

who lives in my district. He stood up in my townhall meeting in Winchester, Kentucky, and told me he suffered from aggressive stage 4 mantle cell lymphoma and lost his current health insurance.

The least expensive replacement policy on the Kentucky Kynect exchange was \$1,800 more per month. ObamaCare was supposed to fix the problem of pre-existing conditions, but for Tony Calvert and for his family, ObamaCare in Kentucky is a personal and financial disaster.

Consider the Blue Grass Stockyards, a beef cattle auction business that employs over 60 full-time employees who have enjoyed the benefits of high-quality, employer-provided health insurance for many years.

In 2010, the company's cost per employee was about \$250 each month, and it provided about a \$1,500 deductible, good prescription coverage, and \$3,000 out-of-pocket maximum.

By 2014, this company faced a 50 percent increase in cost because of ObamaCare and nowhere near the coverage quality that they had been able to provide to their employees in the past.

Moving all of their employees to Kentucky Kynect was no help. The very best scenario they have come up with is to purchase a policy at over a 9 percent increase in premiums, a \$5,000 in-network deductible, and a \$10,000 out-of-network deductible, and these are narrow networks.

The company told me that they have always taken pride in providing their valued employees with quality coverage, but because of ObamaCare, they can't do that any more.

Then there is Joe and Laura Westbrook. They have been owner-operators of Speedflo and Snapflo, a family printing company in Lexington, Kentucky, since 1976. Their family-owned business has grown to 32 employees—including many working moms—providing good benefits and affordable group health insurance until May 2014, when their renewal rates skyrocketed 101 percent.

To make matters worse, the available post-ObamaCare plans had deductibles that were three times larger than the pre-ObamaCare plans. These increases threatened to make it impossible for them to continue to provide their employees with health insurance, and for the first time, they had to ask their employees to contribute to cover the cost of the new plans.

The VA scandal is a window into the future of ObamaCare. It is a window into what government health care looks like: higher cost, higher premiums, less choices.

Let's get together as a country and acknowledge that this law doesn't work. It is unfortunate that ObamaCare doesn't work. The American people deserve health care reform that actually lowers costs, that provides more choices, and does not put bureaucrats in charge of health care.

EPA RULE WILL BE DEVASTATING FOR COAL COMMUNITIES

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

Mr. RAHALL. Mr. Speaker, on Monday, the EPA is expected to unleash what is essentially a Federal cap-and-trade proposal aimed at our Nation's existing coal-fired power plants.

I will oppose this rule, as it will adversely affect coal miners and coal mining communities throughout West Virginia and the Nation. At stake is our economy and the livelihoods of our coal miners, our steelworkers, electrical workers, those who keep our freight trains running, and families and businesses that rely on affordable energy from coal.

Even though we don't have the details of the rule yet, from everything we know, we can be sure of this: it will be very bad for jobs. The only real question is where, on a scale from devastating to a death blow, the new rule will fall.

I have written to OMB opposing the new source performance standards rule for future power plants and calling upon the Director to return the draft rule to EPA and calling on EPA to go back to the drawing board on their proposal.

I have joined 181 Members of this body in a letter to Administrator McCarthy asking that the normal 60-day comment period be extended to at least 120 additional days.

I have cosponsored and voted for H.R. 3826, the Electricity Security and Affordability Act, along with my colleague, the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. WHITFIELD), which would block the new source performance rule for future power plants. The House passed the bill on March 16, by a vote of 229-183, and sent it over to the other body.

I have cosponsored, along with my colleague, the gentleman from West Virginia (Mr. MCKINLEY), H.R. 2127, a resolution of disapproval that would prevent the new source performance standard rule for future power plants from going into effect. If enacted, this would have the same effect as the Whitfield bill, blocking EPA from advancing the rule on existing plants.

More importantly, Mr. Speaker, are the effects on our coal miners' health care and pension plans. There are more than 100,000 retirees, their dependents, and surviving spouses who receive health care and/or pensions from the UMWA, United Mine Workers of America, health and retirement funds.

Because these benefits are paid for by contributions made by the coal companies for every hour worked by an active miner, this rule could dramatically undercut the solvency of these funds.

In 2012, for example, a total of \$1.2 billion went into coal field communities in pension payments and direct payments to health care providers for retiree health care benefits. That included nearly 400 million into rural West Virginia communities.

