild habitat is destroyed; mountain streams are buried; fish are killed; and the long-suffering people living in the valleys suffer as they are left with degraded water.

It is not simply my opinion or the warnings of a few fringe environmental groups. This is what the science tells us. In a paper published in the journal *Science* a few years ago—a preeminent scientific journal—dozens of scientists laid this out very clearly. Building on a wealth of recent scientific data from a variety of researchers, they wrote:

Mountaintop mining in the valley fills revealed serious environmental impacts that mitigation practices cannot successfully address.

Now, the chairman today is talking about detailed procedural matters. He is wrong on that. The real point is the health of the people in the valleys. These scientists described:

When streams are buried, water emerges from the base of the valley fills, containing a variety of solutes that are toxic and damaging to biota, and that the recovery of biodiversity in mining waste impacted streams has not been documented.

In other words, the recovery that they talk about does not exist in fact. It has not been shown to be possible.

□ 1245

Most frighteningly for the people who live with these impacts in their backyards, the scientists write:

Adult hospitalizations for chronic pulmonary disorders and hypertension are elevated as a function of county-level coal production . . .

They know it comes from this.

To continue the quote:

. . . as are the rates of mortality, lung cancer, chronic heart, lung, and kidney disease.

Hospitalizations, hypertension, lung cancer, heart disease, kidney disease, increased flooding. Water with dangerous concentrations of toxic metals? Yes. That is what the science says. And the destruction of forests and streams.

These are the impacts of mountaintop removal mining that Congress should be addressing today. This is what we should be holding hearings on and writing legislation about.

We should be making the protection of people and the environment of the Appalachian region our top priority and making the mining companies act responsibly, not just cheaply. But the Republicans, Mr. Chairman, don't seem to want to talk about any of these impacts. They prefer to keep their heads in the sand and the gravel and the

toxic waste when it comes to this issue.

Instead of the real impacts of mountaintop removal mining, they are focusing on imagined impacts of a rule that hasn't even been released yet. They imagine a war on coal, they imagine a political conspiracy to subvert the rule that the Bush administration put in place in the last minutes of their administration, instead of seeking to guarantee clean water for all Americans.

So they spent years trying to uncover that conspiracy, all the while forcing the Department of the Interior to spend tens of thousands of hours of staff time and millions of taxpayer dollars in order to comply with their commands—and now their subpoenas. And they have come up empty.

The inspector general for the Department of the Interior confirmed in December there were no political shenanigans. There was no misconduct. There was a poor choice of contractors, yes, and a debate among career staff about the proper way to move forward.

Could it have been handled better? Maybe. But there was no misconduct.

Meanwhile, the rule put in place by the Bush administration—the very rule that this bill would force States to adopt—was thrown out by a Federal court 2 weeks ago because the real misconduct was from the Bush administration, which decided that it didn't even need to consider the effects that destroying streams and rivers would have on threatened and endangered species. They did not do the consultation that is required under the law.

So this bill would overturn the court's decision, forcibly enact a rule that was improperly developed in the first place, and forbid the Obama administration from actually doing something to protect the streams from being buried and to protect the people who live there.

This bill would forbid them from actually doing something to protect forests, fish, wildlife, and humans. It would forbid them from actually doing something to protect the health of the people in these communities. This bill would create its own reality through an amendment added at the last minute that would deem the 2008 rule to have met the requirements of the Endangered Species Act that the court said they did not meet.

Now "deem" is a word that is not in common use. It certainly is a strange word the way it is used here in Congress. By "deem," they mean they would declare in legislation that the Endangered Species Act was observed and that consultation had taken place, even though it wasn't and it hadn't. That is preposterous.

I wish we could do the same thing to environmental destruction caused by mountaintop removal mining and to the contaminated water and to the health impacts by simply saying, by legislation, that contamination never

happened. Those people were never affected. Their health never deteriorated. They didn't die. But we can't do that.

This bill does nothing to protect people from the destructive impacts of mountaintop removal mining. It is strongly opposed by a coalition of environmental groups like the Southern Environmental Law Center, the Sierra Club, the League of Conservation Voters, the National Parks Conservation Association, and many more.

It is not just me standing here talking about it. It is not even just these scientists. It is many more.

Once again, I want everyone to understand that the real issue here today is not bureaucratic procedure. It is not even when a rule might have been issued and what went into making up that rule. What is at stake today is safe water for people, the health of the population, and an environment that can save us all.

I urge my colleagues to defeat this bill, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I am very pleased to yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. LAMBORN), the subcommittee chairman of the House Natural Resources Committee dealing with this legislation.

Mr. LAMBORN. I thank the chairman.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of H.R. 2824, the Preventing Government Waste and Protecting Coal Mining Jobs in America Act. This critical piece of legislation, which was introduced by Representative BILL JOHNSON and myself, is designed to save taxpayer dollars and protect American jobs by putting the Office of Surface Mining on a responsible path forward for managing and regulating coal mining in America.

So far, the Obama administration has spent nearly 10 million taxpayer dollars rewriting a coal production rule and the 2008 Stream Buffer Zone Rule, but the 2008 rule was never fully implemented. The administration is conducting this rewrite without ever providing justification for the need for a new rule.

The \$10 million does not include the money spent on attorneys fees and costly litigation or the internal costs borne by the agency. Even more critically, it does not include the costs to the families of the thousands of workers who have been displaced or seen work delayed by the regulatory inaction of the Department.

The legislation before us today is very simple. It would cripple the Obama administration's war on coal by ending their unnecessary rewrite and it would require the Office of Surface Mining to implement the 2008 Stream Buffer Zone Rule. This rule was developed over 5 years through an open, public, multimillion-dollar process and requires consultation on endangered species where necessary.

Under this legislation, H.R. 2824, once all the plans have been approved, the

effects of the new regulations will be analyzed for a period of 5 years. On completion of this analysis, the Office of Surface Mining is required to report back to us on the effectiveness of the rule, impact on energy production, and to identify and justify anything that should be addressed through a new rulemaking process.

If the Obama administration had followed this process from the beginning, taxpayers would have 9 million more dollars, thousands of unemployed Americans would likely have jobs, and we would be far along in the process of understanding the impacts and environmental benefits of the 2008 rulemaking. Unfortunately, this administration's first act was to discard the rule and plunge head first into a failed, wasteful, and never-ending rulemaking process.

This legislation will stop the massive ongoing waste, saving the taxpayers money. It will stop the administration from continuing with a reckless rulemaking process and imposing a needless regulation that will directly cost thousands of hardworking American jobs and cause significant American economic harm.

This bill will also provide regulatory certainty for an important domestic industry—an industry that not only provides great family-wage jobs with good benefits, but also provides affordable energy for the American people and the Nation's manufacturing base.

I urge my colleagues to support this critical legislation.

Mr. HOLT. Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. DEFAZIO), the ranking minority member of the Resources Committee.

Mr. DEFAZIO. I appreciate the gentleman's statement and leadership.

What are we doing here today? We are going to take a rule established by Ronald Reagan, the first modest attempt to protect water quality, stream quality, forests, and other environmental values in cases of strip mining mountaintop removal.

So the Republicans today are going to overrule the judgment of Ronald Reagan, preempt him with a rule that basically says it is okay to blow the top off a mountain, dump it into a stream, and it doesn't affect water quality because the stream doesn't exist anymore. Except there is a little problem. The water does still leach through all the toxic soils and it does cause problems downstream. But let's not worry about that too much.

Secondly, they are going to preempt states rights. Hey, the party of states' rights. They are all for local control. They hate those one-size-fits-all Federal rules, don't they? No, not today.

We are going to impose a Bush administration midnight rule which a court found to be laughable in terms of its compliance with Federal law. They are going to impose that on all the States of the United States of America as the law of the land. We are going to

preempt the judgment of any State that wants to do more to protect water quality than allow the tops to be blown off mountains and mining waste dumped into streams and saying there is no problem. But we will study it for 5 years, as we heard previously. Okay, sure. How much harm will happen in that time?

So those are a few of the problems and the inconsistencies I see here today. We are preempting a Reagan rule that was quite modest and not overly burdensome on the industry. It should have been improved upon. The Bush administration tried to totally undo it. It was laughed out of court. The Obama administration fumbled and messed up writing a new rule with an incompetent contractor. And now we are going to impose the Bush rule on all the States.

They are going to deem, as we heard earlier—that is, pretend—that it meets the Endangered Species Act, and give that pretension the force of law. What they are saying is there were at least two or three people in the Bush administration who had a conversation. That meant they talked about the Endangered Species Act, so that meets the intention of the Endangered Species Act.

Finally, they are talking about a war on coal. We will hear from some well-intentioned people later here today who are going to talk about the potential job impact of this, and I appreciate that. There has to be a balance. But this is not a balance.

This is yet another imaginary war being waged by the Obama administration on coal. A war on Christmas, a war on coal, a war on jobs, a war on whatever. At least it is not an overseas war that is unnecessary in Iraq that cost us many thousands of lives and trillions of dollars.

But the war on coal? When the Obama administration came into office, there were 5,000 less jobs in coal mining than there are today.

The CHAIR. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. HOLT. I yield the gentleman an additional 2 minutes.

Mr. DEFAZIO. The Obama administration leased out 2.1 billion tons of coal in the Powder River Basin in its first term. That is twice what the Bush administration leased in the 4 years before that. Recent accounts from the GAO lead us to believe that maybe they were a little too cozy with the industry and in fact that those deals were a little too sweet for that 2.1 billion tons of coal.

So that is a war on coal? No. What they are talking about is actually less coal is being used to produce electricity.

Now they are also the party of market forces and capitalism. Well, guess what? Market forces and capitalism have reduced the use of coal. Natural gas was really, really, really cheap a couple of years ago. Coal used to generate electricity. It totally tanked. It

had nothing to do with the Obama administration. It had to do with market forces, and they worship the market. I hope they are not trying to undo market forces here and have some kind of socialist dictate.

So what has happened is coal use has bumped up a little bit as natural gas has become a little bit more expensive. But that was about economics and not policy.

The bottom line here is should we allow, without any regulation, blowing the tops off mountains, dumping them into valleys, filling in streams, and pretend it has no impact on the environment. And I would say “no.”

□ 1300

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. JOHNSON), the author of this legislation.

Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, today, I rise in strong support of H.R. 2824, the Preventing Government Waste and Protecting Coal Mining Jobs in America Act, legislation that I introduced with my friend and colleague, Congressman DOUG LAMBORN.

This important legislation addresses the administration’s flawed, waste of taxpayer money, and job-killing rewrite of the Stream Buffer Zone Rule.

Immediately upon taking over in 2009, the administration began their efforts to rewrite the Stream Buffer Zone Rule, even though a new rule that took 5 years to codify had just been finished in 2008.

From the beginning, the Office of Surface Mining and the Department of the Interior fumbled the ball, and it has been a train wreck and lack of leadership over the past 5 years.

Nearly \$10 million of taxpayer money has been wasted by the administration in their attempts to destroy thousands of direct and indirect jobs and cause electricity prices to skyrocket.

We know from the administration’s own estimates that their preferred rule would cost 7,000 direct coal jobs and thousands more indirect jobs, not to mention that States like mine in Ohio would see their electricity prices skyrocket thanks to increased coal prices.

We also know, from the whistleblower contractors that worked on the rule, that the political appointees in the Office of Surface Mining tried to cover up these job loss numbers because they knew how politically damaging they would be in the runup to the 2012 election year.

In fact, a political appointee threatened the contractors that there “would be consequences” if the contractor refused to change the numbers.

Furthermore, a recent report from the inspector general at the Department of the Interior confirmed these findings and even quoted the President-appointed and Senate-approved Director of OSM, saying that we need to “fix the job loss numbers.”

Is this the type of good government that the American people expect of our

leadership, a rulemaking process that sees political appointees threatening contractors and cooking the books to get a preferred outcome?

Under the leadership of Chairman DOC HASTINGS, the Natural Resources Committee has been aggressively investigating the malfeasance and flawed rewrite of this rule. In a serious threat to the separation of powers spelled out in the Constitution, the administration has largely ignored requests and subpoenas for relevant documents.

This is just another example of a Presidency and administration ignoring the will of the people and abusing power.

That is why this legislation is so important, Mr. Chairman. It will ensure that my constituents in eastern and southeastern Ohio, along with other hardworking Americans employed by the coal industry all across the country, can keep their jobs and continue to mine and use the coal that powers our manufacturing engine here in America.

It directs the States to implement the 2008 rule, a rule that had tens of thousands of comments and was thoroughly vetted before being thrown aside by the incoming administration.

The CHAIR. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. I yield the gentleman an additional 1 minute.

Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio. After 5 years, the States would be asked to report back with a description in detail of any proposed changes that should be made to the rule.

This legislation ensures that the States that are directly impacted by the proposed rule would have an actual say-so in the process, instead of a topdown approach from the Office of Surface Mining.

Despite what some may say, it does not stop the administration from protecting waterways or the environment.

Mr. Chairman, the rewrite of this rule has cost the taxpayers nearly \$10 million and threatens to shut down underground coal mining in America, killing thousands of jobs in the process.

I thank Chairman HASTINGS and Congressman LAMBORN for their leadership on this important issue, and I urge all of my colleagues to support this legislation.

Mr. HOLT. Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to yield 3 minutes to my friend from Kentucky (Mr. YARMUTH), a champion for people’s health, for wildlife and the environment, an outspoken critic of destructive mining practices, and the sponsor of the Appalachian Communities Health—emphasis on health—Emergency Act, a bill on which I am pleased to join him as a co-sponsor.

Mr. YARMUTH. Thank you, Mr. HOLT, for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, this bottle is filled with water from a well near a mountaintop removal mining site in eastern

Kentucky. In case you can’t see it, the water is orange.

This is what comes out of the taps in Appalachian communities where the water is contaminated by dangerous mine waste, which fills their wells and flows through the streams in their yards.

It is the result of an inadequate law that is failing to protect public health and safety near mountaintop removal mining sites; but today, rather than examining ways to strengthen that law and begin to address the public health crisis that accompanies mountaintop removal mining in Appalachia, we are debating a bill that would make it worse.

Mining communities already have more instances of chronic pulmonary disorders and hypertension, as well as higher mortality rates, lung cancer rates, and instances of chronic heart, kidney, and lung disease. Proximity to mountaintop removal mining operations also correlates with a higher risk of birth defects and damage to the circulatory and central nervous systems.

Yet, instead of finding ways to better balance public health and safety with coal mining—or at least working to prevent mining companies from turning our water supply this shade of toxic orange, we are debating a bill to roll back what little protection the Federal Government currently offers these Appalachian communities.

I sympathize with my colleagues’ desire to protect jobs in the coal fields, and the loss of 75 percent of eastern Kentucky coal mining jobs due to mechanized mining over the past several decades has brought challenges; but a rule to protect waterways that has been in effect since 1983 is not the source of those challenges, nor is addressing the public health crisis that has unfolded in Appalachia as a result of mechanized mining.

No one here would risk their health by drinking this water. If any of my colleagues want to prove me wrong, I invite them to come have a sip.

It is bad enough that children who live in mining communities color their streams orange when they draw their environment, but it is tragic that the water they drink is denying them the healthy future they deserve.

We are risking the health of families in mining communities in Kentucky and throughout Appalachia by continuing to ignore the toxic orange water that pollutes their drinking supply.

I urge my colleagues to stand up for public health and vote against this legislation.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from North Dakota (Mr. CRAMER), a member of the Natural Resources Committee.

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Chairman, I thank Chairman HASTINGS and Chairman LAMBORN and my friend from Ohio, Mr. JOHNSON, for introducing this important legislation.

I had the great honor, for nearly 10 years prior to coming to Congress, to be on the North Dakota Public Service Commission, where we carried the SMCRA laws and enforced the Federal SMCRA laws on behalf of our lignite coal industry that employs thousands of people.

We had a little over 100,000 acres under permit, mined 30 million tons of coal every year, and burned it to generate electricity, very low-cost electricity.

We had a great relationship with our Federal Government, our Federal partners. We did it in partnership. They appreciated and honored State primacy. We carried out the letter and the spirit of the law very well.

As a consequence, we have clean streams; clean water; clean air; good, rich topsoil; as well as the jobs that come with it.

We don't have mountains, so a rule that was designed by somebody to deal with mountain removal mining doesn't really match the prairie of North Dakota, which is always the problem with one-size-fits-all regulations; and that is what we find so offensive back home, is when the Federal Government tries to fix every problem with one piece of legislation or one regulation.

We were very familiar—I worked with the 2008 rule. It works just fine. It involved stakeholder involvement. It involved consultation with stakeholders. We are missing that in this particular case.

Quite honestly, I guess when you talk about the war on coal, and some might want to deny that one exists, you might believe that if it was just one rule occasionally; but in the context of the aggregate of all of the rules and regulations and laws coming down from this administration, it is hard not to believe that there is an attempt to unilaterally disarm our economy and the global marketplace with a war on coal.

I encourage my colleagues to join me in voting for this important piece of legislation.

Mr. HOLT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from West Virginia (Mr. RAHALL), my good friend.

Mr. RAHALL. I thank my dear colleague from New Jersey for yielding me the time.

Mr. Chairman, I do rise in support of the pending legislation, H.R. 2824; and to my good friend, the chairman of the committee, DOC HASTINGS, I commend him for bringing this bill to the floor of the House.

