



United States  
of America

# Congressional Record

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

Vol. 159

WASHINGTON, WEDNESDAY, MAY 15, 2013

No. 68

## House of Representatives

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

### DESIGNATION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

WASHINGTON, DC,

May 15, 2013.

I hereby appoint the Honorable MO BROOKS to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

JOHN A. BOEHNER,

Speaker of the House of Representatives.

### MORNING-HOUR DEBATE

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

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

### SEQUESTRATION

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

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, this week the House will be voting for the 37th time to repeal the Affordable Care Act.

This vote comes at a time when we are facing serious and pressing challenges, one of the most important of which is the operations of the sequester. That is 37 votes to repeal the Affordable Care Act.

Let us set aside for a moment the important issue of how health reform is working and making quality care accessible and affordable for more Ameri-

cans. I'll be speaking more about that from this floor in coming days, as I know some of my colleagues will.

What I find—and I believe most Americans find—incomprehensible is how this House could waste its time on such a blatantly partisan vote when the effects of sequestration are having a growing negative effect on our economy and on the lives of so many American families. That ought to be our focus this week and every week until we find a solution, Mr. Speaker.

Speaker BOEHNER has said that this 37th repeal vote is justified because freshman Members have not had an opportunity to vote on that issue. If that is his view, then, by the same reasoning, he should allow a vote on a balanced alternative to the sequester. Freshmen have not had a chance to cast their votes on whether to replace the entire sequester with a big and balanced solution to deficits.

If the House proceeds with a vote on repealing the Affordable Care Act on the grounds that Members deserve an opportunity to be on the record on such an important issue, surely, Mr. Speaker, we also ought to have a vote on replacing the sequester, which we know is having adverse effects on our economy and on our national security.

American families and businesses are facing greater and greater uncertainty as the result of the sequester and the unwillingness on the part of Congress to take a meaningful, bipartisan action to stop it. With this uncertainty, businesses have slowed hiring and in some cases have even begun to lay off workers.

This indiscriminate and irrational nature of the sequestration means that it's ill effects will be felt across our economy and society without regard to our priorities. It also means that none of us, not one of us in this Chamber, is immune in our own districts where constituents will see a reduction in services and dislocation.

Because of the sequester, we are at risk of 70,000 young people kicked off Head Start; 10,000 teacher jobs at risk for title I cuts; 4 million fewer Meals on Wheels for seniors; 600,000 women, infants, and children dropped off the rolls; emergency unemployment insurance cut by 11 percent for 2 million out-of-work Americans; 2,100 fewer food-safety inspections. That's a drop of 18 percent to make sure that our food is safe. And one-third of combat air units are grounded.

The responsible path forward is for Democrats and Republicans to work together on a big and balanced approach to deficits that restores certainty to our businesses and families.

Four times Mr. VAN HOLLEN, the ranking member of the Budget Committee, has offered an amendment to the sequester, which would get to the same deficit reduction, but in a way that was prioritizing those things that are important in our country and eliminating those that are not, and raising some additional revenues, as well.

Not only has that not been considered, but the Republicans have refused to allow that amendment on the floor. Yet we have the 37th time to repeal the health care bill, which is already benefiting millions of Americans. It's not a responsible use of congressional time.

I urge the Speaker and the Republican leader to cancel this repeal vote and get back to business by allowing us to consider a balanced alternative to the sequester this week.

I also urge them to bring to the floor a motion to go to conference on the budget. My Republican friends pleaded for the Senate to pass a budget. The Senate passed a budget; we passed a budget. Regular order is going to conference where we could, in fact, come to an agreement on a big and balanced deal to replace this negatively impacting sequester.

There is nothing on the schedule to do that, either to repeal the sequester

□ 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.

H2607

and change it or to go to conference, but a 37th vote that will go nowhere. And everybody who knows that to be the case is on the floor this week. How sad.

RETURN THE POWER BACK TO  
THE PEOPLE

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

Mr. RADEL. Mr. Speaker, in this great country of ours, since our founding, we've always had a distrust of government. And, quite honestly, I think that's a healthy thing, most especially today as we learn about what both the Department of Justice and IRS have done.

What we are learning is that this is a threat to your First Amendment: freedom of speech. And let there be no question the order of importance. It is your very first in your Bill of Rights: freedom of speech.

I believe that these rights are so sacred, so precious that I'm introducing the Free Flow of Information Act to protect journalists from the prying eyes of this Federal Government. It is my hope that Republicans and Democrats alike will support this just like then-Senator Obama did in 2007.

A select few in these agencies represent the worst when it comes to a heavy-handed government working to shut down your basic right to speak out as an individual or report the news as an organization. Now is the time that we stand up and say, Our society is not about I, the Federal Government; it is about we, the people. And to quote my generation's music from Public Enemy to Rage Against the Machine: "We gotta fight the powers that be; we gotta take the power back."

In other words, we need to stand up and say that we see the abuse from a few in Washington and we must return the power back to the people. After all, Washington works for you. Not a party. Not an ideology. Your government—elected and unelected—works for you, not against you.

But now we clearly see that both the IRS and the Department of Justice are working against you, working to stifle, to shut down your God-given right of freedom of speech, that freedom often carried out by the press.

In the United States, we are so unique and so powerful because we really share a common belief of some pretty simple things. You should be able to speak your mind. Again, it's called "freedom of speech." And journalists should be able to do their job and do so without the fear of a heavy-handed tyrannical government threatening or stifling them. It's called "freedom of the press."

But now we see an entire culture of government acting on their own behalf, not even beholden to an administration, party, or even a belief. These are rogue agencies that we are talking about, unelected, unchecked, without

boundaries, without ethics, and without a shred of respect for the Constitution or you. These individuals are some people on some floor of some building named after some dude that you've never even heard of messing with your life.

□ 1010

And if you don't think that wiretaps or IRS audits are going to hit you, think again. Two groups from my home in southwest Florida were hit so hard by the IRS that they quit. They shut down their groups. That was it; enough is enough. This is the clearest example of how the government is coming after you to strip away your most basic rights. These groups were made up of hardworking Americans just like you. Their goal: to teach people about the Constitution. Think about that for a second. They wanted to teach people about the very document that tells you you have the right to say what you want. They're now gone.

And let's look at the Department of Justice wiretapping, seizing and prying into the lives of journalists. I worked as a journalist for almost 20 years, living with what I thought our government also believed in—freedom of the press. The freedom to investigate, share, and speak out on injustice.

And from journalists to partisan pundits, Rachel Maddow to Bill O'Reilly, they're coming for you next. Sean Hannity to Chris Hayes, you'll be tapped next as you try to shed light on truth, on injustice, or just try and get some answers.