This is what keeps the health care systems in these communities open. Doctors, pharmacies, clinics, therapists, and nursing homes all depend on this funding to survive.

So in conclusion, Mr. Speaker, let me say how devastating these proposed rules—although we have not seen the details yet—could be for coal mining communities.

I—and I am sure others who represent coal mining communities across this Nation—will not sit idle in the face of this latest challenge by the EPA to our way of life.

It is about jobs, it is about jobs, and it is about jobs, and I will look at any and all options that will be available to block this proposed rule from being finalized.

NOT ONE MORE TRAGEDY FOLLOWED BY INACTION

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

Mrs. CAPPs. Mr. Speaker, last Friday night, my home community was rocked by unspeakable violence. It left six students and their assailant dead and 13 others injured. Friday's rampage in Isla Vista, California, has touched the community in a powerful way.

IV, as it is affectionately called, is a special place where people know their neighbors. Everyone is presumed to be a friend, and bikes are more common than cars.

On Friday, IV joined a growing list of small communities touched by unspeakable violence. Today, we continue to mourn those we lost: George Chen, "James" Cheng Yuan Hong, Weihan "David" Wang, Katherine Breann Cooper, Christopher Ross Michaels-Martinez, and Veronika Weiss.

We reach out to the injured who need our support as they heal, and we pray for the many others affected, including the families and friends the victims left behind. Our community grieves, and we struggle to make sense of the senseless.

For many in a variety of places, this sadness and grief is also a frustration, frustration that more could have and should have been done to prevent this tragedy from the start.

We think of other places where similar rampages have occurred so recently: Tucson, Carson City, Seal Beach, Atlanta, Oakland, Seattle, Aurora, Oak Creek, Minneapolis, Newtown, Washington Navy Yard, Santa Monica, Fort Hood.

How many more of these mass shootings do we need before we act?

We have all seen how a violent incident can bring public attention to the need for sensible gun safety measures. We know that we must keep these weapons out of the hands of violent individuals; but all too quickly, the attention fades, the drumbeat quiets, and we are left with inaction.

I sincerely hope that this time will be different, but it won't be unless we, as Congress, act.

The American public wants universal background checks. They want limits on high-capacity magazines, increased school safety, and stronger gun-trafficking penalties, and that is the least we can do. We also need to make sure that our systems talk to each other, so that no one falls between the cracks.

It is clear that we need to do more to ensure that our mental health system and our law enforcement can work together to identify potentially dangerous individuals.

We need to ensure that parents who are concerned that their son might be a danger to himself or others have a meaningful way to seek help, and we need to ensure that we use the many new tools available, including social media, so when threats are made on the Internet they are taken seriously.

The American public's message to Congress is clear, and I heard it so poignantly at the University of California Santa Barbara just 2 days ago: not one more, not one more life should be lost, not one more family should have to grieve like ours, not one more community should be added to this list.

Gun safety and the Second Amendment are not mutually exclusive. Law-abiding Americans have the right to own a gun, but each of us deserves to feel safe in our homes and our communities.

Over the next few weeks, I will be meeting with local and national advocates on these issues to identify the gaps and to propose ways we can fix them, but no matter how much bills are researched, supported, and proposed, we need our House leadership to commit to us, to commit to the American people that we will have a vote.

Bills may pass, they may fail, but the American people have the right to know where their elected Representatives stand.

I join in the chorus of those who are rightly frustrated with the system and with this Congress: not one more.

I implore my colleagues to make sure that this phrase has yet another meaning: not one more tragedy followed by inaction. This time can be different, and it is up to us.

IN MEMORY OF REPRESENTATIVE BUTLER DERRICK

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

Mr. CLYBURN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to commemorate the life of a colleague and friend, Butler Derrick, who passed away earlier this month. I had the privilege of serving with Butler during my first term, which was his last.

Although our service together in this body lasted only 2 years, I had the pleasure of working with him in the years before and the years since. I am honored to say he was a friend, and I know I am not alone in saying that he will be missed.

Butler Carson Derrick, Jr., was born in Springfield, Massachusetts, in 1936. His family soon returned to South Carolina, and he grew up in Florence. He received his undergraduate degree from the University of South Carolina and his law degree from the University of Georgia.