As he knows, I am the only Member left in this body that served on the original conference committee that wrote H.R. 2, which was enacted as the Surface Mining Control and Reclamation Act of 1977, otherwise known as SMCRA.

Due to the nature of my congressional district and my years of service on the Natural Resources Committee, I am very familiar with SMCRA and what it requires.

This law has numerous performance standards governing the coal surface mining and reclamation process. These standards govern everything from the handling of excess spoil to the period for which successful revegetation must take place prior to bond release.

One fundamental aspect of the performance standards is that the mine area be reclaimed to its approximate original contour, with one exception. The law is clear, and it provides for an exception from the approximate original contour requirement in the case of mountaintop removal operations if certain conditions are met.

A stream buffer zone rule is not included among the many SMCRA performance standards. Such a rule was not contemplated by the conferees on H.R. 2 back in 1977. This rule was a manifestation of the bureaucracy.

That is not to say that there should not be such a rule, but any such rule must work within the statutory framework of SMCRA.

The effort by the current administration to replace the 2008 stream buffer zone promulgated by the Interior Department does not meet that test. It is clear, at least to me, that the effort by the current administration to revise the 2008 rule is aimed at halting a mining practice that is specifically condoned by SMCRA.

Fundamentally, there is no question; this debate is about jobs. It is about good-paying jobs in West Virginia and other areas of the Appalachian region.

Mr. Chairman, it is about our economy, whether it be providing needed flat land for agriculture or industrial facilities or saving millions of dollars by providing a readymade roadbed for a new highway, as has been done, and is continuing to be proposed in Mingo County, in the congressional district I am honored to represent.

In conclusion, Mr. Chairman, I urge passage of the pending measure, the Preventing Government Waste and Protecting Coal Mining Jobs in America Act. I commend, again, the chairman of the committee, and I commend my colleague from Ohio (Mr. JOHNSON) for his introducing this bill as well.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. KELLY), a new Member, not necessarily a brand-new Member, but a newer Member.

Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in really strong support of H.R. 2824.

I think if we go back to the President's original candidacy, he said: Listen, if you want to continue to make electricity using coal-fired power plants, you can do it, but we are going to bankrupt you.

There is no question about the war on coal. It is factual. Now, we come here today, and I think that—the area of the country that I represent is western Pennsylvania. It is hard to look at a source that is so abundant, so accessible, so affordable, so reliant, and so

sustainable that keeps our energy costs lower and creates thousands of jobs.

The administration's efforts have not only eliminated people who are mining coal, they have absolutely eliminated entire communities and wiped them off the face of the Earth.

Now, we look at a piece of legislation, and we say wait a minute. In 2008, we had a rule that received certification from the Environmental Protection Agency and complied fully with the Clean Water Act.

So the question becomes: How good does the coal energy have to become in order to receive a pat on the back from the administration?

The answer is they can never reach that level. They will never be accepted. It will never be part of our energy strategy. It will never lead America to be independent from every place else in the world.

All you have to ask yourself is: What in the world are we doing to the people we represent?

This is not a Republican strategy or a Democrat strategy. This is an American strategy. If it is truly about energy and about creating jobs and protecting our environment, it is all there, gentleman, and has been there for years.

□ 1315

Why would the administration spend \$10 billion to get an answer that didn't comply with what they thought it was going to be? So automatically, the answer has to be: These folks didn't do the test the right way. They didn't come up with the results that we needed, so we are going to get rid of them and get somebody else in here.

Mr. Chairman, the lights are going out across this country. Our position in the world is being challenged right now, in a country that has been so blessed for so long with abundant, affordable, and accessible energy, and to sit back and say: You know what? They are getting better, but they are never going to be good enough for us; they are never going to quite reach that metric they have to reach.

In fact, the bottle of water the gentleman just showed, I have got to tell you: Take a bottle of Fiji water off the shelf; it won't comply either.

So we have got to start asking ourselves, where is it that they are going with this? Is this a way to prop up an agenda by the administration or is this a way to prop up the American success story? Are we going to go forward and truly achieve independence from energy from anyplace else in the world other than our own or are we going to continue to fight over things that don't make sense to the American people but yet somehow make sense in this House?

Listen, what we are doing today just makes sense. We have already run the traps on it. We have already run the tests. We have done all the metrics. Coal is good for America. Coal has always been good for America. Coal has

cleaned itself up incredibly and will continue to do so. These are the most responsible people. I would invite some of my friends who have never been down in a coal mine, travel with me to western Pennsylvania. Go down in the Bailey mine. Go down 700 feet and see how they are scrubbing coal, and then say to me that they are not doing it the right way.

The CHAIR. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. I yield an additional 30 seconds to the gentleman.

Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I really want to ask my colleagues today, let's take a real good look at this, at what we are doing. In a country that so badly now is looking for leadership across all phases so that we can retain our position in the world, let's take a look at where we are today with this coal strategy. If it is truly a war on coal and if it is truly a war we can't win, then I say that is not why we came here.

I strongly urge the passage of H.R. 2824.

Mr. HOLT. Mr. Chairman, I would like to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. MORAN), a Member of this body who has been a leader on countless environmental issues, my friend from Virginia who knows the harmful effects that mountaintop removal mining has had in his own State and throughout the Appalachian region.

Mr. MORAN. I thank my very good friend from New Jersey for yielding to me, and I thank my very good friend from Arizona.

Mr. Chairman, I do rise in opposition to this so-called Preventing Government Waste and Protecting Coal Mining Jobs in America bill. I know that is what this bill's sponsors have tried to suggest, but the fact is that this promotes destructive mountaintop mining removal and it doesn't protect jobs.

The goal of this bill is to require all States to incorporate a now vacated 2008 rule that was issued in the very last days of the Bush administration and was then struck down by a U.S. Federal court. It was an eleventh-hour regulation that was designed to repeal Reagan-era protections for streams and waterways from the impacts of mountaintop mining by providing a buffer zone for waste disposal. Its vague and permissive language sets an alarmingly low bar when it comes to protecting communities and wildlife habitats near mountaintop mining operations.

The reality is that this midnight rulemaking of the Bush administration would only hasten further environmental destruction and increase the volume of toxic chemicals entering our water supply.

This bill before the House represents a transparent attempt to resurrect an already rejected rule by forcibly enacting it across this country, thereby putting communities nearby coal mining plants at risk while undoing necessary protections from pollutants.

But in addition to resurrecting this stream buffer zone rule, H.R. 2824 comes with a 5-year mandatory implementation period that conveniently prohibits the Department of the Interior from issuing any new regulations to protect streams.

So the public should be deeply troubled by what is a blatant disregard for public health. Americans living near coal mining operations are going to be harmed by this. Our legal process is jeopardized, and certainly the integrity of already fragile ecosystems will be put at risk.

The CHAIR. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. HOLT. I would gladly yield an additional 1 minute to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. MORAN. I very much thank my good friend.

An environmental impact statement found that between 1985 and 2002, nearly 2,000 miles of streams were buried or destroyed by mountaintop removal. Not surprisingly, peer-reviewed scientific studies continued to confirm the devastation on the surrounding environment and wildlife habitats of the numerous toxic chemicals, like arsenic and mercury, that enter into streams as mountaintops are blasted and bulldozed away.

We found in a 2011 study that cancer rates were twice as high in communities exposed to the effects of mountaintop mining. In the journal *Science*, we found, likewise, chronic pulmonary disorders in coal country. A 2011 study of births in Appalachia from 1996 to 2003 found that counties near mountaintop mining areas had substantially higher rates of multiple types of birth defects.

Congress should welcome regulations that are going to save and enhance American lives, not put them in jeopardy; and unfortunately, this bill gives a green light to remove mountain summits and dump their waste into nearby valleys and streams.

The fact is that coal has been the mainstay of Appalachia's economy for more than 100 years, but it has yet to make the region prosperous. We are talking about jobs. We need healthy people, and we need healthier environments. So I urge a rejection of this legislation.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I am very pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. SCALISE).

Mr. SCALISE. I appreciate my colleague yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of the Preventing Government Waste and Protecting Coal Mining Jobs in America Act introduced by my colleague from Ohio.

Mr. Chairman, there is a war on coal by the Obama administration. It is being carried out every day throughout this country in many ways through rules and regulations imposed by radical agencies like the EPA, and so what we are doing here is pushing back and

saying: Enough is enough. Stop killing jobs in America, Mr. President. Stop increasing energy costs for American families, hardworking taxpayers who are struggling in this bad economy.

The President continues to pursue this global warming agenda. It is snowing outside of the Capitol right now as we speak in support of this bill, and they are still talking about global warming and imposing more regulations that are killing—killing—American jobs.

If you look at the sue-and-settle process that has brought us to this point, that really is the reason behind legislation like the bill we are bringing up today. The sue-and-settle process that the Obama administration is using through agencies like the EPA, in this case, has resulted in 7,000 lost jobs and is wreaking havoc in 22 States. Just one rule.

This isn't a bill that was passed through Congress. The President loves bragging about he has got a pen and a phone, yet he is using Federal agencies, not law passed by the people's House, debated in the open public view. Behind closed doors, they are going and trying to impose these radical regulations that are killing jobs in America. The President is going to spend days and days on the campaign trail, a campaign trail that never ends. He never leads and governs. He runs around campaigning, and his latest mantra is to talk about unemployment benefits. Mr. Chairman, the best unemployment benefit is a good job.

The American people don't want to be getting unemployment checks from the Federal Government—they want jobs—and yet this administration, through its war on coal and so many other radical regulations, is killing jobs in America. Enough is enough. This legislation helps to undo the damage that President Obama's radical policies are wreaking through our economy.

Again, I commend my colleague from Ohio for bringing this legislation forward. I think we will see a very strong bipartisan vote in support of helping get jobs back in our economy.

Mr. HOLT. Mr. Chairman, I would like to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. GRIJALVA), my good friend and colleague from the Natural Resources Committee who has been a leader on standards and enforcement in mining and knows as well as anyone the time and energy that has been wasted in the committee's investigation of this stream protection rule, time that could have been spent protecting the environment and the people's health.

Mr. GRIJALVA. I thank my colleague from New Jersey for yielding me the time.

Mr. Chairman, it is our singular responsibility, as Members of Congress, to protect the health and well-being of the American people. Voting "yes" to this legislation would do just the opposite. H.R. 2824 is not only poisonous to

our pristine rivers and waterways, but harmful to the health and well-being of the American people.

H.R. 2824 is wrong at many levels. First, it seeks to lock in a 2008 Bush administration rule that virtually eliminates the buffer zone protecting streams from mine waste. Just last month, a Federal court ruled that the 2008 rule that this legislation seeks to lock in was unlawful because it risked the federally protected endangered and threatened species.

But the problem with this bill isn't limited to just endangered and threatened species. The bill would also violate the purposes and objectives of the Clean Water Act and those of the Surface Mining Control and Reclamation Act to minimize harm from surface mining. These are a few laws and regulations to protect rivers and waterways in our communities and ultimately ensuring public health and well-being. H.R. 2824 is about eliminating our environmental safeguards and deteriorating our public health to provide legal loopholes for private mining companies.

The effect of polluted waterways to our communities is catastrophic and costly. This year, we have already witnessed a few incidents. First, the chemical spill in Elk River in West Virginia in January. Then the coal spill in Dan River in North Carolina in February. While both these incidents remain unsolved and are being investigated, they have forced tens of thousands of residents to go without clean and safe water for weeks—and this legislation seeks to grant immunity to those violations.

The bill will not only pollute more rivers and waterways and risk millions of Americans being without clean and safe water, but worse, it will poison millions of Americans. The question I want to ask my colleagues in this Chamber is: What kind of government poisons its own people? Is that the government we are?

So with that, I urge Members who care about its people to oppose this poisoned legislation.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes, again, to the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. LAMBORN), the chairman of the subcommittee dealing with this legislation.

Mr. LAMBORN. I thank the full committee chairman.

Mr. Chairman, my colleagues on the other side seem to continue living in the past. This bill isn't about the Bush administration. This bill is about the rampant failure of the Obama administration and its inability to craft a reasonable rule on coal mining. They have spent 5 years and nearly \$10 million on this rewrite. And for what? What have they produced? Absolutely nothing. Their waste-ridden, failed effort is apparently nothing more than a sham facade over a real agenda—to kill coal mining.

You don't have to take my word for it. This is a direct quote from an in-

spector general investigator's interview with a current DOI contractor working on the rule, Emily Medine. She said the rule appears to be "an effort to kill coal mining."

Also, the Department has continued to insist on falsifying the baseline to reduce the stated impacts of their rule-making. As you can see from the interview with the current contractor, over here, OSM continues to insist that companies use the more restrictive but never implemented 2008 rule as a baseline in an effort to hide the real economic impacts of whatever rule they want to come up with. Again, don't take my word for it. Right here, OSM's own contractor says that by using the more restrictive 2008 rule, they will show fewer job losses.

That is our choice today: a rule fine-tuned over 5 years with a clear process for future rulemaking and certainty for jobs and affordable energy, which we have now, or, if we follow this path, a continued waste of taxpayer dollars to pursue an agenda to kill coal mining.

I choose jobs and affordable energy for American families. Please support H.R. 2824.

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

This is an actual photograph of actual water coming from an actual mountaintop removal site. I hope that the camera captures the color of the green hills that used to be there and the orange water that is there now. A stream this orange might be good for dyeing Easter eggs but not for drinking.

Now, earlier, I referred to the studies by scientists that associated hospitalizations with these activities. I referred to hospitalizations, hypertension, lung cancer, heart disease, kidney disease, increased flooding, loss of habitat, damage to wildlife. The other side, the majority, keeps wanting to talk about procedures, so let's talk about procedures for just a moment.

□ 1330

The record is clear. These are the words of the Federal District Court. The record is clear. The 2008 rule may affect or threaten endangered species or critical habitat. Further, the court goes on, the errors in this rule constitute a—in their words—serious deficiency and not merely a procedural defect.

Mountaintop removal mining is a serious environmental and health threat in Appalachia. That is what we should be talking about today, not about creating legislation that will deem reality to be different than it actually is, that will declare this stream clear flowing, that will declare these mountains green and verdant, that will declare that the Endangered Species Act was observed when it wasn't, that will declare that this rule will protect the environment and human health when it won't.

No amount of legislative deeming will make this reality change. What

will make this reality change would be good, strong regulations with good, strong enforcement with an emphasis not on speed and cheapness but on people's health and an environment that can sustain us. That is what we should be talking about.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I am very pleased to yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. STUTZMAN).

Mr. STUTZMAN. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I come to the floor to support H.R. 2824, the Preventing Government Waste and Protecting Coal Mining Jobs in America Act. I thank my colleagues Congressman JOHNSON and Chairman DOC HASTINGS for their hard work and leadership on this very important issue.

The Obama administration has consistently put mandates ahead of jobs and energy security. Instead of promoting the American-made energy that powers our factories, small businesses, warehouses, and offices, Washington bureaucrats have wasted nearly \$10 million to overhaul coal mining regulation.

Three years ago, the Obama administration's own experts estimated that these unnecessary and sweeping changes could kill 7,000 jobs. The urge to issue mandates was too strong and, instead of listening to reason, the administration fired its own advisers and kept on pressing. That is no way to promote economic recovery.

Mr. Chairman, today's legislation would halt the Obama administration's haphazard and disastrous rulemaking. Hoosiers deserve an all-of-the-above energy plan, not a red tape agenda. So I would urge my colleagues to support this legislation.

Mr. HOLT. Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER), a most thoughtful and strong spokesperson on protecting our environment and people's health.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. I appreciate the gentleman's courtesy as I appreciate his leadership.

Mr. Chair, there is nothing here in terms of what the administration has done that is ill-considered or reckless. I am sorry that there is opposition to protections that were put in place by the Reagan administration dealing with stream buffers, simple and common sense, which would indeed merit the support by virtually all of our colleagues.

We have seen that the last-minute efforts by the Bush administration to circumvent protections for mountaintop removal were rejected by the courts because they did not deal adequately with requirements of the Endangered Species Act. We are still facing the specter of taking the debris from mountaintop removal mining and putting it in our streams and waterways, and we would sentence our States to not be able to put in place

more effective and stringent protections if they wanted to but force them to follow this outdated and rejected proposal and wait until 2021 to be able to move forward.

Mr. Chairman, this is an expression, I think, of frustration on the part of some of my friends on the other side of the aisle for the fact that they are on the wrong side of history, they are on the wrong side of science, and they are on the wrong side of public opinion; and simply declaring that the administration is out of control or EPA is overreaching or there is a war on coal doesn't make it so.

People can see for themselves the devastation from mountaintop removal and the fact that we have been negligent as a country for years providing adequate protections.

The CHAIR. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. HOLT. I yield the gentleman an additional 15 seconds.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. I would hope that the Chamber sees fit to reject legislation that is not going anyplace and that we stop the charade of initiatives that are conjuring up imaginary threats when we are not focusing on the clear and present dangers to the environment now, to community protection, and for health. Reject this legislation, and then let's get down to business on things that really will make a difference and that we can agree upon.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I would advise my friend from New Jersey I am prepared to close if the gentleman is prepared to close.

Mr. HOLT. I am prepared to close, as well.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. I reserve the balance of my time.

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

The other side speaks about technicalities. Is it a technicality to fail to consider the negative impact on wildlife and the environment? Is it a technicality to ignore the harmful health effects for people living in communities near mining operations? Is it a technicality that allows us to sacrifice people's clean drinking water so that large mining companies can save a few dollars as they blow up a mountain?