Where does all of this end?

Well, this is where the so-called far left and far right need to embrace each other. Whether you are a Tea Partier or part of the Occupy movement, this is about you. Whether you are an evangelical Christian wanting to share the word of God or an atheist simply asking for a more secular society, this is about you. This is about you—your freedom of speech, your ability to express what you believe in. This is about you.

Washington insiders should not be dictating your life. The more it's about them, it's not about you. The more government grows unchecked and unbalanced and out of control, the more it's about them and not you.

I believe in you. Stand with me and let's take the power back and return this government to we the people. I promise to stand with you.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Members are reminded to direct their remarks to the Chair.

PROTECT BANGLADESHI FACTORY  
WORKERS

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

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, little more than 100 years ago, a New York State assemblyman

was an eyewitness to one of our Nation's worst industrial tragedies—the Triangle Shirtwaist factory fire. He recounted how he saw girl after girl appear in the reddened windows, pause for a terrified moment, and then leap to the pavement below, to land as a mangled, bloody pulp. He said it went on for what seemed like a ghastly eternity, and described how the firemen's life nets were torn by the impact of falling bodies.

This inferno at a sweatshop garment factory in New York City employed mostly poor, immigrant women. One hundred forty-six workers died that day because it lacked proper stairways, fire escapes, and managers had locked all of the exits. This tragedy shook our Nation and led to lifesaving workplace safety reforms.

A century later, I recently met a young Bangladeshi garment worker named Sumi. She, too, jumped from a window of the Tazreen garment factory. She survived, but 12 of her co-workers who jumped with her did not. More than 100 others who never had the opportunity to jump were found inside of the factory dead. This haunting tragedy has many parallels to the Triangle fire: exit doors were locked; fire extinguishers were not working; fire codes went unenforced.

We don't tolerate those workplace conditions in the United States anymore, but those are deadly conditions that are tolerated in other countries that make the clothing that we wear. These tragedies have moved from New York to Bangladesh, driven by the business models and global supply chains of the world's leading retailers and clothing brands. But now Bangladesh has had what might be its own Triangle Shirtwaist fire.

On April 24, more than 1,100 people died as Rana Plaza and its garment factories collapsed. Some 2,000 more were injured, and rescuers are still pulling bodies out 3 weeks later. There have been an additional 40 fires, explosions, and other incidents between the Tazreen fire and the Rana Plaza tragedies. It's simply a matter of time before there is another one.

These incidents shocked people around the globe and laid bare the need for bold action. The lives of 4 million workers in these factories are counting on bold action. But not everyone has been shocked. Major American retailers and clothing brands have refused to change the way they conduct business in Bangladesh, the second largest garment producer in the world after China. They are hoping instead that the heightened attention will pass without having to change their business model. That business model pits sweatshop against sweatshop, country against country, in a race to the bottom to rake in billions of dollars in profits while paying as little as 22 cents per shirt.

In Bangladesh, American and international companies flourish in this system, companies we all know like

Walmart, the Gap, JCPenney, and The Children's Place, just to name a few. They refuse to accept responsibility.

So what can be done to improve the Bangladeshi factory safety? Certainly there are things local government can do: address corruption that allows unsafe, dangerous structures; enforce safety codes; defend the right of workers to form unions and to have workers be able to refuse unsafe work.

The Bangladeshi Government is scrambling to implement limited reforms, hoping to keep the industry that is critical to its economy, but only the retailers and brands can put a floor under this race to the bottom. The economic power rests with them. That is why the announcement this week by major European companies and one American company that they have signed a binding and enforceable fire and building safety agreement for Bangladesh factories is so significant.

H&M, Zara, Primark, and C&A are to be applauded for their unprecedented and bold steps. They have been joined by only one American company, Phillips-Van Heusen, which has Calvin Klein and Tommy Hilfiger among its brands, and one major German retailer. But now El Corte Ingles, Marks & Spencer, Mango, and Benetton have also agreed to sign this enforceable agreement.

The agreement provides for independent safety inspections with public reports, mandatory repairs and renovations, money to fund the necessary safety upgrades, the right of workers to refuse unsafe work, and the vital role of workers and unions. This agreement is truly unprecedented.

But where are the other American companies? Where are the American retailers? Where are the American clothing brands? Where is Walmart? Where is JCPenney? Where is the Gap? Where is The Children's Place? Their silence in the face of this tragedy is inexcusable. They should sign the binding safety agreement to protect Bangladeshi workers. They should sign it now.

Experts estimate safety improvements under this plan would cost about a dime a garment. A dime for the life of these women.

I urge all Americans to join in demanding that the American retailers and fashion brands stop selling their bloodstained labels and sign the enforceable agreement to protect these Bangladeshi women.

#### AMNESTY BILL HARMS VULNERABLE WORKERS

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

Mr. BROOKS of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, the President and Senate Gang of Eight amnesty bill is not only bad for America, it is a disaster for American workers who are pitted against millions of illegal aliens in the competition for scarce jobs.

On April 24, 2013, Dr. Frank Morris, former executive director of the Congressional Black Caucus Foundation and now leader for the African American Leadership Foundation, stated, "The Senate Gang of Eight's immigration bill is not only impractical, but immoral. Increasing immigration levels through amnesty and new visa programs, particularly at the low-skilled level, will flood the labor market with millions more people, leading to higher unemployment, more poverty, and a lower standard of living for many in the Black community."

Dr. Morris is right. Amnesty undermines millions of African-American workers' incomes and job searches by flooding the American market with cheap labor.

In an April 23 news release, the African American Leadership Foundation stated, "Blacks have an unemployment rate nearly twice that of the national average. The Senate's immigration plan to drastically increase the immigrant workforce will continue to keep that number high."

Dr. Morris emphasized that illegal aliens have huge advantages over American job seekers. "Immigrants are the preferred employees because they are more vulnerable, you can cut them out of overtime, you can cut them out of safety measures, you can cut them out of anything and they have no recourse."

Charles Butler, also of the African American Leadership Foundation, added that the amnesty bill would "provide green cards and residency benefits to illegal aliens when many Americans are hurting the most. What makes sense is for America's jobs to be reserved for people who are legally entitled to compete for them."

In 2007, T. Willard Fair, president of the Urban League of Greater Miami emphasized that, "Amnesty for illegal workers is not just a slap in the face to Black Americans. It's an economic disaster."

"I see illegal immigration and the adverse impact that it has on the political empowerment of African Americans and the impact it has on the job market."

□ 1020

How bad does illegal immigration hurt American workers?

Harvard Professor George Borjas found in a study released in April 2013, and I quote, "Illegal immigration reduces the wage of native workers by an estimated \$99 to \$118 billion a year, and generates a gain for businesses and other users of immigrants of \$107 to \$128 billion."