□ 1045

He took up the mantle of leadership at an early age, serving as president of the student body at the University of South Carolina and was a legal student leader at Georgia.

After law school, he settled in Edgefield, South Carolina, where he started his own law firm, Derrick and Byrd. Just 3 years out of law school, he was elected to the South Carolina House of Representatives, where he served on the Rules and Ways and Means Committees and as a member of the South Carolina Nuclear Advisory Board. It was during these years that our paths first crossed, while I was serving on the staff of Governor John C. West, and we became fast friends.

In 1974, Butler was elected to this body from the Third Congressional District of South Carolina. He quickly distinguished himself among his large freshman class, becoming the first freshman ever appointed to the Budget Committee, on which he served for 10 years in the House, as well as chairing the Task Force on Budget Process for an additional 2 years.

At the start of his third term, Butler was appointed to the Rules Committee, on which he would serve for the remainder of his tenure in Congress, serving as vice chair from 1989 to 1995.

Butler had a way of bringing people together. The Democratic Caucus in those days was very ideologically diverse, from dyed-in-the-wool Northern liberals to old guard Southern conservatives. Born in Massachusetts and raised in South Carolina, Butler was uniquely able to bridge these divides. In 1986, he was elected to serve as a regional representative to the Democratic Steering and Policy Committee. In 1992, his ascent in the leadership continued when he was named chief deputy whip, the first time that a South Carolinian had been named to a top leadership post in 130 years. I owe him a debt of gratitude for paving the way for other South Carolinians to follow in his footsteps.

While Butler's service in leadership gave him a role in all the issues affecting the Nation, his focus never left the Third Congressional District. He was a tireless advocate for the textile industry, serving as chair of the Congressional Textile Caucus from 1987 to 1994.

With his district containing the Savannah River Site and Barnwell Nuclear Fuel Plant, he struck a balance between promoting the economic benefits of the industry and ensuring the health and safety of his constituents. Finding the right balance wasn't always easy, but Butler navigated the issue as he did all issues, with a keen intellect and fierce advocacy.

Butler Derrick was a man who did what he thought was right and let the political chips fall as they may. Scott A. Frisch and Sean Q. Kelly, in their book, "Jimmy Carter and the Water Wars," singled Butler out for a special commendation in this regard when it came to fiscal responsibility and environmental protection. It is worth quoting them at some length:

Butler's support of the administration's position might be considered surprising. Included in the hit list was the Richard B. Russell lake project which spanned Georgia and South Carolina.

Mr. Speaker, Butler's service to South Carolina continued beyond his years in Congress. I close by concurring with the late Speaker Tom Foley, who said, upon Butler's retirement, "Butler Derrick is a true leader."

While I miss my friend Butler, I am comforted by the fact that he lived a rich and full life, and he will live on through the impact he made in the lives of those he served. He is a model that we will all do well to emulate.

IRAN'S NUCLEAR AMBITIONS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LAMALFA). The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. BENTIVOLIO) for 5 minutes.

Mr. BENTIVOLIO. Mr. Speaker, I am gravely concerned about the threat of a nuclear-armed Iran and the status of the current negotiations between P5+1 in Iran.

As Iran has moved off the front pages over the past few months, I fear that the Iranians are becoming increasingly emboldened. With less than 2 months until the current Joint Plan of Action expires, we have yet to see real concessions from the Iranians. In fact, President Rouhani, supposedly a moderate, said just weeks ago that Iran will offer only transparency in a final agreement.

What good is transparency if Iran can continue to spin uranium and charge forward towards a nuclear weapon?

While the administration is responsible for representing the United States with the P5+1, it is important to remember that Congress has a very important role to play in this process. Congress has made it very clear that any final deal with Iran must lead to the dismantlement of Iran's nuclear infrastructure, and we must continue to reiterate this. It is unacceptable for the P5+1 to strike a deal that allows Iran any pathway to a nuclear weapon.

Additionally, Congress must continue to insist that Iran does not extend the negotiations and use them as a stalling tactic to advance its program. If the Joint Plan of Action is extended beyond the July 20 deadline, Iran must make real and meaningful concessions and convince us that it is not simply stalling. If Iran violates the current agreement or if it refuses to negotiate an acceptable final agreement, Congress must move immediately to impose dramatic new sanctions on the regime.