No. These are not technicalities. In fact, the U.S. district court a few weeks ago made it clear these were not technicalities. I will repeat, in their words: the way this was put together is a serious deficiency and not merely a strictly procedural defect. That is why the rule was vacated by the court. We should not be imposing that now. We should be looking after the health of our environment and the health of the people we were sent here to represent.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Chairman, how much time remains on my side?

The CHAIR. The gentleman has 2½ minutes remaining.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Chairman, to hear my friends on the other side of the aisle argue about this, they are making arguments that are pre-1977. Now, why do I say that? Because they are talking about their perception of mountaintop mining or surface mining probably in general. Well, it is precisely that argument that led to the Surface Mining Control and Reclamation Act of 1977 under the Carter administration—with a Democrat Congress, I might add. So that bill passed to allow for surface mining.

Now, there is always necessary rule-making that comes after that, and the latest rulemaking prior to the turn of this century was in 1983 under the Reagan administration. So the Bush administration looked because of some court test that maybe we ought to rewrite this rule; and, Mr. Chairman, contrary to what my friends on the other side of the aisle said that that was a late-breaking rule, it took 5 years to put that together—5 years to put that together.

So, as a result, because of this court decision that ended up vacating because of the technicality of the 2008 rule, the issue before us is this: Do we put the 2008 rule in place, which is what the focus of this legislation is, and then look forward to further rule-making, or do we vacate the 2008 rule and go back to 1983? That is what the choice is.

What I find that is so interesting about my colleagues on the other side of the aisle is that everybody acknowledges that the 2008 rule is more restrictive—more restrictive—but they want to go back to the 1983 rule. I find that hard to understand, but at least that is what appears to be their argument.

So, Mr. Chairman, we think the responsible way to do this is to take into consideration what the Bush administration did for 5 years, looking at proper rulemaking that, by the way, looked into the Endangered Species Act. That is something the '83 rule did not look at at all. So we think that is a better way to put that in place right now. It is a more restrictive rule that industry understands, the States understand, and it is probably better for energy certainty in this country.

So I urge my colleagues to vote for this legislation, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Chair, I rise in strong opposition to H.R. 2824, the so-called "Preventing Government Waste and Protecting Coal Mining Jobs in America Act."

I oppose the bill because it would misdirect limited resources and limit State discretion in regulating industries within their borders.

The bill would require State surface coal mining regulatory agencies to implement the discredited 2008 Stream Buffer Zone Rule—promulgated by the Bush Administration—for a mandatory implementation period, which inadequately protects drinking water and watersheds from strip mining.

H.R. 2824 replaces sensible Reagan-era protections for streams and communities in Appalachia from mountaintop mining with the flawed 2008 Bush rule that has been rejected

by a federal court, most states, and the Administration.

The bill puts families at risk by stopping the current updating of federal rules, wasting time and money, while delaying development of a responsible stream protection rule for years.

The bill allows big coal companies—many of whom export their coal—to reap larger profits, while families in Appalachia pay the price through with degraded water, flooding, and health impacts.

In opposing this misguided legislation I stand with a broad range of conservation and environmental groups, including American Rivers, Environment America, Clean Water Action, League of Conservation Voters, National Parks Conservation Association, Natural Resources Defense Council, National Wildlife Federation, and Sierra Club.

Mr. Chair, waste from mountaintop removal coal mining has buried over 2,000 miles of streams throughout Appalachia. This practice destroys wildlife habitat, contaminates surface and drinking water, and leads to flooding.

As a number of new studies show, there is an increased incidence of cancer, birth defects, lung disease, and heart disease for those living and working near these mines.

In December 2008, the Bush Administration finalized a last-minute rule that weakened Reagan-era protections for streams from the impacts of mountaintop removal mining. The Bush rule was challenged in court and in February 2014, the D.C. Circuit Court vacated the rule, finding that the Bush Administration's refusal to consider the impacts of stream fills on threatened or endangered species in drafting the rule had been illegal.

The bill before us seeks to write the midnight Bush rule into law and require all states to incorporate it into their state mining regulations.

Mr. Chair, it makes no sense to require the states to adopt a vacated rule that has already been vacated by a federal court, especially when the Obama Administration is in the process of finalizing a new stream protection rule providing for responsible development while protecting our communities and environment.

This new rule will reflect the significant technological and scientific advances in mining practices that avoid, minimize, and mitigate environmental damage from coal mining.

Mr. Chair, I support the amendment offered by Congressman LOWENTHAL that would keep in place implementation of the Reagan Administration rule. I also support the amendment offered by Congressman CARTWRIGHT that would ensure that states retain the ability to issue their own stream buffer rules.

But I do not support the underlying bill. I urge my colleagues to vote "no" on H.R. 2824 and reject this misguided, irresponsible, and harmful legislation.

Then let us finally get to work on the issues the American people care about.

The 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 the nature of a substitute consisting of the text of Rules Committee Print 113-41, modified by the amendment printed in part A of

House Report 113-374. 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. 2824

*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 “Preventing Government Waste and Protecting Coal Mining Jobs in America”.*

**SEC. 2. INCORPORATION OF SURFACE MINING STREAM BUFFER ZONE RULE INTO STATE PROGRAMS.**

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 503 of the Surface Mining Control and Reclamation Act of 1977 (30 U.S.C. 1253) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(e) STREAM BUFFER ZONE MANAGEMENT.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—In addition to the requirements under subsection (a), each State program shall incorporate the necessary rule regarding excess spoil, coal mine waste, and buffers for perennial and intermittent streams published by the Office of Surface Mining Reclamation and Enforcement on December 12, 2008 (73 Fed. Reg. 75813 et seq.) which complies with the Endangered Species Act of 1973 (16 U.S.C. 1531 et seq.) in view of the 2006 discussions between the Director of the Office of Surface Mining and the Director of the United States Fish and Wildlife Service, and the Office of Surface Mining Reclamation and Enforcement’s consideration and review of comments submitted by the United States Fish and Wildlife Service during the rule-making process in 2007”.

“(2) STUDY OF IMPLEMENTATION.—The Secretary shall—

“(A) at such time as the Secretary determines all States referred to in subsection (a) have fully incorporated the necessary rule referred to in paragraph (1) of this subsection into their State programs, publish notice of such determination;

“(B) during the 5-year period beginning on the date of such publication, assess the effectiveness of implementation of such rule by such States;

“(C) carry out all required consultation on the benefits and other impacts of the implementation of the rule to any threatened species or endangered species, with the participation of the United States Fish and Wildlife Service and the United States Geological Survey; and

“(D) upon the conclusion of such period, submit a comprehensive report on the impacts of such rule to the Committee on Natural Resources of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources of the Senate, including—

“(i) an evaluation of the effectiveness of such rule;

“(ii) an evaluation of any ways in which the existing rule inhibits energy production; and

“(iii) a description in detail of any proposed changes that should be made to the rule, the justification for such changes, all comments on such changes received by the Secretary from such States, and the projected costs and benefits of such changes.

“(3) LIMITATION ON NEW REGULATIONS.—The Secretary may not issue any regulations under this Act relating to stream buffer zones or stream protection before the date of the publication of the report under paragraph (2), other than a rule necessary to implement paragraph (1).”.

(b) DEADLINE FOR STATE IMPLEMENTATION.—Not later than 2 years after the date of the enactment of this Act, a State with a State program approved under section 503 of the Surface Mining Control and Reclamation Act of 1977 (30 U.S.C. 1253) shall submit to the Secretary of the Interior amendments to such program pursuant to part 732 of title 30, Code of Federal Regula-

tions, incorporating the necessary rule referred to in subsection (e)(1) of such section, as amended by this section.

The CHAIR. No amendment to that amendment in the nature of a substitute shall be in order except those printed in part B of the report. Each such amendment may be offered only in the order printed in the report, by a Member designated in the report, shall be considered read, shall be debatable for the time specified in the report equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question.

AMENDMENT NO. 1 OFFERED BY MR. LOWENTHAL

The CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 1 printed in part B of House Report 113-374.

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

The CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 1, beginning at line 16, strike “December 12, 2008 (73 Fed. Reg. 75813 et seq.)” and insert “June 30, 1983 (48 Fed. Reg. 30312), except that this paragraph shall not apply to a State if the Governor of the State notifies the Secretary that such application would reduce stream protection from the level of protection achieved by the State program as in effect on the date of the enactment of the Preventing Government Waste and Protecting Coal Mining Jobs in America”.

The CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 501, the gentleman from California (Mr. LOWENTHAL) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California.

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

Mr. Chairman, my amendment is about protecting the health of those Americans who live near mountaintop removal coal mines. It is about keeping surface water from being contaminated; it is about keeping drinking water from being contaminated; and my amendment is about reducing the risk of cancer, birth defects, lung disease, and heart disease for families living near coal mines.

Mr. Chairman, all of these health problems have been conclusively linked to the mining practices of dumping the tops of mountains into streambeds. For example, in January 2010, the peer-reviewed journal Science published an article, entitled, “Mountaintop Mining Consequences.” And in that article, the authors, who were a dozen scientists from institutions across the country, concluded:

Adult hospitalizations for chronic pulmonary disorder and hypertension are elevated as a result of county-level coal production, as are rates of mortality, lung cancer, and chronic heart, lung, and kidney disease.

Health problems are for women and men. So the effects are not simply the result of direct occupational exposure of predominantly male coal miners.

Mr. Chairman, in 1983, the Ronald Reagan administration completed rules

that kept coal mining companies from dumping their overburden directly into streams. The rules required a buffer of 100 feet around waterways. The Reagan rule also allowed States to promulgate more protective rules, effectively creating a Federal floor of protection against stream contamination.

Right now, the Reagan rule is the regulation that the Office of Surface Mining Reclamation and Enforcement is operating under, and my amendment would keep the Reagan rule in effect.

So what does the majority bill do? It wipes away the Reagan rule and forces all States to adopt the 2008 Bush stream buffer rule. Instead of protecting streams, the Bush rule is a blank check for mining companies to dump their overburden directly into waterways. That’s right. The Bush rule referenced in this bill has a gaping loophole that allows mining companies to dump mine waste into streams if avoiding disturbance of the stream is not reasonably possible.

And how is “reasonable” to be interpreted by the agency? Very loosely. An alternative to dumping mine waste into streams generally may be considered unreasonable, according to the agency, if its cost is substantially greater than the cost normally associated with this type of project.

Well, of course it is cheaper to dump mine waste into a nearby streambed than to properly treat and remove it elsewhere. Thus, given the agency’s criteria, it will always be found cheaper and reasonable to dump coal mine waste into streams.

But it gets even better, Mr. Chairman. This is the same Bush rule that was struck down by the D.C. circuit court just this last month, and it is the same Bush rule that is really against the States’ ability to promulgate stronger rules because it creates a ceiling that no State can exceed.

□ 1345

Mr. Chairman, my amendment would simply return to the Reagan rule to protect the health of families living near coal mines. I urge support of my amendment.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the gentleman’s amendment.

The CHAIR. The gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

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

I find it hard sometimes to listen to this debate, especially when I hear my good friends on the other side of the aisle defending anything that the Reagan administration did. But they are doing it, so I will acknowledge that there is some substance there, but let me just go back to what I mentioned in my closing arguments.

SMCRA was passed in 1977. The Reagan rulemaking was 6 years after that. So there has not been an update on that rule—right now—for 30 years,

but it was more likely probably 20 years when the Bush administration thought it should be updated.

Now I want to get right to the heart of the matter and the reason that the environmental community does not like the 2008 rule and instead opts for the 1983 Reagan rule. They don't like it because the 2008 rule will provide clarity and certainty in the SMCRA process, which of course will free up job creation, meaning that there is going to be some certainty in coal production; rather, the environmental community would like to use loopholes that they found in the 1983 rulemaking to take people to court.

That is exactly why, from my perspective, that this amendment is offered, to go back to the Reagan times so there can be probably more litigation and less certainty in rulemaking of surface mining.

The gentleman mentioned, for example the 100-foot buffer zone. The Bush rule has a 100-foot buffer zone just like the Reagan rule. Nothing changed there. The only changes in the long run in rulemaking is certainty, and those who like to go to court don't like certainty. That is why I believe we have this improbable defense of anything that Reagan did, because they see that over a period of time there are ways that you can manipulate that to their advantage.

I think the Bush rule—which I said several times and is even acknowledged by the coal mining industry that it is more restrictive but has more certainty in it—is a better model, and it is precisely what this legislation does. It takes us to the 2008 rule.

This amendment takes us back to the 1983 rule, and I don't think that is a proper way to go. I urge rejection of this amendment.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LOWENTHAL. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume. I want to respond to one thing that was just said. The 2008 Bush rule is not more protective than the 1983 Reagan rule. I have explained that. The 2008 Bush rule has huge exemptions within it, and that is why it is important that we go back and we adopt my amendment to take us back to the reasonable 1983 Reagan rule.

I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. CARTWRIGHT).

Mr. CARTWRIGHT. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from California for yielding.

I rise in support of the amendment by the gentleman from California (Mr. LOWENTHAL) which seeks to reinstate the 1983 Stream Buffer Rule. While the Reagan administration rule is not perfect, the 2008 Bush rule inserted unnecessary loopholes in the law and takes us in the wrong direction.

This commonsense Lowenthal amendment from the Natural Resources Committee would simply keep the best option we currently have in place instead of forcing the adoption of

the 2008 rule, which the courts have already struck down. Thus, I urge my colleagues to support the Lowenthal amendment.

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

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Very briefly, and maybe we are caught here in semantics, but the issue—I have said several times and it has been acknowledged that the 2008 rule is more restrictive. My friend on the other side of the aisle and the author of the amendment said, "Let me be clear, the 2008 rule is not as protective."

I think when we are talking about protecting the environment, that "restrictive" and "protective" are probably synonymous in nature. So when we hear statements made by the industry that the 2008 rule is more restrictive, I take them at their word.

But, Mr. Chairman, I have to make this point and this point is very important because we need to have a certainty supply of energy in this country if we are going to have a growing economy. I am in favor of all of the above, and that certainly includes coal. Unless you have certainty in the regulations, you will not have an energy source.

As I have said right from the start—and as a matter of fact, many have acknowledged within the administration that this administration has a war on coal—this provides certainty. It is contrary to where the administration obviously wants to go because it does provide certainty with our energy production. So I would urge rejection of this amendment, which would take us back to a rule that would be more potentially litigious in nature to something that has certainty. With that, I urge rejection of the amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. LOWENTHAL).

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

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

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

AMENDMENT NO. 2 OFFERED BY MR. CARTWRIGHT

The CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 2 printed in part B of House Report 113-374.

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

The CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 1, line 17, before the last period insert "except that this subsection shall not apply to a State if, upon request from the Governor of the State, the Secretary finds that the State's existing program exceeds the

standards established by such rule regarding excess spoil, coal mine waste, and buffers for perennial and intermittent streams".

The CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 501, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. CARTWRIGHT) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

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

The underlying bill I seek to amend has been labeled today as Preventing Government Waste and Protecting Coal Mining Jobs in America. The true label for this bill ought to be the "No Streams Protection" bill.

Mountaintop removal coal mining is a process that has buried over 2,000 miles of streams throughout Appalachia, contaminating surface and drinking water, and destroying wildlife in Appalachia communities.

The practice is currently governed by a rule written by the Reagan administration. The Reagan rule needs to be updated, and this is what the Obama administration wants to set about doing. H.R. 2824 seeks to accomplish two things: to write into statute a stream buffer rule promulgated in December of 2008 by the Bush administration and then to prohibit the Obama administration from working on writing a new stream buffer rule for at least 5 years while precluding the States also from issuing their own more stringent rules.

Members ought to be aware that the Federal District Court of the District of Columbia handed down a decision on February 20, just last month, vacating the 2008 rule because the Bush administration refused to consider the impacts of coal mining on threatened or endangered species in writing the rule. As a result, the rule this bill would write into statute no longer exists.

It is also surprising that the Republicans would enact a bill that strong-arms States into forcibly adopting a Federal standard, completely preempting states' rights to enact their own rules.

That is why the amendment I am offering today protects states' rights by ensuring that all States are able to implement a stream buffer rule that can go beyond the national floor. States ought to have the ability to protect their natural resources at a level beyond the requirements of the Federal Government when they see that need. My amendment ensures that States maintain the ability to issue their own more stringent stream buffer rules, which this legislation is attempting to prohibit.

States should be able to maintain the ability to adequately protect their natural resources and health and safety of their local coal mining communities. Safe drinking water should be a right for everybody, and should not be subject to the Federal loopholes this bill would insert. States should have the right to close loopholes as they see fit.

It is important to remember that the amount of coal exported from this country is significant and growing. In fact, a record amount of coal was exported in 2012, over three times the amount exported one decade earlier. We don't need to relax our environmental and health protections for this industry. We don't need to jeopardize the health of the people and the once-pristine environment of Appalachia for the profits of these companies.

Finally, the claim that the Obama rule must be stopped because it is part of a so-called war on coal is obviously false. How can you make such a claim about a rule that doesn't even exist yet?

This bill is simply an attempt to resurrect a flawed 2008 Bush rule, rejected by a Federal court and the administration, which provides loopholes to the industry. It is poor public policy and a poor use of Congress' time given the pressing needs of this country.