Who is hurt the most by illegal aliens? American workers who lose \$99 to \$118 billion in badly-needed income.

Who is helped the most by illegal aliens? Employers who pad their profits to the tune of \$107 to \$128 billion when they hire illegal aliens over Americans. Dr. Borjas adds that "immigration has its largest negative im-

pact on the wage of native workers who lack a high school diploma, a group that makes up a modest . . . share of the workforce. These workers are among the poorest Americans."

Who do American workers compete against for jobs? Per a 2010 Pew Hispanic Center study, 7.8 million illegal aliens hold jobs in America. That's 7.8 million job opportunities that would be opening up for American workers if the President would enforce Federal immigration laws.

The way to help our blue-collar and low-wage workers is not to flood the market with illegal aliens. The way to help America's blue-collar and low-wage workers is by denying American jobs to illegal aliens, thus forcing blue-collar wages up and helping workers and their families pursue the American Dream.

Mr. Speaker, we must return American jobs to American citizens. The White House and Congress should be fighting for American jobs for American citizens, not jobs for illegal aliens.

Mr. Speaker, I cannot, in good conscience, ratify illegal conduct with my vote, and I hope other elected officials in Washington will represent Americans seeking jobs, not foreigners illegally on American soil.

#### THE PARTNERSHIPS FOR ACHIEVING STUDENT SUCCESS ACT

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

Ms. CHU. Last month, Galway Central School District in New York considered outsourcing the roles of their school psychologist and social worker. After all, budgets are tight, and what harm could come from this?

Andrew Huzsar, the district psychologist, and Christine Bornt, the school social worker, had already faced an uphill battle helping their students. Although the district has only 900 children in attendance, Galway is geographically one of the largest school districts in New York State. And as the only school psychologist and social worker, Andrew and Christine struggled to meet the needs of their students, facing more than double the recommended ratio of students to mental health professionals across the district.

An onslaught of letters and testimony soon flooded the Board of Education, as students, parents, and teachers, alike, protested on Andrew and Christine's behalf. The board soon relented to the public outrage, perhaps thanks to a very moving letter of support that Andrew received. This letter was from a young student explaining that he would not be alive today if it had not been for Andrew intervening in his life. This student was not someone Andrew saw regularly. They met only three times the previous school year.

Mental health counseling is a critical component for student success. Just three meetings were enough to save this student's life.

As a clinical psychologist, I know that there is no budget cut more shortsighted than one that stands between mental health resources and those who desperately need them. For a student, that access may be the difference between a productive day in class and an act of aggression against themselves or their peers. In the case of Andrew and that student, it made the difference between life and death.

That's why last week I introduced the Partnerships for Achieving Student Success, or PASS, Act. It does more than ever before to help our Nation's neediest schools ensure that our children have access to the appropriate mental health and student service professionals on campus. It creates a Federal grant program to help low-income school districts recruit, employ, and retain school counselors, school social workers, school psychologists, and other psychologists qualified to work in K-12 schools.

Galway School District ultimately kept their mental health professionals, but not every school district has the capacity to do so. By expanding the number of school mental health professionals in low-income, high-need schools, we can effect positive change in the lives of students who need it most. That's why the PASS Act already has the support of the American Psychological Association, National Association of School Psychologists, American School Counselor Association, and the School Social Work Association of America.

And it is why I take to the floor today to encourage my colleagues to support this bill and improve the academic and life success for students across this country. Together, we can make sure that the Andrews of this world are there when their students need them.

#### COMFORT WOMEN

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

Mr. ROYCE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to condemn the systematic and brutal enslavement of women during World War II by the Imperial Government of Japan. What is known today as "comfort women" is, in reality, a state-sponsored program of sexual brutality against 200,000 women from Korea, China, Taiwan, and the Philippines.

The fact that women and girls as young as 13 years old would be forced into this kind of misery is appalling. It runs counter to every recognized international norm against human dignity.

Anyone seeking to justify or deny the existence of comfort women is ignoring history. The sheer amount of evidence regarding this terrible time in history is staggering. Not only are there documents chronicling the existence of comfort women camps, but there is also the gut-wrenching testimony of survivors and of eye witnesses.

Countless governments around the world have come to the conclusion that, yes, the Imperial Government of Japan did indeed condone this most reprehensible of actions during World War II, along with such brutal violence as the rape of Nanking.

That is why I rise today to condemn the unfortunate remarks of the mayor of Osaka, Japan, who, as recently as yesterday, denied the existence of comfort women. The mayor not only questioned the existence of comfort women, but he sought to justify the use of a "comfort woman system" as a means to boost morale for the military. The mayor's remarks are absolutely outrageous, and it adds insult to injury for survivors and their families.

The rise of ultranationalism in Japan is very worrisome and, as chairman of the Foreign Affairs Committee, I strongly condemn it.

Mr. Speaker, the House went on record in 2007 to express our outrage regarding the forced enslavement of 200,000 women during World War II. The civilian populations of Korea, China, Taiwan, and the Philippines suffered so much from the imperialism and aggression of the Imperial Government of Japan.

We speak with one voice when we speak against grave violations of human rights. It is in America's interest that we continue to press for justice and to never forget.

#### THE AFFORDABLE CARE ACT

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

Mr. CARSON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, this week the House is voting to repeal the Affordable Care Act for the 37th time.

In every congressional district, there are seniors, new mothers, young children, low-income families, and young adults just starting out on their own. Do my good Republican friends really want to take away their chance for better health?

I would never do that to my constituents, which is why I'm here today, Mr. Speaker, to say again, I am proud of my vote for the Affordable Care Act.

□ 1030

Recently, I had a chance to spend some time with some Hoosiers across my district, and I heard again and again their worry about rising health care costs and their family's ability to access care. Fortunately, millions of Americans no longer have to worry about accessing care because of the Affordable Care Act. Instead, more than half a million Medicare beneficiaries in Indiana alone received free preventive services in 2012, avoiding more costly illnesses. More than 17 million children with preexisting conditions nationwide are no longer being denied insurance coverage. More than 100 million Americans no longer face lifetime limits on coverage.

Mr. Speaker, over 360,000 small businesses have already used tax credits to help insure 2 million workers. By the end of this year, health exchanges will be set up making it easier for people who don't have insurance to choose the coverage that best suits their needs. Next year, we will happily welcome even more consumer protections. Insurance companies will no longer be able to place lifetime limits on coverage. Discrimination against pre-existing conditions will be banned for all Americans.