My amendment protects states' rights from overreach by the Federal Government, protects Appalachia communities, protects our environment, and protects clean drinking water. My amendment allows States to do better by their citizens if they so choose, and I believe that is a goal that everybody ought to agree upon.

I urge Members to vote for this amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California (Mr. LOWENTHAL).

Mr. LOWENTHAL. I thank the gentleman from Pennsylvania for yielding me this time.

I strongly agree with my friend that States must be given the right to implement a stream buffer rule that works for them, given the fact that local conditions will vary from State to State. What we are saying is that States should have the ability to protect their natural resources at a level beyond the requirements of the Federal Government when they see the need. What we are saying is that the Federal Government sets a floor, and the States have a right to protect their citizens from public health crisis and illness by setting their own requirements.

H.R. 2824 keeps the States from tailoring stream safeguards and requires the States to waste taxpayer dollars by adopting a rule that has been vacated by a Federal court.

Mr. Chairman, for these reasons I urge support of the Cartwright amendment.

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

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

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

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Chairman, before I speak directly as to why we should not adopt this amendment, let me respond to the rhetorical question that my friend from Pennsylvania asked when he said:

How can you say that this administration rule, which hasn't been promulgated yet, will cost jobs?

Well, I would tell the gentleman, Mr. Chairman, that there were leaked documents of the first initial rewrite of the 2008 amendment, leaked documents that said that the contractor that was hired by the administration to rewrite the rule came back with the conclusion that 7,000 jobs would be lost in 22 States. So what was the response of the Obama administration? They fired the contractor; it was the wrong message.

Now they are still in the rulemaking process. But, Mr. Chairman, I have to tell you, I doubt that the philosophy has changed from that very way because they are trying to manipulate which rules to follow to minimize what we found out in the initial go-round.

So let me just talk about this amendment. This amendment is not only unnecessary, it is actually harmful to protecting states' rights. Under SMCRA of 1977, State regulations have to meet or exceed the new regulation issued by the Office of Surface Mining. The gentleman's amendment would eliminate the ability of States to meet these rules by mandating that States can only exceed the OSM rules. This ignores both the history of Federal-State regulations with regard to rulemaking but also the need for flexibility in the States to meet the OSM rules while protecting their own geology, hydrology, and community interests.

Again, States already have the ability to change regulations to meet or exceed Federal rules with regards to all aspects of the regulatory regime under SMCRA.

□ 1400

We should not limit the ability to have flexibility in meeting the new rules. This amendment would mandate that you could only change that by increasing it. I think, Mr. Chairman, that is the wrong way to go. I think the amendment is ill-advised.

I urge rejection of the amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

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

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

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE CHAIR

The CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, proceedings will now resume on those amendments printed in part B of House Report 113-374 on which further proceedings were postponed, in the following order:

Amendment No. 1 by Mr. LOWENTHAL of California.

Amendment No. 2 by Mr. CARTWRIGHT of Pennsylvania.

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

AMENDMENT NO. 1 OFFERED BY MR. LOWENTHAL

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

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 188, noes 231, not voting 12, as follows:

[Roll No. 138]

AYES—188

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

NOES—231

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

NOT VOTING—12

Benishek	Duckworth	McCarthy (NY)
Camp	Hinojosa	Miller, Gary
Campbell	Jackson Lee	Olson
Cohen	Johnson (GA)	Schwartz

□ 1427

Messrs. TERRY, CULBERSON, and COLE changed their vote from “aye” to “no.”

Messrs. MAFFEI and LARSON of Connecticut changed their vote from “no” to “aye.”

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 2 OFFERED BY MR.

CARTWRIGHT

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

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 196, noes 225, not voting 10, as follows:

[Roll No. 139]

AYES—196

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

NOES—225

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

NOT VOTING—10

Benishek	Duckworth	Olson
Camp	Hinojosa	Schwartz
Campbell	McCarthy (NY)	
Cassidy	Miller, Gary	

□ 1435

Mr. WALBERG changed his vote from “aye” to “no.”

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated against:

Mr. CASSIDY. Mr. Chair, on rollcall No. 139, I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted “no.”

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

The amendment was agreed to.

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

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. POE of Texas) having assumed the chair, Mr. WOODALL, 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. 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, and, pursuant to House Resolution 501, he reported the bill back to the House with an amendment adopted in the Committee of the Whole.

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

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

The amendment was agreed to.

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

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

MOTION TO RECOMMIT

Mr. BERA of California. Mr. Speaker, I have a motion to recommit at the desk.

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

Mr. BERA of California. I am opposed to it in its current form.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. Bera of California moves to recommit the bill H.R. 2824 to the Committee on Natural Resources with instructions to report the same back to the House forthwith with the following amendment:

Page 3, after line 20, add the following:

**SEC. \_\_\_\_ . MAKING IT IN AMERICA AND PROVIDING JOBS FOR UNEMPLOYED WORKERS.**

Nothing in this Act limits, restricts, or prohibits the Secretary of the Interior or any State program from giving priority to—

(1) hiring unemployed workers, including veterans, who are actively seeking work and for whom unemployment taxes were paid during prior employment; and

(2) utilizing equipment and materials manufactured in the United States in mining operations, where practicable.

Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio (during the reading). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to dispense with the reading.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. BERA of California. Mr. Speaker, this is the final amendment to the bill,

which will not kill the bill or send it back to the committee. If adopted, the bill will immediately proceed to final passage as amended.

Mr. Speaker, instead of voting on divisive bills that threaten communities and their water supply with toxic mining waste, we need to focus on creating jobs and getting unemployed Americans back to work.

Mr. Speaker, we have no more urgent mission than getting our veterans back to work. That is our priority. American families want their leaders to work together, Democrats and Republicans, to rebuild an economy that works for the middle class, not more partisan politics.

Today, over 2 million unemployed Americans have been waiting for Congress to restore Federal emergency unemployment benefits since December.

Among veterans who have served since 2001, the unemployment rate is 9 percent. This is disgraceful. During these tough economic times Americans need to focus and Congress needs to focus on getting Americans back to work.

This amendment would do just that, allowing priority hiring of veterans and those who have received unemployment insurance. To help create more jobs, we also need to make more products here in the United States. There is a greater opportunity for our people to make it in America if we make things in America.

That means we need to focus on creating the best conditions for American businesses to manufacture their products, to innovate, and to create jobs right here in the United States.

Already, more and more U.S. companies are bringing overseas manufacturing back home. Let's continue to encourage these U.S. companies to continue to bring those jobs back here and to build things here in America. We have seen the American auto industry come back, Apple computers, alternative energy companies, just to name a few. We need to continue to encourage these companies to make their products here.

□ 1445

That is exactly what this amendment does, and it will help set us on a solid path forward to a future of greater economic competitiveness, more jobs, and longstanding, long-term economic success.

Let's show the American people what our priorities are. It is about creating jobs and getting Americans back to work and, most importantly, getting our veterans back to work. That is exactly what this amendment does.

I urge the adoption of this important amendment.

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

Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the motion.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, this is simple. There are two competing

views on the floor right now about the future of America.

One side believes that the key to America remaining the leader of the free world starts with a robust American economy, led by a strong and stable energy market; an America that then leverages a healthy economy and a strong energy market to help allies across the globe like Ukraine, Japan, and others; an America that can go toe-to-toe with the Russians as they leverage their energy resources to try and achieve their political ambitions; an America that creates energy jobs here at home in a way that balances the dual needs of a vibrant economy and a healthy environment.

Now, that other competing view would rather see American manufacturers and hardworking middle class families pay more for their electricity.

Mr. Speaker, that is not fair. The other side talks a big game about being for an all-of-the-above energy policy, but at every turn, it tries to shut down our fossil fuel production and use.

The other side would rather shut down our cheapest and most reliable form of energy and the thousands of jobs that go with it, in favor of taxpayer-subsidized windmills to heat our homes on cold days like today.

The other side's apparent unwillingness to leverage America's energy abundance to influence geopolitics is unwise. America's rivals and adversaries are watching.

Mr. Speaker, like I said, this is simple. What side of the coin do we want to stand on? The one that shoots ourself in the foot or the one that embraces our God-given energy advantage and leads?

To me, the choice is clear. I urge all of my colleagues to vote against this motion and to vote for final passage.

Mr. Speaker, 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.

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. BERA of California. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 and clause 9 of rule XX, this 5-minute vote on the motion to recommit will be followed by 5-minute votes on passage of the bill, if ordered, and agreeing to the Speaker's approval of the Journal, if ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 197, noes 224, not voting 10, as follows:

[Roll No. 140]

AYES—197

Barber	Beatty	Bishop (GA)
Barrow (GA)	Becerra	Bishop (NY)
Bass	Bera (CA)	Blumenauer

Bonamici	Hastings (FL)	Pallone	Issa	Mullin	Schweikert
Brady (PA)	Heck (WA)	Pastorell	Jenkins	Mulvaney	Scott, Austin
Braley (IA)	Higgins	Pastor (AZ)	Johnson (OH)	Murphy (PA)	Sensenbrenner
Brown (FL)	Himes	Payne	Johnson, Sam	Neugebauer	Sessions
Brownley (CA)	Holt	Pelosi	Jolly	Noem	Shimkus
Bustos	Honda	Perlmutter	Jordan	Nugent	Shuster
Butterfield	Horsford	Peters (CA)	Joyce	Nunes	Simpson
Capps	Hoyer	Peters (MI)	Kelly (PA)	Nunnelee	Smith (MO)
Capuano	Huffman	Peterson	King (IA)	Palazzo	Smith (NE)
Cárdenas	Israel	Pingree (ME)	King (NY)	Paulsen	Smith (NJ)
Carney	Jackson Lee	Pocan	Kingston	Pearce	Smith (TX)
Carson (IN)	Jeffries	Polis	Kinzinger (IL)	Perry	Southerland
Cartwright	Johnson (GA)	Price (NC)	Kline	Petri	Stewart
Castor (FL)	Johnson, E. B.	Quigley	Labrador	Pittenger	Stivers
Castro (TX)	Jones	Rahall	LaMalfa	Pitts	Stockman
Chu	Kaptur	Rangel	Lamborn	Poe (TX)	Stutzman
Ciilline	Keating	Richmond	Lance	Pompeo	Terry
Clark (MA)	Kelly (IL)	Roybal-Allard	Lankford	Posey	Thompson (PA)
Clarke (NY)	Kennedy	Ruiz	Latham	Price (GA)	Thornberry
Clay	Kildee	Ruppel	Latta	Reed	Tiberi
Cleaver	Kilmer	Rush	LoBiondo	Reichert	Tipton
Clyburn	Kind	Ryan (OH)	Long	Renacci	Turner
Cohen	Kirkpatrick	Sánchez, Linda	Lucas	Ribble	Upton
Connolly	Kuster	T.	Luetkemeyer	Rice (SC)	Valadao
Conyers	Langevin	Sanchez, Loretta	Lummis	Rigell	Wagner
Cooper	Larsen (WA)	Sarbanes	Marchant	Roby	Walberg
Costa	Larson (CT)	Schakowsky	Marino	Roe (TN)	Walden
Courtney	Lee (CA)	Schiff	Massie	Rogers (AL)	Walorski
Crowley	Levin	Schneider	McAllister	Rogers (KY)	Weber (TX)
Cuellar	Lewis	Schrader	McCarthy (CA)	Rogers (MI)	Webster (FL)
Cummings	Lipinski	Scott (VA)	McCaul	Rohrabacher	Wenstrup
Davis (CA)	Loeb	Scott, David	McClintock	Rokita	Westmoreland
Davis, Danny	Lofgren	Serrano	McHenry	Rooney	Whitfield
DeFazio	Lowenthal	Sewell (AL)	McKeon	Ros-Lehtinen	Williams
DeGette	Lowey	Shea-Porter	McKinley	Roskam	Wilson (SC)
Delaney	Lujan Grisham	Sherman	McMorris	Ross	Wittman
DeLauro	(NM)	Sinema	Rodgers	Rothfus	Wolf
DelBene	Lujan, Ben Ray	Sires	Meadows	Royce	Womack
Deutch	(NM)	Slaughter	Meehan	Runyan	Woodall
Dingell	Lynch	Smith (WA)	Messer	Ryan (WI)	Yoder
Doggett	Maffei	Speier	Mica	Salmon	Yoho
Doyle	Maloney,	Swalwell (CA)	Miller (FL)	Sanford	Young (AK)
Duncan (TN)	Carolyn	Takano	Miller (MI)	Scalise	Young (IN)
Edwards	Maloney, Sean	Thompson (CA)	Benishek	Hinojosa	Schock
Ellison	Matheson	Thompson (MS)	Camp	McCarthy (NY)	Schwartz
Engel	Matsui	Tierney	Campbell	Miller, Gary	
Enyart	McCollum	Titus	Duckworth	Olson	
Eshoo	McDermott	Tonko			
Esty	McGovern	Tsongas			
Farr	McIntyre	Van Hollen			
Fattah	McNerney	Vargas			
Foster	Meeks	Veasey			
Frankel (FL)	Meng	Vela			
Fudge	Michaud	Velázquez			
Gabbard	Miller, George	Visclosky			
Gallego	Moore	Walz			
Garamendi	Moran	Wasserman			
Garcia	Murphy (FL)	Schultz			
Grayson	Nadler	Waters			
Green, Al	Napolitano	Waxman			
Green, Gene	Neal	Welch			
Grijalva	Negrete McLeod	Wilson (FL)			
Gutiérrez	Nolan	Yarmuth			
Hahn	O'Rourke				
Hanabusa	Owens				

## NOES—224

Aderholt	Cole	Garrett
Amash	Collins (GA)	Gerlach
Amodei	Collins (NY)	Gibbs
Bachmann	Conaway	Gibson
Bachus	Cook	Gingrey (GA)
Barletta	Cotton	Gohmert
Barr	Cramer	Goodlatte
Barton	Crawford	Gosar
Bentivolio	Crenshaw	Gowdy
Bilirakis	Culberson	Granger
Bishop (UT)	Daines	Graves (GA)
Black	Davis, Rodney	Graves (MO)
Blackburn	Denham	Griffin (AR)
Boustany	Dent	Griffith (VA)
Brady (TX)	DeSantis	Grimm
Bridenstine	DesJarlais	Guthrie
Brooks (AL)	Diaz-Balart	Hall
Brooks (IN)	Duffy	Hanna
Broun (GA)	Duncan (SC)	Harper
Buchanan	Ellmers	Harris
Bucshon	Farenthold	Hartzler
Burgess	Fincher	Hastings (WA)
Byrne	Fitzpatrick	Heck (NV)
Calvert	Fleischmann	Hensarling
Cantor	Fleming	Herrera Beutler
Capito	Flores	Holding
Carter	Forbes	Hudson
Cassidy	Fortenberry	Huelskamp
Chabot	Fox	Huizenga (MI)
Chaffetz	Franks (AZ)	Hultgren
Coble	Frelinghuysen	Hunter
Coffman	Gardner	Hurt

Issa	Mullin	Schweikert
Jenkins	Mulvaney	Scott, Austin
Johnson (OH)	Murphy (PA)	Sensenbrenner
Johnson, Sam	Neugebauer	Sessions
Jolly	Noem	Shimkus
Jordan	Nugent	Shuster
Joyce	Nunes	Simpson
Kelly (PA)	Nunnelee	Smith (MO)
King (IA)	Palazzo	Smith (NE)
King (NY)	Paulsen	Smith (NJ)
Kingston	Pearce	Smith (TX)
Kinzinger (IL)	Perry	Southerland
Kline	Petri	Stewart
Labrador	Pittenger	Stivers
LaMalfa	Pitts	Stockman
Lamborn	Poe (TX)	Stutzman
Lance	Pompeo	Terry
Lankford	Posey	Thompson (PA)
Latham	Price (GA)	Thornberry
Latta	Reed	Tiberi
LoBiondo	Reichert	Tipton
Long	Renacci	Turner
Lucas	Ribble	Upton
Luetkemeyer	Rice (SC)	Valadao
Lummis	Rigell	Wagner
Marchant	Roby	Walberg
Marino	Roe (TN)	Walden
Massie	Rogers (AL)	Walorski
McAllister	Rogers (KY)	Weber (TX)
McCarthy (CA)	Rogers (MI)	Webster (FL)
McCaul	Rohrabacher	Wenstrup
McClintock	Rokita	Westmoreland
McHenry	Rooney	Whitfield
McKeon	Ros-Lehtinen	Williams
McKinley	Roskam	Wilson (SC)
McMorris	Ross	Wittman
Rodgers	Rothfus	Wolf
Meadows	Royce	Womack
Meehan	Runyan	Woodall
Messer	Ryan (WI)	Yoder
Mica	Salmon	Yoho
Miller (FL)	Sanford	Young (AK)
Miller (MI)	Scalise	Young (IN)

## NOT VOTING—10

Benishek	Hinojosa	Schock
Camp	McCarthy (NY)	Schwartz
Miller, Gary		
Duckworth	Olson	

□ 1454

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

## MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Ms. Curtis, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate has passed without amendment a bill of the House of the following title:

H.R. 3771. An act to accelerate the income tax benefits for charitable cash contributions for the relief of victims of the Typhoon Haiyan in the Philippines.

□ 1500

## ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER

The SPEAKER. The Chair wishes to reiterate the announcement of February 26, 2013, concerning floor practice.

Members should periodically rededicate themselves to the core principles of proper parliamentary practice that are so essential in maintaining order and deliberacy in the House. The Chair believes that a few of these principles bear emphasis today.