This means that when a woman notices a lump under her arm, there is no reason for her to wait until she finds a job to schedule an appointment. And she doesn't have to wait to get sicker, costing more of her time off from work and away from her family. Under the Affordable Care Act, Mr. Speaker, she knows she can obtain potentially life-saving care right away. The same goes for her spouse, her parents, and her children. Our health care system benefits us by allowing us to make investments in lower-cost treatments and prevention now rather than expensive therapies later.

Of course, I know that times are tough right now and we have to be even more careful about the mandates we put on businesses. But my good Republican colleagues seem to forget that people have to be healthy to contribute to our economic growth. As a Representative of many hardworking families, Mr. Speaker, I have stood here time and time again over the past few years to extend a hand to anyone who wants to work with me and us to provide quality health care for all Americans.

Today, I make that very same offer. I will work gladly with anyone who wants to improve our health care system and ensure that all Americans have access to quality and affordable health care.

I call on my Republican colleagues to work with us to implement the Affordable Care Act and start improving it. It's time we all stand together, Mr. Speaker, and start looking out for the health of this great Nation. Without it, we have nothing.

#### POLITICAL BIAS AT EPA

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

Mr. WHITFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to express in the very strongest terms possible my disapproval of a pattern of conduct of the Obama administration that is of great concern to all of us, a pattern of conduct in which this administration rewards its friends and punishes its opponents.

Now, when our Founding Fathers wrote the Constitution many years ago, there were some basic principles in that Constitution. One was equal protection under the law, and the other was protection from discriminatory

practices. Well, we all know about the IRS being accused of going after groups that they disapprove of.

Today and late yesterday afternoon, two more incidents arose that show that this administration is about punishing their opponents and taking care of their friends. The first incident revolves around the Environmental Protection Agency. There is a system in the Federal Government called the Freedom of Information Act in which individuals, groups, and other entities can request of the Federal Government to obtain information about regulations, things that the Federal Government is doing; and if the group asks for a waiver of fees to obtain that information, they can obtain the information free.

Well, because of a lawsuit filed by the Competitive Enterprise Institute, we now find out that EPA routinely grants fee waivers to its favored left-wing groups who demand a more intrusive and powerful EPA, but systematically deny waivers for free information from any group that EPA disagrees with. In fact, the headline says that EPA gives information for free to groups it agrees with 92 percent of the time, but it denies fee waivers for groups that it disagrees with 93 percent of the time. We cannot afford a government that systematically goes against groups that it opposes and yet rewards groups that it favors.

I want to give you another example that came about yesterday. More than 573,000 birds are killed by the country's wind farms each year, including 83,000 hunting birds such as hawks, falcons, and eagles. Now, nearly all the birds being killed are protected under the Federal environmental laws which prosecutors have used to generate tens of millions of dollars of fines and settlements from businesses, including oil and gas companies and electricity generators over the past 5 years. As a matter of fact, BP oil company was fined \$100 million for killing and harming migratory birds during the 2010 gulf oil spill. And PacifiCorp, which operates coal plants in Wyoming, paid more than \$10.5 million in 2009 for electrocuting a number of eagles along power lines in its substations.

Yet this administration has never fined or prosecuted a wind energy company, even those that flout the law repeatedly. Instead, the government is shielding the industry from liability and helping to keep the scope of the deaths secret.

So there is clearly a double standard in this administration. If you kill an eagle and you happen to be a private business or you are a power generator or you're an oil company or a chemical company, you're going to be fined. But if you're a wind energy company, even though the bird you killed may be protected under the Endangered Species Act, you're going to be protected. America will not stand for a government that rewards its friends and punishes its opponents in this discriminatory fashion.

#### ACKNOWLEDGING THE END OF THE CIVIL WAR IN SRI LANKA

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois (DANNY K. DAVIS) for 5 minutes.

Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to acknowledge the fourth anniversary of the end of the civil war in Sri Lanka on May 18, 4 years ago. Although the war has ended and all of those who care about the well-being of this country are indeed glad and delighted, there remain high levels of suspicion among many Tamils who still feel that they are being denied equal rights, equal protection under the law, and are being treated as second-class citizens.

A large number of Tamils fled the country, left their homeland, during the war; and many have not returned to their homes. Peace is present, but there still exists many hard feelings. Therefore, I urge that the government and the Tamil community find as many ways as possible to promote peace and live in harmony with equality, equal justice, and equal protection under the law. Mr. Speaker, I wish the country well on its peaceful coexistence.

□ 1040

#### INTRODUCTION OF PUERTO RICO STATUS RESOLUTION ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Puerto Rico (Mr. PIERLUISI) for 5 minutes.

Mr. PIERLUISI. Mr. Speaker, today, joined by a bipartisan group of my colleagues, I am introducing the Puerto Rico Status Resolution Act. This bill is a response to the results of a referendum held in Puerto Rico in November. The first question asked voters if they support Puerto Rico's current territory status, which deprives my constituents of the most fundamental democratic rights. Fifty-four percent said "no."

The second question asked voters for their preference among the three alternatives to the current territory status. Of those who chose an option, 61 percent favored statehood. More voters said they want Puerto Rico to become a State than to maintain the current status, which is unprecedented.

The White House has recognized the importance of the results, which is why the President is seeking an appropriation to conduct the first federally authorized vote in Puerto Rico's history, intended to "resolve" the territory's future status.

The legislation I am filing today is consistent with the President's budget request and serves as a blueprint for how the vote conducted pursuant to that appropriation could be structured.

After outlining the rights and responsibilities of statehood, the bill authorizes a ratification vote on whether Puerto Rico should be admitted into the Union as a State. If a majority of

voters affirm Puerto Rico's desire for statehood, the bill provides for the President to submit legislation to admit Puerto Rico as a State after a reasonable transition period. The bill also expresses Congress's commitment to act on such legislation.

Now, I want to speak directly to the men and women who voted for statehood in November. Our movement has become a predominant force in Puerto Rico. Every day, we grow stronger. Like you, I believe that justice delayed is justice denied. And, like you, I find it difficult to be patient. But we fight with our heads as well as our hearts. Perfecting our Union requires passion, but it also demands perseverance. There are no shortcuts on the path to statehood, and politicians who suggest there are are leading us to a dead end.

The statehood movement is powerful because we are united by a single principle, the principle of equality. The November vote has fortified our spirit and renewed our sense of purpose. We will not shy away from a fight. History teaches that once a people have chosen democracy, self-government and progress, they are unlikely to reverse course. Rest assured, now that the people of Puerto Rico have withdrawn their consent to second-class citizenship, the question is not whether, but when, Puerto Rico will obtain equality through statehood.