Members should refrain from trafficking the well when another, including the presiding officer, is addressing the House.

Members should wear appropriate business attire during all sittings of the House, however brief their appearance on the floor might be.

Members who wish to speak on the floor should respectfully seek and obtain recognition from the presiding officer, taking the time to do so in proper form, including 1-minute. The proper form would be to ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

Members should take care to yield and reclaim time in an orderly fashion, bearing in mind that the Official Reporters of Debate cannot properly transcribe two Members simultaneously.

Members should address their remarks in debate to the presiding officer and not to others in the second person or to some perceived viewing audience.

Members should not embellish the offering of a motion, the entry of a request, the making of a point of order, or the entry of an appeal with any statement of motive or other commentary, and should be aware that such utterances could render the motion, request, point of order, or appeal untimely.

Members should attempt to come to the floor within the 15-minute period as prescribed by the first ringing of the bells. Members should be advised that if they are in the Chamber attempting to vote, the Chair will try to accommodate them. But as a point of courtesy to each of your colleagues, voting within the allotted time would help with the maintenance of the institution.

Following these basic standards of practice will foster an atmosphere of mutual and institutional respect. It will ensure against personal confrontation, among individual Members or between Members and the presiding officer. It will facilitate Members' comprehension of, and participation in, the business of the House. It will enable accurate transcriptions of proceedings. In sum, it will ensure the comity that elevates spirited deliberations above mere argument.

The Chair appreciates the attention of the Members to these matters.

## PREVENTING GOVERNMENT WASTE AND PROTECTING COAL MINING JOBS IN AMERICA

The SPEAKER. Without objection, 5-minute voting will continue.

There was no objection.

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

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

## RECORDED VOTE

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

A recorded vote was ordered.

The SPEAKER. This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 229, noes 192, not voting 10, as follows:

[Roll No. 141]

AYES—229

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

NOES—192

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

Eshoo	Lipinski	Richmond
Esty	LoBiondo	Roybal-Allard
Farr	Loeb	Ruiz
Fattah	Loftgren	Ruppersberger
Fitzpatrick	Lowenthal	Rush
Foster	Lowe	Ryan (OH)
Frankel (FL)	Lujan Grisham	Sánchez, Linda
Fudge	(NM)	T.
Gabard	Luján, Ben Ray	Sanchez, Loretta
Gallego	(NM)	Sarbanes
Garamendi	Lynch	Schakowsky
Garcia	Maffei	Schiff
Gibson	Maloney,	Schneider
Grayson	Carolyn	Schrader
Green, Al	Maloney, Sean	Scott, David
Green, Gene	Matsui	Serrano
Grijalva	McCollum	Sewell (AL)
Gutiérrez	McDermott	Shea-Porter
Hahn	McGovern	Sherman
Hanabusa	McNerney	Sinema
Hastings (FL)	Meeks	Sires
Heck (WA)	Meng	Slaughter
Herrera Beutler	Michaud	Smith (NJ)
Higgins	Miller, George	Smith (WA)
Himes	Moore	Speier
Holt	Moran	Swalwell (CA)
Honda	Murphy (FL)	Takano
Horsford	Nadler	Thompson (CA)
Hoyer	Napolitano	Thompson (MS)
Huffman	Neal	Tierney
Israel	Negrete McLeod	Titus
Jackson Lee	Nolan	Tonko
Jeffries	O'Rourke	Tsongas
Johnson (GA)	Owens	Van Hollen
Johnson, E. B.	Pallone	Vargas
Kaptur	Pascrell	Veasey
Keating	Pastor (AZ)	Vela
Kelly (IL)	Payne	Velázquez
Kennedy	Pelosi	Visclosky
Kildee	Perlmutter	Walz
Kilmer	Peters (CA)	Wasserman
Kind	Peters (MI)	Schultz
Kuster	Pingree (ME)	Waters
Langevin	Pocan	Waxman
Larsen (WA)	Polis	Welch
Larson (CT)	Price (NC)	Wilson (FL)
Lee (CA)	Quigley	Wolf
Levin	Rangel	Yarmuth
Lewis	Reichert	

NOT VOTING—10

Benishek	Hinojosa	Olson
Camp	Lummis	Schwartz
Campbell	McCarthy (NY)	
Duckworth	Miller, Gary	

□ 1506

Mr. PAYNE changed his vote from "aye" to "no."

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. FLEISCHMANN). The unfinished business is the question on agreeing to the Speaker's approval of the Journal, which the Chair will put de novo.

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

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

CONGRATULATING FIU COLLEGE OF ENGINEERING AND COMPUTING ON ITS 30TH ANNIVERSARY

(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, I rise to congratulate the College of Engineering and Computing at my alma mater, Florida International Univer-

sity, known as FIU, on its 30th anniversary of proven excellence in producing high-quality graduates.

The college was established with one mission in mind: to provide public access education to those interested in these fields and to serve as an instrument for economic development in our vibrant south Florida community. They have accomplished that and much more. From using nanotechnology to improve human health to building superior bridges, people's lives across the country are impacted each and every day in a positive way through FIU's STEM graduates.

FIU has also created many programs to encourage young students to pursue careers in STEM fields. Their latest innovative approach was to create an Accelerated Technology Magnet Program that would prepare low-income high school students for employment and educational options in computer science and information technology. I am certain FIU will continue to lead and produce more skilled professionals in these fields.

Go, FIU. Go, Golden Panthers.

193RD ANNIVERSARY OF GREEK INDEPENDENCE

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

Mr. SARBANES. Mr. Speaker, I rise today, March 25, to celebrate the 193rd anniversary of Greek independence. In Greek, we say "Long Live Greece, Long Live Freedom"—Zito Ellada, Zito Eleftheria—in recalling the day that the Greek people threw off the yoke of the Ottoman Empire and established modern Greece as a free and independent nation.

America's Founding Fathers drew upon the example of the ancient Greeks in forming our constitutional Republic, and modern Greece has been a staunch and dependable ally of the United States. Our relationship is based on shared democratic values and respect for individual freedom.

The spirit that guided the Greek people in securing their freedom nearly 200 years ago resides within them still. It is the reason I am confident that Greece will overcome the economic and humanitarian crisis that it faces today. The United States must and will stand as a strong partner in Greece's efforts to regain its footing, to take full advantage of new opportunities that are emerging in the eastern Mediterranean, and to move forward as a vital economic and cultural resource for a critical region of the world.

Knowing that America and Greece will stand together allows us to proclaim that both democracies will continue to live in freedom. Long Live Greece, Long Live America, Long Live Freedom—Zito Ellada, Zito Ameriki, Zito Eleftheria.

SELL AMERICAN NATURAL GAS  
TO UKRAINE

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

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, the Napoleon of Siberia, Putin, controls Ukraine and other European countries by holding their energy needs hostage. Russia uses gas as a political and economic weapon to manipulate its neighbors.

This does not have to be, and the United States can change that.

By selling European countries our oil and gas, we can reduce their dependence on imperialist Russia. We have more gas than we can use here in the United States, and we could sell the gas we don't need to our allies in Europe. That would create jobs here in America and help our allies overseas.

The same goes for crude oil.

Mr. Speaker, my amendment that passed the House Foreign Affairs Committee today would require the State Department to submit a report to Congress within 90 days on the effect our increased natural gas and crude oil exports would have on Russia's economic and political influence over Ukraine and other European nations.

Ukraine has to get their oil and gas from someplace. Let's have them buy American and make the Russian bear Putin and his energy irrelevant.

And that's just the way it is.

NATIONAL AGRICULTURE DAY

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

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, as a member of the House Agriculture Committee, I rise in support of the goals of National Agriculture Day, which is today, March 25.

Agriculture remains the number one industry in the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, supporting upwards of 63,000 family farms, generating more than \$67 billion in economic impact, and one in seven residents of Pennsylvania works in the agriculture sector.

While a good portion of America's population does not see firsthand where our food supply comes from, a wise man once told me that we shake hands with a farmer at least three times a day. This saying truly illustrates the importance of supporting agriculture, but equally the importance of supporting the future of agriculture and our future food security.

I had the pleasure of meeting with two officers of the Pennsylvania chapter of the Future Farmers of America earlier this morning. I commend them for their outreach efforts here in Washington to promote the goals of National Agriculture Day. Their advocacy in engaging the next generation to become farmers is crucial to ensuring our country has the most affordable, the highest quality, abundant, and safest food supply in the world.

CELEBRATING THE 100TH ANNI-  
VERSARY OF  
NORMAN  
BORLAUG'S BIRTH

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

Mrs. BACHMANN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in celebration of National Agriculture Day. But also, today marks the 100th anniversary of the birth of a man who literally changed the world. His name is Norman Borlaug. He was born in an upstairs bedroom in northeast Iowa 100 years ago today. He went to the University of Minnesota, where he received a Ph.D. degree in plant biology.

While he was in a class dealing with plant genetics and the future options of increased food production, Norman Borlaug had that moment of divine genius. That is when he applied himself to work. And Norman Borlaug, because of 6,000 experiments in very difficult terrain, created a grain of wheat that literally changed the world.

Norman Borlaug is rightly credited with saving the lives of over 1 billion people, 1 billion people on this Earth because he dedicated his life and persevered to create strains of wheat which would grow in India, Pakistan, Africa, and places that never before could be able to uphold a grain of wheat. He did that in East Asia with rice.

Today we honor and recognize and celebrate the life of one American who did so much for 1 billion people across the world.

□ 1515

OUR FIRST FREEDOM

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. DESANTIS). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2013, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GOHMERT) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. GOHMERT. Mr. Speaker, this is an important day right across the street at the U.S. Supreme Court Building. It has been interesting. In the past, most of the time that I am aware of, when there was a matter coming before the Supreme Court, they observed what is called reciprocity, just as if a U.S. Senator wants to come down here and observe—they can't speak on the floor—but they can come to the House floor. In the same way, we have reciprocity with the Senate. We can go down to the Senate and stand in the Chamber and be there in person, as I have done when RAND PAUL was doing what amounted to a filibuster and when TED CRUZ was doing what amounted to a filibuster.

With the Supreme Court, normally, if there are Members of Congress that are going to be coming, they will reserve a bench. There have been a couple of times that the bench was full and other Members of Congress filled those spaces before I got there; but it has

been an observation that, since this body is charged with funding the Supreme Court and providing what they need and determining what they don't really need, it is part of reciprocity that they provide those places to observe what is happening.

I have been rather ambivalent. I can see both sides of the issues of cameras in the courtroom, because as a judge, murder trials, other things of interest, networks would want to come film. I had one case that went for 10 weeks. We have very strict rules. We only allow one camera in the courtroom. It could never be worked on during anything that was going on, and it could never be a distraction at all. But I saw how cameras could work in the courtroom without being any problem at all.

Here in Congress, I have fairly much taken the position that if a camera is going to be in the courtroom, leave it up to the courts. But with the United States Supreme Court, as I have seen this week, there would be no harm in having a camera somewhere in the courtroom where people didn't notice so that Americans could see—since we moved the Supreme Court toward being an oligarchy—we could see what they are doing, whether they are sleeping, whether they are participating, or whether they are asking stupid questions.

I went over, and since I am sworn in as a member of the Supreme Court Bar, I was allowed to be in the overflow room and hear what was going on; so it was kind of difficult to really tell who was addressing what during the case that the Supreme Court was hearing this morning that I heard oral arguments on. This is an extremely critical case, and I couldn't tell which judge asked the questions, but when the Supreme Court is, in effect, expressing concern through their questions that a corporation, a for-profit corporation, could not possibly have firmly held religious beliefs, then it occurred to me, for Heaven's sake, this Justice Department doesn't seem to have a problem indicting corporations. So, if the Justice Department can indict a corporation and say they have an intent to violate the law, well, if that corporation can have intent with regard to violations of the law, it certainly ought to be able to form the intent to have firmly held religious beliefs.

It was shocking as I listened to questions from some of the Supreme Court Justices today, when that is compared with the history of the United States of America and Roger Williams, for example, whose statue has been moved last week, but how he formed Rhode Island because of his firmly held religious beliefs and his beliefs that there should be freedom of religion in America where the government does not interfere in any way.

You compare the beliefs of the Pilgrims who came from Holland to England and then here—they wanted religious freedom so they could serve the God of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob;

they could follow their Christian beliefs without being persecuted or without having a government say that you don't have any right to practice those beliefs—compared with the Supreme Court Justices, in effect, saying, gee, they could just pay the fine and it would be a lot cheaper than \$475 million in penalties they will have to pay. Actually, one Justice had the nerve to say: I believe that was called a tax and not a penalty.

Paul Clement was doing a great job. My immediate thought was, well, no, the Supreme Court at page 15 of the majority opinion said that clearly the mandate was a penalty. Congress called it a penalty. It clearly was a penalty. It is only assessed if you don't do what the bill requires people to do, so clearly it is a penalty. And since it is a penalty, they said at page 15, then we do have jurisdiction to go forward because, the Supreme Court pointed out, if that mandate were a tax, then under the anti-injunction statute, the Supreme Court would not have jurisdiction to have proceeded when they did and the plaintiffs that brought the case would not have had standing to bring the case. But they said, since this is clearly a penalty and not a tax, then we can go forward, because if it is a tax, then the Anti-Injunction Act kicks in, and we don't have jurisdiction at this time.

But on page 15, the Supreme Court called it a penalty. And they, in that opinion, apparently to the ignorance of at least one of our Supreme Court Justices, the Supreme Court called it a penalty at page 15, because they quoted the Congress calling it a penalty in ObamaCare, and they said, clearly, it is a penalty. We have got jurisdiction, and we will go ahead and determine the rest of the case.

Then you go over about 40 pages, and then they determine, okay, now that we are hearing this because it is a penalty and not a tax, we determine it is a tax and therefore it is constitutional.

We know under the rules of this House that Supreme Court judges would not do anything inappropriate, but, Mr. Speaker, I can tell you that opinion was indecent. It was a travesty. It was hypocritical, that decision was. How you can call it a penalty at page 15 and then, with a straight face, 40 pages later, say now it is a tax so it is a constitutional, and then sit as they were today and have a Justice say, kind of snidely: Well, we didn't call it a penalty. I mean it was called a tax. It depends on where you look in the majority opinion as to whether it is a penalty or a tax, but Congress clearly called it a penalty.

I am very concerned. We had someone who was in a position with the executive branch when ObamaCare was put together and pushed here in Congress, and in her position with the executive branch, at that time, she had to either be incompetent and failed to give the executive branch any advice on its most important bill that they

took up or there was a lie told that no advice was ever given about this bill. Either way, that Justice should not have been allowed to hear this case as a member of the Supreme Court because, clearly—and I think the questions that were apparently asked by her today show—she was an advocate, is an advocate now and most likely was an advocate then in this administration.

So this country is in trouble.

I yield to my dear friend from Minnesota (Mrs. BACHMANN) for any comments she might have.

Mrs. BACHMANN. Well, I want to thank the gentleman from Texas for allowing me to participate in this discussion, because this really is the issue of our day.

People on a political level are talking about ObamaCare and how ObamaCare is destroying our economy. It is hurting job prospects, and it is not allowing us to move into the robust growth we would be in without ObamaCare. But it is even more fundamental; and I think the gentleman from Texas, as a judge and as a lawyer, has been laying out, really, his broken heart over what he observed today at the Supreme Court.

I share that same level of heartbrokenness because this really is the whole game. This is the whole ball of wax. Because if you look at what America was founded upon and why we were founded in the first place, it was so that we could be a free land made up of free people who are allowed to exercise our own moral conscience—and not just in the realm of belief, freedom of belief, but also freedom of speech and freedom of expression. But even one step further, it is the exercise of our religious liberties.

There was a case that the gentleman from Texas would remember. It was during the Vietnam war era. It was called *Tinker v. Des Moines*, and the very famous holding out of that Supreme Court decision was this: students did not have to check their constitutional rights at the schoolhouse door. Today, the Supreme Court is taking up this question: Will the American employer and will the American employee have to check their religious liberties at their church door so they can only exercise their religious faith within the confines of their religious house of worship or maybe even so far as in their home, but certainly, according to the Obama administration, not in the workplace?

Think about it for a moment. The author of the Constitution of the United States, James Madison, and the other Founders specifically wrote the Constitution and, in particular, the First Amendment to the Constitution to guarantee that it wasn't just behind closed doors in our church or behind the confines of our home that we would be entitled to religious liberty of freedom of belief and freedom of expression and walking out our faith, because isn't that what most churches and syn-

agogues and mosques advocate during the time of worship, that we live our faith, that we don't have a dead faith but an alive faith that we practice?

This is really the key, and this is the issue. We are here in the most lively place on the planet for speech—the House of Representatives. Representative GOHMERT is standing in the well. There is no other piece of real estate on this Earth that allows for greater freedom of speech and expression than right here. In fact, we are protected by law. We can't be arrested while we are coming here to cast a vote. We can't be dragged off to a court because of the speech that we enjoy here on this House floor.

Just merely steps from here, if you pass through Statuary Hall and into the rotunda—Representative GOHMERT has given probably more tours of this building than any other Members of Congress, and I know when he gives that tour he points to one of the seminal paintings that hangs in the rotunda. That painting is called the "Embarkation of the Pilgrims," and it shows our ancestors, the Pilgrims, as they bowed on their knees before a holy God, the Bible in front of them on their lap turned to the New Testament. And on the sail of the ship it says, "God with us," hanging in the rotunda just in yonder Hall.