To my colleagues who represent States, I know you will respect my constituents for seeking the same rights and responsibilities as your constituents. This respect must take the form of concrete action. The U.S. citizens of Puerto Rico have made their choices heard, and they deserve a meaningful response from their national government.

There is overwhelming evidence that territory status has affected Puerto Rico's political, economic, and social development; and it has become clear that the status quo does not serve the national interest, either. The U.S. succeeds when Puerto Rico succeeds; when the island is strong, stable and secure; and when its residents do not feel obligated to relocate to the States to achieve their dreams. From the U.S. perspective, a robust and resilient State of Puerto Rico would advance the national interest.

The position of every President since Harry Truman has been that their administration would accept whatever status choice is made by a majority of Puerto Rico's voters. The U.S. Government is a champion of democracy and self-determination around the world, and it must adhere to those principles with respect to its own citizens. This is essentially true in light of the service that generations of men and women from Puerto Rico have rendered to this Nation, most notably in the Armed Forces, but in so many other ways as well. In a very real sense, Puerto Rico has earned the right to be equal, and equal we will become.

Puerto Rico has been called the shining star of the Caribbean. The time has

come for our star to shine, alongside the others, on the Flag of the United States of America.

#### GOVERNMENT OPPRESSION OF PATRIOTS

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

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, early last year, I spoke with businesswoman Catherine Engelbrecht, also founder of True the Vote and King Street Patriots in Houston, Texas. True the Vote is a nonpartisan organization whose purpose is to train poll workers to uphold voter integrity at the polls, because, despite what many say, voter fraud is rampant in America. King Street Patriots is a group of liberty-minded, patriotic individuals in Houston who meet weekly to discuss what's going on here in Washington.

Catherine told me that both of these groups and her family had not only been harassed by liberal progressive groups but also by the Federal Government. It all began when Catherine applied for nonprofit status in 2010 for True the Vote and King Street Patriots. So began the tidal wave of government inquiries and harassment.

In a recent interview, Catherine said this:

We applied for nonprofit status in 2010. Since that time, the IRS has run us through a gauntlet of analysts and hundreds of questions over and over and over again. They've requested to see each and every tweet I've ever tweeted and each and every Facebook post I've ever posted. They've asked to know every place I've ever spoken since our inception, and to whom, and everywhere I intend to speak in the future.

We have learned that the IRS has even asked these groups, Mr. Speaker, for donor lists.

Mr. Speaker, this level of detail goes well beyond the business of the IRS, and it didn't stop there. The Federal Government's snooping included six visits by the FBI, as well as multiple unannounced visits from OSHA and, yes, even the ATF. Mr. Speaker, you may remember the ATF. Those are the ones responsible for smuggling guns into Mexico. How ironic it is they want to audit American citizens but lose track of guns where they were purposely sent to the drug cartels.

In any event, in addition to True the Vote, Catherine and her husband were also personally audited. Keep in mind Catherine and her husband have owned a small family business for 20 years and have never been audited by the IRS until all of this. Why now? It seems very coincidental.

I asked that question when I submitted a FOIA request on behalf of True the Vote and King Street Patriots to FBI, OSHA and the ATF asking if they were under criminal investigation. The reply from these agencies was that none of these individuals were under criminal investigation. Well, if they're not, why are they being treated

like criminals? Just because they question government.

Mr. Speaker, Catherine is not alone. The IRS has admitted to systematically targeting certain groups who have opposing views from the administration. According to USA Today, between February 2010 and May 2012, only one Tea Party group was granted tax-exempt status from the IRS. But during that same 2-year period, the IRS has approved dozens of liberal and progressive groups for their tax-exempt status. Coincidence? Yeah, right.

Not only does this behavior of the IRS threaten individual freedom and violate the Constitution; I think it may be criminal. It is unlawful for any Federal agency to use its law enforcement and its investigation power as a means to harass and target certain individuals whose political views differ from any administration. It would appear that such actions are also in violation of Federal law and the equal protection and due process protections guaranteed in the Constitution.

Private citizens should not be punished for questioning government. This is America, not a Third World dictatorship or the Soviet Union.

□ 1050

This type of government oppression and political opposition is disturbing. I've written Attorney General Eric Holder to request him to direct the U.S. Office of Special Counsel to investigate any potential violation of the Hatch Act that may have occurred by IRS employees. I've also asked Attorney General Holder to appoint a special prosecutor to investigate all of this.

No government should be requiring citizens to furnish their schedules, donor lists, personal communications or political beliefs to any government agency. No government agency—whether it's the IRS, the FBI, the ATF, or OSHA—should be used as a tool to suppress those who are considered “opposition groups” and dare to question our government.

The IRS is abusing its power to tax by harassing and punishing those who have been “taxed enough already.”

And that's just the way it is.

#### 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 50 minutes a.m.), the House stood in recess.

#### PRINTING OF PROCEEDINGS OF FORMER MEMBERS PROGRAM

Mr. MCHENRY. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the proceedings during the former Members program be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and that all Members and former Members who spoke during the proceedings have the privilege of revising and extending their remarks.

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

There was no objection.

The following proceedings were held before the House convened for morning-hour debate:

UNITED STATES ASSOCIATION OF FORMER MEMBERS OF CONGRESS 2013 ANNUAL REPORT TO CONGRESS

The meeting was called to order by the Honorable Barbara Kennelly, vice president of Former Members of Congress Association, at 8:05 a.m.

#### PRAYER

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

Lord God of history, and our salvation, when former Members return to Congress it must be similar to any American opening the Bible or their holy book at random. By doing so, people of the Book read between the lines, see the story of America, and rejoice.

Congress, too, holds old and familiar stories, strong exhortations, repeated corrections, and consoling confirmation of hopes that speak anew of love, patriotism, and light. Looking at Congress once again, these former Members, still Your stewards, hear the praise of Psalms, the lament of Job, and are strengthened by the sentiments of Gideon as well as Paul, the commands of Moses and the prayers of Jesus.

As the Good Book binds people into community, You tie together the years of Congress and make of them a prophetic voice that reverences the past, speaks to the present, and holds promise for the future.

May all former Members be rewarded for their contributions to this constitutional Republic and continue to work and pray that the goodness and justice of this beloved country be proclaimed to the nations.

Quicken life, promise, and fortitude in all here gathered that we may bring joy to the present age and long for eternal happiness, calling upon Your holy name, now and forever.

Amen.

#### PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The Hon. Barbara Kennelly 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.

Ms. KENNELLY. The Honorable STENY HOYER will now address us.

Mr. HOYER. “Address us” overstates what I'm going to do, but I'm always so pleased to be with all of you. And I was kidding on saying that.

I want to tell you frankly, on the Republican side, you guys look so much better than you did when we served together, and we want all of you back on our side of the aisle. We're voting to reelect you.