The Pilgrims left their surroundings not because they didn't like England and not because they didn't like Holland. They came to the United States because their religious liberties were being infringed upon. They weren't allowed to believe and act on their belief in such a way where they truly felt free.

□ 1530

So they came to the United States of America. That was in 1620 when the Pilgrims first came, and it wasn't until later in 1776 when the Declaration of Independence was passed, and then later in 1789, I believe, or '87 when the Constitution of the United States was passed, but the author of the Constitution, James Madison, wrote, and I just the week before last saw the First Amendment to the Constitution. It was written in James Madison's hand. I bent over and read in that beautiful calligraphy script, and James Madison scratched out the original words that he was going to put in the First Amendment. It was full toleration of religious expression, meaning we tolerate your belief. Instead, what he wrote in was "free exercise."

So that not only was our government saying that it is nonnegotiable, there is no negotiating away these rights. These were fundamental rights every American enjoyed just because we are Americans—freedom of religious belief and freedom of free exercise, expression of those beliefs.

That is what is on trial today before the Supreme Court. It should have never gotten there because our liberties shouldn't be up for sale. That is

part of the problem. We believe there should be equal treatment under the law for every American—Black, White, whether or not you are male, female, poor, rich—everybody should be treated equally under the law. Is that true under ObamaCare? According to the Becket Fund, they say over 100 million Americans who are politically connected to this administration are exempted or waived from some of the requirements under the Affordable Care Act. But Americans who have religious objections to providing drugs or devices that would take the life of innocent Americans, they are being denied the exercise of their religious liberties.

So just think of that: over 100 million people, whether they belong to a union or maybe they work for a university, but somehow they are politically connected to this President and this administration, they are waived, but the people who aren't politically connected, they have a different kind of justice that they have to come under. That is wrong, and that denies equal treatment under the law.

Mr. GOHMERT. I would say to the gentlelady, I was not aware of the line that was scratched out by James Madison, but obviously if he scratched out "tolerate" and added in "free exercise," it was intended to be more than just tolerant. This was a bedrock principle. I know the gentlelady, I doubt there is anybody else in all of Congress or even the Senate that has a master's in tax law, as the gentlelady from Minnesota does, but I know we have both heard during our professional lives that the power to tax is the power to destroy.

I don't have the exact words, and I haven't seen the transcript or heard any replay since I was at the Supreme Court building this morning, but to hear a Supreme Court Justice of this country say to the litigants' attorney, in essence:

Why don't you just pay the tax, the penalty, and then you can have your religious beliefs?

Staggering.

Mrs. BACHMANN. Could we talk about that?

Mr. GOHMERT. I yield to the gentlelady. I doubt you were aware that in essence that question was asked:

Why don't you just pay that tax?

Mrs. BACHMANN. Let's talk about the reality as an employer and an employee of how egregious this tax is.

The employers that were in front of the Supreme Court today, and there were two employers before the Supreme Court today, they could pay the tax. They could do that, and then enjoy their religious liberty. This is what the tax is: it is over \$36,000 per employee per year. So we are talking about a company that has 16,000 employees. They offer a very generous health care package. The employer wants to provide health insurance for their employees. In fact, they already offer 16 different contraceptives. They just don't believe, because it violates their moral

belief, that they should supply four different contraceptives because it takes the life of a innocent human being. So they fully pay for health insurance, but if this employer decided they didn't want to offer health insurance, then they would pay the government a \$2,000 fine per person. So they can either choose to offer health insurance and pay over \$36,000 a year, which would effectively shut the company down. They would have to go out of business.

Mr. GOHMERT. And apparently it is phenomenal insurance. The employees love it.

Mrs. BACHMANN. Yes, it is very, very high, wonderful insurance that they already offer. Or they offer no insurance and they pay the government a \$2,000 fine, and the employees don't get any health care, by the way. Or they can choose to violate their moral conscience. Or they can just close their doors and go out of business. This is freedom under the Obama administration? This is freedom for the American people?

I think the gentleman would agree that the supreme irony of all of this is that we have a President today who under article II is given executive power, and he has made a decision apparently that he is going also to arrogate to himself the power that is given to Congress under article I, which is to make the laws, because this President is currently making his own law, even as we speak every day. But it is also arrogating to himself the powers of article III of the judicial system when he and our Attorney General said they don't agree that the Defense of Marriage Act is a constitutional law, so they are not going to uphold it, in violation of article II, which says the President must faithfully execute the laws of the land.

So we have a President who, ironically, is taking power that wasn't granted to him, and by this law today he is taking away fundamental guaranteed rights from the American people. The President is giving himself power unconstitutionally, but he is taking away from the American people power that belongs to them.

That to me is a part of gangster government. We talked about gangster government early on when the President issued 3,400 pink slips to automobile dealerships all across America. He shut them down virtually overnight because he said so. Now we have a President who is giving a pink slip to anybody who wants to exercise their religious liberty rights.

We are here to say, Mr. Speaker, to the President of the United States—I hope he is listening—that our First Amendment rights, our Second Amendment rights, all of our rights are non-negotiable because they are guaranteed by the Constitution of the United States. That is why this matters, and that is why the gentleman from Texas is dead-on today to talk about this issue because this is it. If we lose political speech and expression and reli-

gious liberty, it is game over for the American people. It is game over.

Mr. GOHMERT. I would like to ask the gentlelady a question, knowing our American history as well as you do: Can you imagine if King George had sent a decree that said pay a \$2,000 penalty or tax and then you can observe your religious beliefs, what would the gentlelady think would be the response of Patrick Henry, John Adams, James Madison, Thomas Payne, and all of those people? Thomas Payne was not a very religious man, but he was big on rights.

Mrs. BACHMANN. We know exactly what they would say. Patrick Henry said:

Give me liberty or give me death.

They were willing to put their lives, their honor, their sacred fortune on the line to fight for exactly what the Obama administration has been eager to deny to the American people, which is political speech and expression, and also religious liberty. We know that is what they would do.

They would do far more than dump some boxes of tea into Boston Harbor in one of the first tea parties there is. If they thought the Tea Party was strong now, you ain't seen nothing yet, because we are going to see the American people rise up in force. They are unwilling to put duct tape willingly over their mouths. They are unwilling to put duct tape over their moral conscience. They are unwilling to put duct tape over their hearts, to have a heart for God.

People will stand for freedom. It is written in our DNA as Americans. It is what we do for a living. We get up in the morning and we fight for liberty. It is who we are. The Obama administration can pass an unconstitutional bill, which ObamaCare is, but the American people won't stand for it. That is why we are here today in this Chamber, where we still retain free speech, to hopefully continue to give free speech and religious liberty to every American so they don't have to check their religious liberty at the doors of their church or their synagogue or their home.

Mr. GOHMERT. If it came down to this, the Federal Government, of course using the IRS under ObamaCare to enforce the law, the Federal Government comes and says, the gentlelady from Minnesota must either pay a \$2,000 fine, penalty, tax, whatever they may wish to call it today, or you cannot observe your religious beliefs, what would the gentlelady's reaction be?

Mrs. BACHMANN. Fundamentally what they are doing in this legislation, and apparently the question that the Supreme Court Justice asked today, that is what the Justice was saying. That is that you pay a fine of over \$36,000 a year per employee, and then that is the price for exercising your religious liberty. So you can have religious liberty, but it is at a very steep price. Since when did it become for sale? That is the issue. That is what is

unconstitutional about this bill. No one has to pay for speech. Are we going to start charging the printing presses? What about local TV? What about bloggers and what about all of the mainstream media, usually called "Team Obama." What if they have to start paying for the privilege of being able to publish? Then where would they be in their defense of the administration?

Mr. GOHMERT. Well, it is going to be interesting, and this is a bit of a tangent, but because of what the gentlelady has pointed out, this President has indicated he is going to turn over control of the Internet away from where it is now to an international confab that has been champing at the bit to have a chance to control the Internet. They have been hoping desperately that some day they would have something that everybody wanted to use so they could begin taxing it, charging fees to use the Internet. And once they could do that, then the international entity, like the U.N., wouldn't have to go begging to the different countries that make up its membership. They could require taxes and penalties to be paid in order to publish on the Internet, in order to send an email on the Internet. You could rack up taxes, and then they will be a permanent entity from now on once we give control of the Internet over to an international group that will have authority to tax those who want to publish online.

So we are talking about the disaster that ObamaCare is, but that is where it is going.

Mrs. BACHMANN. The gentleman is exactly right because if you have an international body, whether it is the U.N. or some other international body—we know that the largest bloc in the U.N. is the OIC, the Organization of Islamic Cooperation. And the number one agenda item of the Organization of Islamic Cooperation is to criminalize speech, any speech that they consider as an insult to their prophet.

So we would see across the world again a silencing of freedom of speech and expression dictated in all likelihood by this large bloc at the U.N., which takes us back to religious liberty here in the United States.

As the gentleman asked in his original question, what about this idea of the government being able to tax us for religious speech? I believe that if we lose this case, this will set the precedent that the government will then be able to dictate and decide any practice that touches our religious belief.

So, for instance, if you are in a doctor's office or if you are in a counselor's office or a therapist's office, the government could conceivably then dictate to the therapist what the therapist can say or not say in that office; or likewise, a doctor, what they can say or not say.

□ 1545

Let's remember, again, what this is. This isn't a company imposing its be-

liefs on employees because employees are free to buy whatever they want to buy in health care.

This is the government. This is government censorship. This is our government forcing government's politically correct beliefs and religious ideas down the throats of every American—every American company, every American employer, every American employee.

Do we see where this is leading? It is here right now. It is government-enforced coerced speech. I want to say that again. This is government-enforced coerced speech—speech and religious practice.

Now, the Federal Government is going to have the power to force you and me and everyone listening to us today, the government gets to choose, the government gets to decide what our speech is, what our religious expression is. That is not America.

You see, that is it. That is the entire game right there. That is why I say it is game over if we lose on this issue. That is how central and important the issue is that the gentleman from Texas is bringing up today.

Mr. GOHMERT. I just can't avoid thinking in these terms the conclusion when, ultimately, you follow the logic of at least one of the Supreme Court justices.

In essence, what is being implied by the question is if you want to avoid paying to kill a child in the womb, then just pay the tax, and we will allow you to observe your conscience, your firmly held religious beliefs.

It is staggering that anybody, any justice on the United States Supreme Court, would have rationalized to the point that—could ever even dream of saying: just pay the fine penalty tax, and then you don't have to pay for killing children in utero.

Mrs. BACHMANN. The gentleman is absolutely correct because in that statement lies the premise. The premise that the justice is embracing is that you don't have a guaranteed right to religious expression and to religious thought; you don't have that right. That is our right. We will sell it. The only question at this point is how much and can you afford it.

Now, for people who are poor people, will the government be subsidizing them so that they can buy their indulgence from the government?

Is that what it will be? We have to buy indulgences from the government now?

Mr. GOHMERT. It is protection.

Mrs. BACHMANN. Protection money.

Mr. GOHMERT. From the government.

Mrs. BACHMANN. That is why I call it a gangster government. It is a gangster government when you have to buy protection from your own government. In this instance, it is over \$36,000 per year, per employee.

In fact, the fine is in excess of what the wage is for some of the employees that are being provided full generous health insurance.

Mr. GOHMERT. The gentlelady brought up something that I don't recall being mentioned during the entire argument. Hobby Lobby, because of their Christian beliefs, not only wants to provide compensation, they want to provide an excellent health care policy.

What I don't believe was brought up in the entire oral argument was that the employees can buy supplemental insurance to cover those four drugs that will kill children in utero, and nothing is denying them that opportunity.

Mrs. BACHMANN. And can I tell you at what price?

Mr. GOHMERT. Certainly.

Mrs. BACHMANN. This is how inexpensive it is. This doesn't deny any employee to go out and purchase a drug that would kill their child in the womb.

You can purchase it at one retailer for \$4 a month and another retailer—all of these retailers are widely available across the United States—for \$9 a month, so this is well within the grasp of any employee.

The one employer from Oklahoma that you mentioned pays a starting wage of over \$14 an hour. There is a lot of Americans listening right now who would love to have a job at \$14 an hour—in fact, I think it is \$14.61 per hour, I think that is their starting wage—plus very generous health insurance benefits.

So why in the world would the Obama administration deny to 16,000 employees scattered across the United States potentially their job, their livelihood? It is either you agree with our administration's view of religion and morality or you forfeit your company.

This is a pretty big deal. This is about as big as it gets. This to me shows a stunning arrogance of power by the Obama administration, that they would force people to give up and yield their religious liberty and freedom of expression rights or pay for that right.

Mr. GOHMERT. One of the justices—and, again, since we don't have cameras in the courtroom yet, I will be fighting for that in the future, I could only listen to the audio—but one of the justices, again, tried to belittle Paul Clement's comment that they have a choice.

The gentlelady has pointed out accurately that you can pay \$2,000 or \$36,500; but he was indicating that, when you add up, with all the employees they have, the total cost, they either pay \$475 million, or they can drop the insurance, leave the employees in a real dilemma to have to go buy ObamaCare insurance that, other than those four contraceptives that bring about abortion, they provide them far better insurance than what ObamaCare requires.

So when he said it is either \$475 million or \$26 million, she was insisting that you could just pay the \$2,000 fine and was virtually in unbelief that it actually amounted to \$26 million when

you add up all the people they would have to pay for.

So that was his position before the Supreme Court: to follow our religious beliefs, we either pay \$475 million or we pay \$26 million.

Mrs. BACHMANN. In fines, in fines to the government, and nobody gives anything. In fact, you give up the health insurance you have today. That is why people are so upset, and rightly so, across the country because more people have lost health insurance, we are told, than have gained health insurance under ObamaCare.

Again, all across my district—I am sure you have the same stories, it breaks your heart—people whose deductibles quadrupled, people whose premiums quadrupled if they still have insurance. This is real.

Then you have got the spectre, as the Becket Fund said, of over 100 million Americans who are politically well connected enough to this administration under what I call gangster government that they were able to be waived out of the ObamaCare requirements.

Does that mean that they get to exercise their religious liberties, but if you are a business that has, what, Christian-held beliefs, then you are going to lose those beliefs?

This is insanity. We have to have freedom in this country, and we have to have equal application of justice under the law. That is who we are. It is a good thing. It is what builds us up. That is worth fighting for.

Mr. GOHMERT. That is who we have been. The question now before the Supreme Court is: Is that who we will continue to be?

We know that at least one justice of the Supreme Court seems to think that it is okay for the government to tax you \$2,000. Just pay the tax, and then you can observe your religious beliefs, even though it keeps you from providing the great health care that you have been providing.

I will tell you that this is a seminal point in our history. ObamaCare, that decision broke my heart because I thought so much of Chief Justice John Roberts. Then when you read the decision, the decision is so poorly written, so pitifully reasoned, so hypocritical within the decision itself.

Yes, it is a penalty, so we have got jurisdiction, and now that we have got jurisdiction, it is a tax, so it is constitutional. I mean, it is totally at odds with itself.

Now, we are to this place. Is a majority of the Supreme Court going to say: Pilgrims, Roger Williams, all of you that brought us to the place where the freest, most successful country in the history of the world, those freedoms that you saw, that you prayed for, they are going away because now, since the government has the power to tax, it will have the power to destroy your religions?

As the gentlelady points out, why stop with \$2,000? Once the Supreme Court says this government has the

power to tax you to observe your religious beliefs, why not \$10,000, why not \$20,000, why not \$50,000?

Mrs. BACHMANN. Well, remember that the tax to express your religious beliefs is \$36,500 per employee. The tax is \$2,000 per employee if you decide you are not going to purchase health insurance, so it is extremely expensive.

I think the gentleman is raising an excellent point because to where do the people of this country repair? If we have a President who many believe is no longer following the Constitution of the United States under article II with the limitations of power or if we look at the Supreme Court and the Supreme Court justices themselves are not rendering opinions that are within the Constitution of the United States, what do the people do?

The Constitution provides for impeachment for justices. There is impeachment provided for the President of the United States. That is an option, but those are options of last resort.

I think what we are trying to do is appeal to the justices, to think of the people, think of the oath they took to the Constitution. Don't consider that, every time you meet in the Supreme Court, that you are in a new open constitutional convention.

It isn't a constitutional convention where the justices have a free pen and a phone, so to speak, and can rewrite the Constitution.

We are appealing to the justices to limit themselves under the Constitution and observe that the First Amendment has been ironclad since James Madison wrote it.

We are here on this floor today saying we stand with James Madison, we stand with the people of this country, and we are not, for one moment, going to allow anyone to attack any American's religious liberties and freedoms.

Mr. GOHMERT. Well, chains can be figuratively applied—figuratively applied when someone taxes because a tax hung around the neck is a burden. It is a chain. It is an albatross. It can be devastating, as some people have found out.

□ 1600

Mr. GOHMERT. Going back to this morning, as I mentioned, I am a member admitted to practice before the Supreme Court. It is a great honor, back when I was a real lawyer. There is seating in front of the bar for the members of the Supreme Court Bar, so those were full. So there is an overflow room where we listened to the audio but obviously don't get to see what is going on.