But I am so pleased to be here with all of you. I had the opportunity to say just a few words yesterday, but I particularly wanted to be here, and I don't

see my Republican Speaker here. I think some of you know that story. Ray LaHood was presiding, and it was the nineties, '95, early '95, and I went up to Ray. We had about—I forget exactly—199 Members at that point in time. I went to Ray and I said, "Ray, if you can get 20 votes, I will get 199, and we'll elect Bob Michel Speaker." But we didn't do that, as you noticed historically.

But I fondly recall with you the days when we really did sit down and work together on a lot of things in a positive way and get things done for our country. We're not doing that as well this time, as you know. Ray would tell you that, working in the administration, but I particularly wanted to be here this morning.

I don't see Bob here. Is Bob coming?

Ms. MORELLA. He is coming.

Mr. HOYER. Okay. Well, he is not here.

I'm a huge fan of Bob Michel's, but I'm also a huge fan of Ray LaHood's, and I know you're honoring Ray today, and I want to join with you in honoring him. Not only did he serve as a staffer in the House of Representatives, upholding what we're not upholding as much today, the integrity and the self-respect of all the Members here, to some degree denigrating this institution and Members—I lament that.

But Ray LaHood, as a staffer and as a Member of Congress and as a member of the President's Cabinet, has done some extraordinary work.

Ray, I want to congratulate you and thank you for all the positive roles you have played in moving this country forward. We're going to miss you from the Cabinet, but we don't expect to miss you from our lives, as so many here see. I want to wish you the very best.

Jack tells me he's now the president of a community college in New York. I said, "Well, are you watching what we're doing?" He said, "Not much." That's why he's got such a happy look on his face—hear no evil, see no evil, speak no evil.

Some of you were here when I came to the Congress in 1981, and some came with me. I came 5 months after you did, Dennis, and just a few months before Barbara came to the Congress.

So I want to say on behalf of all the leadership—hopefully on both sides of the aisle—I know that's the case.

And remember, I'm not going to drag my leg, but do you remember John Rousselot? Does that name ring a bell with you? Well, when I came to the Congress, John Rousselot probably was the Member that I had the most negative feelings about: John Birch Society, et cetera, et cetera, et cetera. Into about a year, I got to really think, John Rousselot is not a bad guy at all.

I don't recall whether you recall, but he used to smile at all of us as if to say, Okay, I've come over to your side and now I'm really gonna give it to you. And he did it with such a twinkle in his eye and such a positive. Jim

Blanchard—Governor Blanchard, Ambassador Blanchard, all things Blanchard—is shaking his head. But that was a lesson to me, as it should be a lesson for all of us, to take people not on which side of the aisle they're on, not which side of the liberal-conservative range they may fall, not on some simplified newspaper story that you read, but on, as King said, the content of their character.

I think the more that we get to know one another, the more we understand why this body really does over the long term work. The only way you can get here is to be elected by your neighbors, and they do pretty well. They're not perfect, we're not perfect, but they do pretty well, and they elect some really fine people Representatives of their districts.

The trick is for all of us to come together and work together. Your efforts here, I think, help in that regard. So, welcome back, and I look forward to seeing you, not just when the former Members come back. I see Connie all the time and Bev all the time, my colleagues from Maryland. And I saw Jim the other day, and we had a good talk. But come back, visit; and if I can help in any way, I want to do it, just as I will want those who succeed me after I leave to do the same.

So, Ray, congratulations to you. Thank you very much. And, to all of you, thank you for all you have done through the years, and thanks for remembering and coming back and helping our institution be all that it can be. Thank you very much.

Ms. KENNELLY. Thank you, Leader. And now I would like to present the Honorable Connie Morella, president of the Former Members Association.

Ms. MORELLA. First of all, I want to thank, on behalf of all of us, STENY HOYER for launching us this morning for this 43rd annual meeting that we had. STENY never really saw an aisle. He saw issues and compromise, and that's what we—the brothers and sisters who have been here—would like to see continued.

So, thank you, Barbara. It is always a distinct privilege to be back in this revered Chamber, and we appreciate the opportunity today to present our annual report of the United States Association of Former Members of Congress.

I'm going to be joined by some of our colleagues in reporting the activities and projects of our organization, but, first of all, I would like to ask the Clerk to call the roll.

The Clerk called the roll of the former Members of Congress, as follows:

Mr. Alexander of Arkansas  
Mr. Buechner of Missouri  
Mr. Bustamante of Texas  
Ms. Byron of Maryland  
Mr. Carr of Michigan  
Mr. Clement of Tennessee  
Mr. Coyne of Pennsylvania  
Mr. DioGuardi of New York  
Mr. Edwards of Oklahoma  
Mr. Ewing of Illinois

Mr. Frost of Texas  
Mr. Gordon of Tennessee  
Mr. Hertel of Michigan  
Mr. Hughes of New Jersey  
Mr. Johnson of Georgia  
Mr. Kennedy of Minnesota  
Ms. Kennelly of Connecticut  
Mr. LaHood of Illinois  
Mr. Michel of Illinois  
Mr. Moore of Kansas  
Ms. Morella of Maryland  
Mr. Quinn of New York  
Mr. Sarasin of Connecticut  
Mr. Tanner of Tennessee  
Mr. Turner of Texas  
Mr. Walsh of New York  
Mr. Wamp of Tennessee  
Mr. Zeff of New Hampshire  
Mr. Spratt of South Carolina  
Mr. Largent of Oklahoma  
Mr. Blanchard of Michigan  
Mr. Hochbrueckner of New York  
Mr. Pressler of South Dakota  
Mr. Slattery of Kansas

Ms. MORELLA. Thank you all for joining us today. Our association, as you know, was chartered by Congress, and one requirement of that charter is for us to report once a year to Congress about our activities. Today, therefore, is our opportunity to demonstrate to Congress that creating us over 40 years ago wasn't such a bad idea.

Before my colleagues and I describe our activities of the past 12 months, I want to focus on the second purpose of our meeting here this morning, and that is to bestow our association's highest honor on a former Member of Congress whose public service inspires us and who deserves our recognition. When you look at Ray LaHood's public service, you understand quickly why he was a unanimous choice and an easy choice for our board to make.

Ray LaHood has spent his entire professional life in service to either his community or to the country, or to both. He was a junior high school teacher, he was a member of the Illinois State Legislature, a congressional chief of staff, a Member of Congress, and now a member of President Obama's Cabinet. In Congress, he served on the Transportation Committee and on the Appropriations Committee. During his many years in Congress, Ray LaHood's approach to legislating was characterized by decency, reason, civility, and respect. He was a Member more interested in solutions and debate than politicking and scoring wins.

It is that credibility and integrity that made it easy for President Obama to appoint him to his Cabinet regardless of party label. We are so pleased that we can recognize his exemplary dedication via our Distinguished Service Award.

The inscription on the award reads:

The 2013 Distinguished Service Award is presented by the United States Association of Former Members of Congress to Secretary of Transportation Ray LaHood.

Ray LaHood's devotion to public service has taken many forms and has guided his entire professional life, whether as a teacher, a congressional staff member, a Representative, or a member of the President's Cabinet. In all these roles, he always put country

above party and solutions above politics. He was the arbitrator when a divisive debate required sensible leadership. He would find common ground when compromise seemed unattainable. Whether as a Member of Congress or as a member of the Cabinet, Ray LaHood has distinguished himself as a dedicated and exemplary public servant, and his former colleagues from both sides of the aisle salute him.

Washington, DC, May 15, 2013.

That is the inscription.

I am reminded of a statement from Shakespeare: “the force of his own merit makes his way,” and he has worked hard and deserves the recognition we are about to give him.

Later on in our program, we expect that a former leader, Bob Michel, will be coming here to say something about Ray LaHood, whom he loved and felt was sort of a mentor, and they’re good friends, but he hasn’t arrived yet. I do want to commence with giving the award, and then later, when Bob comes, we will recognize him at whatever point in the program.

So I am going to ask Secretary Ray LaHood to join me here at the dais and accept our association’s 2013 Distinguished Service Award.

Secretary LaHood, we have also a booklet for you, which is here under this award, which I read word for word. The booklet includes letters sent by former Members and friends for you, saying how great you are. So, when you need that inspiration, you can just open the book and read those words. It is a great honor to present this to you, Ray. Congratulations to you.

Mr. LAHOOD. Thank you very much, Connie, and to the former Members.

Thank you so much to the association for this great honor that you do to me, and I know that, when you honor one former Member, we honor all Members. I am grateful to the association for all of the work that you do and for all of the encouragement that you give to people on college campuses, to young people, through the programs that you carry out year in and year out, and for the fact that the association continues to represent former Members and represent what is good about having served here.

I want to say a special word of thanks to my former Illinois colleague, Tom Ewing, for being here. Tom’s district and my district were joined together, and we used to fly to Chicago and ride together, and he would give me a ride kind of near my district, and we worked together on some very important issues.

I also want to thank two of the people who I came to Congress with in the election of 1994—Zach Wamp from Tennessee and Steve Largent from Oklahoma. As you can imagine, when our class came, there were 73 Republicans and 13 Democrats, I believe, and the most famous in our class, God rest his soul, was Sonny Bono. We all thought that we were pretty important. You come with a Hall of Famer like Largent and others who were in our class, but every camera focused on

Sonny. When we went out for our photo and when we were around, we all thought we were pretty important until Sonny showed up, and the media kind of gravitated towards Sonny. While in our first year here, Steve was actually inducted into the NFL Hall of Fame. Yes, he was a great football player out in Seattle. So I am grateful for the two of them coming and representing our class.

I also want to say a word about NICK RAHALL, whom I thought maybe I saw here. He might have walked in. He and I worked on some Lebanon issues together.

Let me just say quickly that this bipartisan thing comes very naturally to me. The district that I represented was 20 counties in central Illinois. Nine of those counties were represented by Abraham Lincoln for one term in this House. So it comes naturally.

One of my predecessors was Everett Dirksen, who went over to serve in the Senate, who became minority leader, and who helped Lyndon Johnson pass the civil rights bill. We’re going to celebrate the 50th anniversary of the civil rights bill. Tom Pegrarn is writing a book about that, and he did a lot of research on Everett Dirksen. Some of you remember Dirksen. He was a fellow from central Illinois who did work with Johnson in so many ways to pass major legislation right after Johnson had been elected in 1964.

Then of course, Bob Michel, whom I served with as his chief of staff, was renownedly known for his bipartisanship. During the time that President Reagan served in the White House for 8 years, he got a lot of credit for doing a lot of major legislation; but what people forget is that Bob Michel was the leader for the Republican Party, which was the minority party then, but he was able to reach across and get some Democratic votes in order to get Reagan’s agenda passed.

So this idea of bipartisanship, it’s in the water in central Illinois. It comes very naturally. It really does. When I came here, I came with people like Steve and Zach and others. Some of our class ran on the idea of turning this place upside down and reform and all of that, and we came here after the Republicans had been 40 years out in the wilderness as the majority party. I came here, really, to use the House of Representatives as a way to solve the country’s problems and to solve the issues and problems in central Illinois. I didn’t come here to necessarily turn the place upside down. I thought the House was a place where you could really solve problems, but it only could be done if there were some compromise involved in what we did. That’s the way that we tried to operate, and I think it’s a good lesson for people to look at. The House really can be a place where you solve the Nation’s problems and issues in your own districts, and that’s the way I always looked at it.

I was very proud of the fact that I chaired four bipartisan retreats. We

started out with David Skaggs and then with Charlie Stenholm. Our first bipartisan retreat included over 200 Members, over 100 spouses, and over 150 kids. That’s the first time that a congressional kid got to meet another congressional kid or that a spouse got to meet a spouse, and those friendships have lasted well beyond Congress.

My friend Jack Quinn, who is here, he and I were not in the same class, but we became friends, and we had friends on both sides of the aisle.

Look, I’m speaking to the choir here. You all know, and that’s why you’re here—you believe in the House; you believe in this organization; you believe that this is a place where you can have debates. But the bottom line is no problem gets solved—no issue ever gets resolved—unless it’s done with compromise, unless it’s done in a bipartisan way.

You can’t name an issue, big or small, that was ever solved unless it was bipartisanship. Not one of us in this House, not one of the 435 gets their own way, not one of us.

Big things get done when people work together, and big legislation gets passed when people work together. That’s the only way. That’s the formula. I don’t care what anybody says. If you look back on the storied history of this House any time that you served here, any issue that you dealt with where you could have a spirited debate, people could give great speeches. In the end, it was when people came together across the aisle that things got done, when big issues got solved. And it’s true today.

During the time that I’ve had this privilege that President Obama gave me, we’ve been able to pass a transportation bill and an FAA bill in a bipartisan way. We’ve been able to do some things, but always in a bipartisan way, always with compromise. There is no other way under this system that we have. So to all of you that are gathered here and honoring me, we honor all of you. We honor this association.

Come on, Mr. Leader. Come on up here.

I know Connie probably wants to introduce him.

They’ve already said a whole bunch of nice things about me, Mr. Leader. Come on. Come on up here.