I was just listening to the argument, the oral argument audibly, without the benefit of being able to see which Justice asked which question. I don't know that I will be able to forget the premise of an educated Supreme Court Justice, almost rhetorically, asking: Why don't you just pay the \$2,000? She didn't say this, but pay the \$2,000 so you can practice your firmly held reli-

gious beliefs. That is what her question amounted to.

Mrs. BACHMANN. Did she say the \$2,000 or \$36,500?

Mr. GOHMERT. She pointed out the \$2,000.

Mrs. BACHMANN. What she was saying is: Don't provide health insurance for your employees. Just push your employees out in the cold. They can sit on the curb. They won't have employer-sponsored insurance—which, by the way, has zero tax consequence to the employee. They have no tax consequences.

Under ObamaCare, every American is forced to buy a product whether they want it or not, even if they can't necessarily afford it. So then people now under ObamaCare have to go buy a product that the government dictates to them they have to buy at a price that the government dictates that they have to pay. So either they get health insurance with no tax consequence or they have to buy their health insurance with after-tax income, money that they have already paid taxes on. Now they are going to get double-hurt under ObamaCare.

So, what the President wins, the American people lose. That is our choice. The President wins; the American people lose—financially, freedom, most importantly in this case, religious liberty, and that is not acceptable under our constitutional guarantee of liberty.

I don't care who it is, because the Magna Carta taught King John at Runnymede that no man is above the law, especially the King, because that is who you have to worry about. It is no different in the United States of America. No man is to be above the law, including the President of the United States. He can't just change a law with the stroke of a pen or with a telephone call. He's not allowed to under our system of justice, but he also is not within his power to deny anyone their religious liberty rights.

Mr. GOHMERT. The gentlewoman makes a great point. But unfortunately or fortunately, depending on your point of view, the Founders created so much in the way of checks and balances to prevent the government from abusing the power, as the gentlewoman points out.

If the Congress will not protect its own powers, as we have not, the Senate has been very protective of the President's executive orders that usurped our power. They have gladly handed over power.

I was shocked to hear in this very room, as the President spoke from this podium, a standing ovation from most of the people on this side of the aisle when the President, in effect, said: If you don't change the law, I will. And they stand and applaud a President who says, in effect: I am going to usurp even more of the legislative power given to Congress under article I than I have already taken.

It is staggering to hear that applauded. It is also staggering to me to

see the Senate has a body, in effect, protecting the President's usurpation of our power. That is one check, one balance.

Mrs. BACHMANN. I was here in the Chamber with the gentleman. I saw and observed exactly what you said, that our colleagues across the aisle stood up and applauded. That is a constitutional crisis. As we are having this discussion today, we are in the midst of a constitutional crisis with a President who is aggregating to himself powers that are not constitutionally his. He is rendering also, taking away and denying constitutional liberties to the American people in terms of freedom of speech, expression, and religious liberty.

It is interesting, too, with all due respect to our colleagues across the aisle, they are applauding becoming dinosaurs when the President of the United States decides that he will also be Congress and he will also write the laws.

Thank you very much. I don't need your help. I am going to do what I want to do.

Why in the world would any Member of this body who has an election certificate applaud that now they get to become a dinosaur? Now they are no longer relevant. We might as well dispense with the cost of elections altogether and go home and revert to what King George III wanted in the first place, which is a total and complete and absolute government with one person calling all the shots. That isn't our form of government.

Mr. GOHMERT. Well, I was shocked that one of the Justices asked the question, basically: How can or does a corporation exercise religious freedom?

You know, this Justice knows that the Justice Department has indicted corporations charging criminal intent, intent to violate the law, and yet she cannot figure out how a corporation could have intent to violate the law but could not have intent to have religiously held beliefs. That was a bit staggering to me to hear that question: How can a corporation exercise religious beliefs?

Mrs. BACHMANN. She also fails to understand that the Federal Government again is practicing censorship and that the Federal Government is the one forcing its vision of morality and religious belief on every American. Again, that is government-enforced coercive speech and morality and religious expression. That is also contained in that remarkable premise of the Supreme Court Justice.

Mr. GOHMERT. Well, it is remarkable. Again, the Justice, if I heard her correctly, just advocated, well, just drop the insurance. Drop the insurance. This company is providing great insurance, as the gentlewoman pointed out, and her point was not made because time is so limited. I know Paul Clement knows, but that is such a huge benefit to the employee.

There was discussion by the Supreme Court about benefits to the employee.

Well, gee, you can raise their salaries and make up the difference, when actually you may have to raise that salary an extra third in order to cover the cost that is pretax to the employee. So the employee is getting hammered when they just, as this Justice appeared to callously advocate, just drop the insurance, pay the \$2,000 tax penalty. Congress said "penalty"; they said "penalty" and "tax," take your pick. Either way, they were advocating harming the employee.

Mrs. BACHMANN. Sixteen thousand employees of one company.

Mr. GOHMERT. Harming 16,000 employees as a way to deal with an unconstitutional act.

Mrs. BACHMANN. By the way, isn't it true, if the gentleman recalls, that while this Supreme Court Justice was just advocating, in a flippant way, drop health insurance coverage for over 16,000 employees, doesn't that same Supreme Court Justice enjoy Federal employee health insurance? And isn't that same Supreme Court Justice protected from not going into ObamaCare?

It seems to me that our President is not in ObamaCare nor are the Supreme Court Justices in ObamaCare. It seems to me that there is a shield of protection for them. It is good enough for the American people to suffer under ObamaCare, but I don't believe our President or the Supreme Court Justices have to be in ObamaCare.

Mr. GOHMERT. That is my recollection. And some of us were pushing for and asking our leadership why don't we do an amendment that will make sure the Supreme Court has to be under ObamaCare. I really think that would have been the more appropriate thing to do. In fact, I still think it is the appropriate thing to do.

It is hard to know, since Congress was not given a chance to see what the Supreme Court was doing and who was asking what questions, but it sure seems like since they feel so strongly about ObamaCare, that they really should have the chance to experience it firsthand and just find out how wonderful it is.

Mrs. BACHMANN. I would like to share my experience with it, because as Members of Congress we were forced to go into ObamaCare. The only exchange we were allowed to go in was the one here in Washington, D.C. It is called a small business link. The only small business is Congress, the government. We are the ones put in.

Just for the record, my own individual premium increased for the same number of people in our family that we would have to cover. Our premium was scheduled to increase times four. So we would have had to increase our premium by four times, and our deductible was quadrupled. That also went up four times. So there was no Affordable Care Act in our family. It is an extremely unaffordable health insurance act.

I would be curious to know if the Supreme Court Justices would voluntarily put themselves in ObamaCare so

they, too, could know the pleasure of what it is to pay four times more for the same health insurance than my family paid last year.

Mr. GOHMERT. One of the Justices appeared to point out, apparently, that an agency is the one that established so many of these things. So the question arises, since an agency can say your insurance policy must provide this medicine, this medicine, not this medicine, this medicine, have we given unelected bureaucrats the power to determine what your religious beliefs firmly held include? Because under ObamaCare, an agency says: Your religious rights must yield to our unelected bureaucratic decision that this medication must be included; therefore, your First Amendment rights yield to our unelected bureaucratic agency rights to decide what your religious rights have to include and what they don't.

Mrs. BACHMANN. That is exactly right. That is government-enforced coercion on religious belief. It varies at caprice and whim. That is one thing under the rule of law that has been a pillar of American exceptionalism, the fact that under the rule of law there is certainty for the American people. If you look at the Declaration of Independence and the Constitution, you knew with certainty when you woke up tomorrow morning that your religious liberties were intact. Now, apparently, today, the gentleman was in the Chamber and heard that, according to at least one Supreme Court Justice, in her opinion, they aren't so certain anymore.

It is not only the election of the Court, but at the election of the unnamed bureaucrat who decides today we will have these killer drugs that we mandate. Tomorrow what drugs will they take off the list? Will I not get lifesaving drugs that I would need to get? Will I not get lifesaving treatments that I thought I was going get? Will the bureaucrats decide that only politically connected best friends of the administration get certain surgical procedures or get to see the best doctors? We don't know, because apparently the Supreme Court has decided that the bureaucracy must be fully imbued with all power.

That means again that the President and his administration wins their religious liberty and the right to force their religious views down the throats of the American people. While the President wins, the American people lose, and they lose under the protections of the Constitution. It is unlike anything we have ever seen before in the history of the United States of America. It is a seminal day in Washington, D.C., and it is why the American people better wake up really quickly and watch what is happening, because we are living in a country we no longer recognize. It is being rewritten by unelected bureaucrats. It is being rewritten by Supreme Court Justices who apparently think that the

amendments in the Constitution are optional rather than mandatory.

Mr. GOHMERT. Well, God bless Justices Antonin Scalia, Clarence Thomas. I didn't hear Justice Thomas ask questions. He normally doesn't. It is extraordinary to spend time with Justice Thomas. You find out rather quickly just how really brilliant he is.

□ 1615

He didn't need affirmative action to get him into Yale Law School—or Harvard, as he was accepted to, but at the time thought was too conservative.

Justice Scalia took on the Government's position. The Government's attorney stood up and basically said if a corporation is for profit, no matter how religiously convicted the holders of that are, they have no right to religious beliefs. Scalia took him on and said there has never been a case.

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

#### REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 1459, ENSURING PUBLIC INVOLVEMENT IN THE CREATION OF NATIONAL MONUMENTS ACT

Mr. BISHOP of Utah (during the Special Order of Mr. GOHMERT), from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 113-385) on the resolution (H. Res. 524) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 1459) to ensure that the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 applies to the declaration of national monuments, 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.

#### THE PRICE IS WRONG

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2013, the gentlewoman from California (Ms. SPEIER) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Ms. SPEIER. Mr. Speaker, I thank you for the opportunity to address the House tonight on what is called the Defense Logistics Agency, something probably not many people have heard about. The DLA is like a big hardware store in the Department of Defense.

About 30 years ago, we heard horrific stories about wasteful spending of taxpayers' dollars being spent: \$436 on a hammer, \$7,600 on coffee makers, and \$640 for toilet seats. We all thought, Well, it has been taken care of. Well, not so fast.

I am showing you right now what is a plumbing elbow. At the local hardware store, this elbow sells for \$1.41. But the taxpayers of this country spent \$80 to a defense contractor that charged us that much money for this elbow.

How about a box of washers? At the local hardware store, we as individuals would pay something like \$1.22 for this box of washers. What did the taxpayers of this country pay a defense con-

tractor for a box of washers? How about \$196.50?

So that issue that was around some 30 years ago is still with us today. It is time for the House of Representatives and for the Armed Services Committee to hold a hearing on why it is that the Defense Logistics Agency, our hardware store that is responsible for putting together good pricing on spare parts, is being overturned and overlooked by defense contractors and persons within the Department of Defense who would rather go outside and pay triple, quadruple, 100 percent more, or 200 percent more.

We are going to play a game tonight on C-SPAN called "The Price Is Wrong," and see what we are talking about here. And if for 1 minute you think that we are talking about small potatoes, we are not talking about small potatoes. We are talking about a lot of money.

The Defense Department has so many excess spare parts, they have disposed of—thrown away—\$15 billion in excess parts and materials in just the last 3 years. There is about \$96 billion worth of spare parts inventory right now in the Defense hardware agency coffers.

So why would we ever go outside the internal hardware store to buy parts?

Well, some argue that it is faster or it is cheaper to go outside. Audits have revealed instances when the military had enough of certain parts that they would last 100 years—and they are still going outside of the Defense Logistics Agency. That is the equivalent of having spare parts that include horseshoes for a cavalry. If we were looking back in time today, that is 100 years of spare parts. The likelihood of these parts being used completely over 100 years is not so likely.

You might say, Well, maybe it is difficult for the Defense Department to figure out where their spare parts are and how much they are and how much they cost. Well, that is not correct. In fact, the Department of Defense has the resources and the databases to check the accuracy of these prices. The auditor found these overcharges by using the Department of Defense's own database. So this is no more than a click on a mouse to find out, one, whether the part is in stock and, two, how much it costs.

Well, let's start this game. The first game we are going to play is called "Flip Flop." It is a game where the numbers are scrambled.

I am going to start with the gate assembly in this picture here. This is what it looks like. It is a little bit larger than a quarter. Ramp gate roller assembly. It is used for the Chinook helicopters.

You can buy this at a local hardware store for about \$3.50, but because this is the military and we want the very best quality, the DLA sells this part for \$7.71.

So the question is, What did the Army pay for this gate assembly? Did they pay \$7.71 cents? No, they didn't pay that.

Did they pay \$77.01?

No, they didn't pay that either.

Did they pay \$771 for this little gate assembly part?

No.

For this ramp gate roller assembly they paid \$1,678.61.

That is obscene, and that shouldn't be happening in the Department of Defense or anywhere in the Federal Government. The taxpayers should not be ripped off in that manner.

In "The Price Is Wrong," taxpayers always lose because the Defense Department consistently pays too much, yet defense contractors consistently win.

So we are going to play the next game, which is "That's Too Much." See what happens again when the military thinks that they can get something faster and cheaper by not going to the Defense Logistics Agency, our in-house hardware store.

This is a bearing sleeve. Let's see what we paid for this. Did we pay \$6? That is what it would cost at our local defense hardware store. No, we didn't pay \$6.

Was \$86 too much to spend for that bearing sleeve?

No, \$86 wasn't too much.

How about \$286? Was that too much to pay?

No, that wasn't too much to pay either.

We paid \$2,286 for a bearing sleeve that cost \$6 at the Defense Department's Defense Logistics Agency.

So that is what we are dealing with here—a rip-off of the taxpayers.

The truth of the matter is that the Defense Department didn't just buy one of these bearing sleeves that we just bought one of here this evening. They bought 573 of these bearing sleeves—not for \$6, not for \$86, but for \$2,286. And let me do the math for you. That is \$1.3 million in overpayments for just these 573 bearing sleeves.

Next, we are going to talk about a spur gear for the Chinook helicopter. This is what it looks like. It is this tiny little thing smaller than a quarter. This is what is used in Chinook helicopters. We have lots of them in the DLA. But, again, they didn't want to go to the DLA, our hardware store, to actually purchase this.

They would have paid \$12.51 if they had gone to the hardware store within the Department. No, they didn't want to do that.

So was \$125 too much to pay for that spur gear?

No, that wasn't too much.

In fact, they were willing to pay \$644.75 for this little rubberized spur gear. It was 34 times the fair and reasonable price.

So, again, why are we doing something like this? Why are we allowing the taxpayer dollars to be flushed down the toilet by not paying what is the normal price for these spare parts?

The last part is a flush door ring. Look at this. This is a pen next to it so

you can see this is a pretty small part. It is smaller than a pen the contracting officer would have used to sign off on the price. The DLA sells this part for \$8.37.

Did we pay \$83.37 for this product?

No, we didn't pay \$83.37. That wasn't too much.

What we did pay, though, was \$284.46 for this flush ring—34 times the fair and reasonable price. For that price you could go to dinner, a movie, and rent a hotel room.

Which brings me, I guess, to our last game, "The Showcase Showdown" on "The Price Is Wrong." Much like "The Price Is Right," we have this final showcase and we are going to compare two packages and guess which one costs more.

The first showcase is two ramp gate roller assemblies. This was the very first thing that we showed you earlier. Here it is. This is the item that cost \$7.71.

So the question is, which costs more as a package, two ramp gate roller assemblies or a trip to Paris, France? It includes airfare and 4 nights in a four-star hotel for two adults. Which one do we think costs more?

Well, you have probably figured out that we in fact paid more for the ramp gate roller assembly, times two, than you would have paid for a trip to Paris France. The Army paid \$3,357.22 for these two parts, while the trip to Paris is only \$2,681.

So what are we doing here? How many more studies have to be done for us to make a serious attempt to clean up the spare parts issue in the Department of Defense?

Very recently—in fact, it just came out in February of this year—the inspector general for the Department of Defense put out this report entitled, "Air Force Lifecycle Management Center Could Not Identify Actual Costs of F-119 Engine Spare Parts Purchased From Pratt and Whitney."

Can it get any more embarrassing than that? Not only are we spending extraordinary sums of money on spare parts and not using the internal hardware agency that we have, but in an inspector general's report, the Air Force can't even figure out how much it paid for the initial spare parts.

So I would close, Mr. Speaker, by saying that we have a lot to do. The Army overpaid Boeing \$13 million recently, but the Pentagon only recovered \$2.6 million.

□ 1630

It included paying twice the fair and reasonable price for kits, overpaid \$16,000 for a structural support that should have only cost about \$1,300.

So, all right, we overpaid; they overcharged. What happened next? Well, after the IG exposed the rip-off that had occurred, what did we do? Was that defense contractor kicked out?

No, I am sorry to say that what happened was the Air Force gave this contractor a new contract to oversee the

supply chain contract. That is like giving the fox a contract to guard the chicken house.

I don't like playing this game any more than I think the taxpayers do; and it is not a game, it is truly a disaster, and it is one that we, as Members of the House of Representatives, have to clean up.

So I will continue to make the public aware of these kinds of overpayments until we fix the system. Stay tuned for the next show, "The Price Is Wrong."

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

#### ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

Karen L. Haas, Clerk of the House, reported and found truly enrolled a bill of the House of the following title, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H.R. 3771. An act to accelerate the income tax benefits for charitable cash contributions for the relief of victims of the Typhoon Haiyan in the Philippines.

#### ADJOURNMENT

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

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 4 o'clock and 31 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, March 26, 2014, at 10 a.m. for morning-hour debate.

#### EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

5057. A letter from the Director, Joint Staff, Department of Defense, transmitting a letter regarding a report on the construction requirements related to antiterrorism and force protection or urban training; to the Committee on Armed Services.

5058. A letter from the Under Secretary, Department of Defense, transmitting the semi-annual status report of the U.S. Chemical Demilitarization Program for March 2014; to the Committee on Armed Services.

5059. A letter from the Acting Deputy Secretary, Department of Defense, transmitting a letter regarding recommendations to the Military Compensation and Retirement Modernization Commission; to the Committee on Armed Services.

5060. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the Department's Community Services Block Grant Report to Congress for Fiscal Year 2010; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

5061. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting a report on gifts given by the United States to foreign individuals for Fiscal Year 2013, pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2694(2); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

5062. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting the Department's determination and certification under Section 490(b)(1)(A) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 relating to the top five exporting and importing countries of pseudoephedrine and

ephedrine; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

5063. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting Transmittal of D.C. Act 20-300, "Classroom Animal for Educational Purposes Clarification Temporary Amendment Act of 2014"; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

5064. A letter from the Associate General Counsel for General Law, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting two reports pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

5065. A letter from the Auditor, Office of the District of Columbia Auditor, transmitting a report entitled, "Audit of the Administration of District Funds to the D.C. Children and Youth Investment Trust Corporation"; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

5066. A letter from the Staff Director, Sentencing Commission, transmitting report on the compliance of the federal district courts with documentation submission requirements on sentencing, pursuant to 28 U.S.C. 994(w)(1); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

5067. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Bombardier, Inc. Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2013-0687; Directorate Identifier 2012-NM-118-AD; Amendment 39-17767; AD 2014-04-08] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received March 14, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5068. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Agusta S.p.A. Helicopters [Docket No.: FAA-2014-0035; Directorate Identifier 2013-SW-036-AD; Amendment 39-17734; AD 2014-02-06] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received March 14, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5069. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; The Boeing Company Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2013-0547; Directorate Identifier 2013-NM-028-AD; Amendment 39-17758; AD 2014-03-21] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received March 14, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5070. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Turbomeca S.A. Turbohaft Engines [Docket No.: FAA-2013-0381; Directorate Identifier 2013-NE-16-AD; Amendment 39-17764; AD 2014-04-06] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received March 14, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5071. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Establishment of Class E Airspace; Central, AK [Docket No.: FAA-2013-0017; Airspace Docket No. 13-AAL-1] received March 14, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5072. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Establishment of Class E Airspace; Brevig Mission, AK [Docket No.: FAA-2012-0078; Airspace Docket No. 12-AAL-1] received March 14, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5073. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Revocation of Class E Airspace; Leesburg, VA

[Docket No.: FAA-2014-0085; Airspace Docket No. 14-AEA-2] received March 14, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5074. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Amendment of Class E Airspace; Burnet, TX [Docket No.: FAA-2013-0594; Airspace Docket No. 13-ASW-14] received March 14, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5075. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Establishment of Class E Airspace; Eagle, AK [Docket No.: FAA-2013-0777; Airspace Docket No. 12-AAL-16] received March 14, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5076. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Cessna Aircraft Company Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2011-0562; Directorate Identifier 2011-CE-015-AD; Amendment 39-17740; AD 2014-03-03] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received March 14, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5077. A letter from the National Ombudsman and Assistant Administrator for Regulatory Enforcement Fairness, Small Business Administration, transmitting the National Ombudsman's Annual Report to Congress for Fiscal Year 2012; to the Committee on Small Business.

5078. A letter from the Board, Railroad Retirement Board, transmitting Congressional Justification of Budget Estimates for Fiscal Year 2015, including the Performance Plan, pursuant to 45 U.S.C. 231(f); jointly to the Committees on Appropriations, Transportation and Infrastructure, and Ways and Means.

#### REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. SHUSTER: Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure. H.R. 4005. A bill to authorize appropriations for the Coast Guard for fiscal years 2015 and 2016, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. 113-384). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 524. Resolution providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 1459) to ensure that the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 applies to the declaration of national monuments, and for other purposes, and providing for consideration of motions to suspend the rules (Rept. 113-385). Referred to the House Calendar.

#### PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions of the following titles were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mr. MATHESON (for himself and Mr. KING of New York):

H.R. 4290. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to reauthorize the Emergency Medical Services for Children Program; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. ROGERS of Michigan (for himself, Mr. MILLER of Florida, Mr. CONAWAY, Mr. KING of New York, Mr. LOBIONDO, Mr. NUNES, Mr. WESTMORELAND, Mrs. BACHMANN, Mr. POMPEO, Mr. RUPPERSBERGER, Mr. THOMPSON of California, Mr. LANGEVIN, and Ms. SEWELL of Alabama):

H.R. 4291. A bill to amend the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act of 1978 to prohibit the bulk collection of call detail records, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Intelligence (Permanent Select), and in addition to the Committee on the Judiciary, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. CHABOT (for himself, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. GOODLATTE, and Mr. COHEN):

H.R. 4292. A bill to amend chapter 97 of title 28, United States Code, to clarify the exception to foreign sovereign immunity set forth in section 1605(a)(3) of such title; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CRAMER (for himself and Mrs. LUMMIS):

H.R. 4293. A bill to authorize the approval of natural gas pipelines and establish deadlines and expedite permits for certain natural gas gathering lines on Federal land and Indian land; to the Committee on Natural Resources, and in addition to the Committee on Agriculture, 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. CROWLEY:

H.R. 4294. A bill to amend part A of title IV of the Social Security Act to exclude child care from the determination of the 5-year limit on assistance under the temporary assistance for needy families program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committee on Education and the Workforce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Ms. NORTON:

H.R. 4295. A bill to direct the Administrator of the Federal Aviation Administration to collect and maintain data on the number of sexual assaults that occur on aircraft during flights in passenger air transportation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. SABLAN:

H.R. 4296. A bill to amend Public Law 94-241 with respect to the Northern Mariana Islands; to the Committee on Natural Resources, and in addition to the Committee on the Judiciary, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. WILLIAMS:

H.R. 4297. A bill to authorize a land exchange involving Fort Hood, Texas, and the City of Copperas Cove, Texas, to support the city's efforts to improve arterial transportation routes in the vicinity of Fort Hood and to promote economic development; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. ROGERS of Alabama (for himself, Mr. POE of Texas, and Mr. HECK of Washington):

H. Con. Res. 94. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress that the President should hold the Russian Federation accountable for being in material breach of its obligations under the Inter-

mediate-Range Nuclear Forces Treaty; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and in addition to the Committee on Armed Services, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. HUDSON:

H. Con. Res. 95. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress regarding support for voluntary, incentive-based, private land conservation implemented through cooperation with local soil and water conservation districts; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mrs. MCMORRIS RODGERS:

H. Res. 523. A resolution electing a Member to certain standing committees of the House of Representatives; considered and agreed to.

#### 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. MATHESON:

H.R. 4290.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3

By Mr. ROGERS of Michigan:

H.R. 4291.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The intelligence and intelligence-related activities of the United States government including those under Title 50 and the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act of 1978, as amended, are carried out to support the national security interests of the United States, to support and assist the armed forces of the United States, and to support the President in the execution of the foreign policy of the United States.

Article I, section 8 of the Constitution of the United States provides, in pertinent part, that "Congress shall have power . . . to pay the debts and provide for the common defense and general welfare of the United States"; ". . . to raise and support armies . . ."; "to constitute Tribunals inferior to the supreme Court"; and "To make all laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers and all other Powers vested in this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof."

By Mr. CHABOT:

H.R. 4292.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The constitutional authority on which this legislation is based is found in article I, section 8, clause 9; article III, section 1, clause 1; and article III, section 2, clause 2, of the Constitution, which grant Congress authority over federal courts.

By Mr. CRAMER:

H.R. 4293.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The constitutional authority on which this bill rests is the power of Congress to make Rules and Regulations respecting the Territory or other Property belonging to the United States, as enumerated in Article 4, Section 3, Clause 2, of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. CROWLEY:

H.R. 4294.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the U.S. Constitution

By Ms. NORTON:

H.R. 4295.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

clause 3 of N section 8 of article I of the Constitution.

By Mr. SABLAN:

H.R. 4296.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Under Article IV, Section 3, Clause 2 of the Constitution, Congress shall have Power to dispose of and make all needful Rules and Regulations respecting the Territory or other Property belonging to the United States; and nothing in this Constitution shall be so construed as to Prejudice any Claims of the United States, or of any particular State.

By Mr. WILLIAMS:

H.R. 4297.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article IV, Section 3 of the United States Constitution, which pertains to managerial authority over property.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions, as follows:

- H.R. 6: Mr. STIVERS.
- H.R. 494: Mr. MCNERNEY.
- H.R. 498: Mr. SCHNEIDER.
- H.R. 503: Mr. LATHAM.
- H.R. 508: Mr. REICHERT.
- H.R. 676: Ms. HAHN.
- H.R. 710: Mr. LOWENTHAL.
- H.R. 713: Mr. RICHMOND.
- H.R. 721: Mrs. CAPITO.
- H.R. 725: Mr. TIERNEY.
- H.R. 808: Mr. CLEAVER, Mr. CLAY, and Ms. JACKSON LEE.
- H.R. 820: Mr. RYAN of Ohio.
- H.R. 921: Mr. MURPHY of Florida.
- H.R. 942: Ms. CLARKE of New York, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. GIBSON, Mr. GUTHRIE, Mr. POCAN, Mrs. BACHMANN, and Mr. McALLISTER.
- H.R. 1024: Ms. KAPTUR.
- H.R. 1091: Mr. HUDSON, Mr. CHAFFETZ, Mr. SHUSTER, and Mr. CAMP.
- H.R. 1125: Mr. BISHOP of Georgia and Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California.
- H.R. 1180: Mr. MEEKS, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, and Mr. TAKANO.
- H.R. 1199: Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts, Mr. CASTRO of Texas, and Mr. KENNEDY.
- H.R. 1209: Mr. GIBSON.
- H.R. 1249: Mr. VALADAO.
- H.R. 1250: Mr. COLE.
- H.R. 1252: Mr. RICHMOND.
- H.R. 1278: Mr. CÁRDENAS.
- H.R. 1281: Mr. PASCRELL.
- H.R. 1291: Mr. TIERNEY.
- H.R. 1313: Mr. JOYCE.

- H.R. 1362: Mr. KILMER.
- H.R. 1461: Ms. GRANGER, Mr. HOLDING, and Mr. DESANTIS
- H.R. 1462: Mr. HOLDING and Mr. RIGELL.
- H.R. 1528: Mr. SCHNEIDER, Ms. CHU, and Mr. BISHOP of Georgia.
- H.R. 1563: Mr. DENHAM.
- H.R. 1573: Mr. JONES and Mr. PETERS of California.
- H.R. 1738: Mr. LOWENTHAL, Ms. HAHN, and Mr. GUTIÉRREZ.
- H.R. 1761: Mr. LOWENTHAL.
- H.R. 1812: Mr. OWENS.
- H.R. 1827: Mr. DOYLE.
- H.R. 1843: Mr. TIERNEY.
- H.R. 1851: Mr. CÁRDENAS.
- H.R. 2001: Mr. SIRES.
- H.R. 2012: Mr. QUIGLEY.
- H.R. 2028: Ms. CHU.
- H.R. 2041: Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia.
- H.R. 2315: Mr. KING of New York.
- H.R. 2366: Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania, Mr. ROHRBACHER, Mr. TURNER, Mr. JONES, Mr. BURGESS, Mr. LANKFORD, Mr. CHABOT, Mr. FLEMING, Mr. BOUSTANY, Mr. ROGERS of Alabama, Mr. HARPER, Mr. TERRY, Mr. TIPTON, Mr. PRICE of Georgia, Mr. CRAMER, Mr. GARDNER, Mr. SMITH of Texas, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Ms. MOORE, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, and Mr. RUSH.
- H.R. 2480: Mr. ENYART.
- H.R. 2509: Ms. MOORE.
- H.R. 2529: Mr. O'ROURKE.
- H.R. 2537: Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia.
- H.R. 2548: Mr. STIVERS.
- H.R. 2619: Mr. DEFazio.
- H.R. 2690: Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Mr. HONDA, and Ms. CASTOR of Florida.
- H.R. 2692: Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Ms. SCHWARTZ, and Mr. FATTAH.
- H.R. 2794: Mr. LAMBORN.
- H.R. 2835: Mr. GRAVES of Missouri.
- H.R. 2839: Mr. TIERNEY.
- H.R. 2955: Mr. TIERNEY.
- H.R. 2996: Mr. LATTA.
- H.R. 2997: Mr. CHAFFETZ.
- H.R. 3116: Mrs. ELLMERS and Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee.
- H.R. 3135: Ms. HAHN and Mr. TIERNEY.
- H.R. 3240: Mr. DENHAM.
- H.R. 3322: Ms. MATSUI.
- H.R. 3367: Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania and Mr. TIBERI.
- H.R. 3395: Mr. MICHAUD.
- H.R. 3397: Mr. MURPHY of Florida.
- H.R. 3408: Mr. HOLDING.
- H.R. 3485: Mr. COTTON.
- H.R. 3530: Mr. LOWENTHAL.
- H.R. 3543: Mr. TAKANO.
- H.R. 3560: Mr. POCAN.
- H.R. 3658: Ms. SCHWARTZ, Mr. GERLACH, Ms. FRANKEL of Florida, Mr. PAULSEN, Mr. FARR, Mr. REED, Mr. BRIDENSTINE, Mr. KLINE, and Ms. SINEMA.
- H.R. 3678: Mr. TIERNEY, Mr. PASCRELL, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. NADLER, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Ms. NORTON, Mr. DOYLE, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. COBLE, and Mr. BISHOP of New York.
- H.R. 3698: Mr. CARTWRIGHT.
- H.R. 3712: Mr. O'ROURKE and Mr. CICILLINE.

- H.R. 3774: Mr. DEFazio.
- H.R. 3836: Mr. BARROW of Georgia, Ms. CASTOR of Florida, and Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia.
- H.R. 3852: Ms. CHU and Mr. WAXMAN.
- H.R. 3963: Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Mr. HONDA, Mr. KEATING, Ms. HANABUSA, and Ms. BROWN of Florida.
- H.R. 3970: Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania and Ms. TSONGAS.
- H.R. 3978: Mr. NEAL, Mr. ELLISON, Mrs. CAPPs, Ms. SHEA-PORTER, Mr. TONKO, Mr. CAPUANO, Mr. CROWLEY, Mr. OWENS, and Mr. BISHOP of New York.
- H.R. 3991: Mr. MICHAUD and Mrs. LUMMIS.
- H.R. 4016: Mr. MICHAUD.
- H.R. 4023: Mr. JONES and Mr. MORAN.
- H.R. 4068: Mr. COLLINS of Georgia.
- H.R. 4069: Mr. GRIFFIN of Arkansas and Mr. GUTHRIE.
- H.R. 4075: Mr. POLIS and Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia.
- H.R. 4083: Mr. STIVERS.
- H.R. 4098: Mr. MULVANEY.
- H.R. 4105: Mr. RANGEL.
- H.R. 4111: Mr. COTTON.
- H.R. 4139: Mr. LATTA.
- H.R. 4143: Mr. DESANTIS.
- H.R. 4144: Mr. ISRAEL.
- H.R. 4149: Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania.
- H.R. 4158: Mr. GOSAR, Mr. HUELSKAMP, Mr. WILLIAMS, Mrs. MILLER of Michigan, and Mr. LONG.
- H.R. 4160: Mrs. BACHMANN.
- H.R. 4188: Mr. PAULSEN.
- H.R. 4205: Mr. THOMPSON and Mr. SIRES.
- H.R. 4208: Mr. VALADAO, Mr. HONDA, Mr. BERA of California, and Ms. BROWNLEY of California.
- H.R. 4214: Ms. McCOLLUM.
- H.R. 4216: Ms. JACKSON LEE, Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia, and Mr. GRIJALVA.
- H.R. 4221: Mr. RANGEL and Ms. SLAUGHTER.
- H.R. 4227: Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico.
- H.R. 4228: Mr. O'ROURKE.
- H.R. 4234: Mr. FARENTHOLD, Mr. RUSH, Mr. LOEBSACK, and Ms. NORTON.
- H.R. 4277: Ms. GABBARD.
- H.R. 4278: Mr. STOCKMAN, Ms. ROSS-LEHTINEN, and Mr. MESSER.
- H.R. 4286: Mr. CULBERSON.
- H.J. Res. 47: Mr. MCINTYRE and Mr. DESJARLAIS.
- H. Con. Res. 86: Mr. LATTA.
- H. Res. 112: Mr. RIBBLE.
- H. Res. 247: Mr. HIGGINS.
- H. Res. 254: Mrs. NEGRETE MCLEOD, Mr. YOUNG of Indiana, and Mr. ROSS.
- H. Res. 480: Mr. GIBSON and Mr. BISHOP of New York.
- H. Res. 494: Mr. MURPHY of Pennsylvania, Mr. LUETKEMEYER, Ms. CHU, Mr. BENTIVOLIO, Mr. BURGESS, and Ms. BROWNLEY of California.
- H. Res. 500: Mr. GRIFFITH of Virginia.
- H. Res. 519: Ms. SCHWARTZ and Ms. SCHA-KOWSKY.