Let’s hear it for our former leader.

Ms. MORELLA. I don’t need to introduce this gentleman. You all know him. But I do want to say that he does exemplify what Ray LaHood has said about bipartisanship and drinking the waters of central Illinois.

The bipartisan spirit in which Bob Michel is held was recently exemplified at a 90th birthday party held for him. At that birthday party, the Democrats came in, the Republicans came in, and all the former leaders came in. It was a wonderful opportunity to see how this man is so respected and what he exemplifies.

As we’ve already given the tribute, it’s up to you now to say something. He gave a great speech.

Mr. LaHOOD. Say a word or two.

Mr. MICHEL. Good morning, everybody. Sorry I'm tardy. I thought we started at 9 o'clock, and I went downstairs in the Speaker's dining room there and I thought there would be a few of you for coffee or something. So I apologize for my very tardy entrance.

Have we got the cart before the horse here or something? Something is backward anyway. But I thank you folks.

You may or may not remember that Ray got his start out in Illinois with former Congressman Tom Railsback. Some of you older folks will remember Tom. He was in my local office there, and then during my tenure as leader, in the last 10 years of that leadership role, I had Ray serve as my chief of staff. And I tell you, he kept me out of all trouble. He knew right from wrong, and he knew this institution. He loved to see Members of both sides. I think we talked about that a number of times, to get to know everybody on your side for sure, but don't be afraid to cross that aisle and get to know personally as many of the Democratic Members as you possibly can. He did a marvelous job doing that.

So it was kind of natural when I left and retired, he ran for my seat and won handily, and during his 14 years of service was on the Transportation Committee and the Appropriations Committee. I thought one of the things that Ray wanted to get done, if he possibly could—he always sought a Democrat or two to join him—was having retreats for the newer Members to get to know one another personally and feel comfortable in dealing with them. That was the way, at least with any measure of success that I might have enjoyed—it came by the fact that you loved to visit with the Members on the other side of the aisle whenever it was possible. Ray did that to the nth degree.

But most important I think for me is that he's got a great moral compass and he knows right from wrong. I tell you, that's guided him during his public service time. Those of you who have served, any number of times there are things that come up in the office once in a while where you're thinking, Well, I'm not altogether sure about this. It may be good; it may not. Ray always knew the right choice to make. That made me feel comfortable. And if I enjoyed any measure of success as leader, boy, I owe so much to this guy.

I think that's what the President saw in Ray when he decided, after he was elected, that he was going to have a couple of Republicans serve in his administration. Of course, Bob Gates was Secretary of Defense, and then he picked Ray to be his Secretary of Transportation. And with Ray's experience and again that ability to be very sociable and likeable, he was a great success and was a good ambassador for the President in that position.

I think if we look back over that period of 4 years, that Bob Gates and Hillary Clinton, yes, were very popular and well-known, and, boy, I tell you,

ranking right under them had to be Ray LaHood in his tenure as Secretary of Transportation.

He is a guy that really pushed safety. This idea of texting and talking while you're driving, boy, he made the case with the American public out there, and with some of those shady bus operators, when they were running into trouble, you know, Ray stepped right up there to bat. So I think it's just a wonderful thing that our organization would, by tradition, name someone of our former group to receive some special honor and recognition. Whoever makes the decision in the group these days, I personally thank you so much because he is my dear friend, and I don't think we could have made a better choice than Ray. Congratulations to you.

And since I got things backward, I was going to read the citation as I concluded. But obviously—

Mr. LaHOOD. Connie read it.

Mr. MICHEL. Oh, she did? Thank you.

Again, he prompted me correctly.

But in conclusion, thanks everybody. It's nice to see so many of you here.

Mr. LaHOOD. You obviously realize why Bob Michel was able to serve for 38 years. He's just a phenomenal human being. He's loved.

We had a 90th birthday party in our hometown of Peoria a couple of weeks ago, and over 300 people came to Bob's 90th birthday party. This is after he had left office for more than a decade. They came because of his service and the respect that they have for him, and we had a great day in Peoria honoring Bob Michel.

Again, in honoring Ray LaHood, we honor all of you and we honor the association.

Thank you all for what you've done to make this institution the great institution that it continues to be, and hopefully the few words that we said about how things really work and how to get things done will resonate a little bit through the hallways here for a moment or two. I know it won't be much more than a moment, but maybe somebody will pick it up.

Thank you to the association. I'm deeply honored. And I thank all of those who came this morning. God bless everybody.

Ms. MORELLA. That was a nice beginning of our annual meeting.

I'm now privileged to report to Congress about the activities of the U.S. Association of Former Members of Congress since our last meeting in July of 2012.

Our association is bipartisan. You've heard that over and over again, and you know that as you see the people who are here and listen to the words that have been spoken. It was chartered by Congress in 1983, and the purpose of the U.S. Association of Former Members of Congress is to promote public service and strengthen democracy abroad and in the United States. About 600 former Senators and Rep-

resentatives belong to the association. Republicans, Democrats, and Independents are united in this organization in their desire to teach about Congress and the importance of representative democracy. We're proud to have been chartered by Congress, and we receive no funding from Congress. All the activities, which we're about to describe, are financed by our membership dues, programs, specific grants and sponsors, or via our fundraising dinner.

Our finances are sound, our projects are fully funded, and our most recent audit by an outside accountant came back with a clean bill of financial health. Not bad, aye?

It's been a very successful, active, rewarding year. We have continued our work serving as a liaison between the current Congress and legislatures overseas. We have created partnerships with highly respected institutions in the area of democracy building and election monitoring. We have developed new projects. We are expanding others. And we, again, sent dozens of bipartisan teams of former Members of Congress to teach about public service and representative democracy at universities and high schools, both in the United States and abroad.

When this organization was created over 40 years ago, the former Members who founded our association envisioned this organization to take the lead in teaching about Congress and encouraging public service. They were hoping that former Members could inspire the next generation of America's leaders. Well, over the years we have created a number of programs, most importantly the Congress to Campus program, to do just that.

We continue to work with our great partner, the Stennis Center for Public Service Leadership. We thank them for their invaluable assistance in administering the Congress to Campus program.

I now yield to a former president of our association, Jack Buechner of Missouri, who, along with Matt McHugh of New York, cochairs this great program. So, Jack, if you would briefly tell us something about it.

Mr. BUECHNER. Thank you, Connie.

I welcome this opportunity to report on this outstanding program. As most of you know, the Congress to Campus program is the flagship operation of the former Members. It's a domestic program, and it also is an international program. It energizes and engages former Members from all over to come and join bipartisan teams of former Members. We go to colleges, universities, and even high schools across this country, and as I said, around the world, to educate the next generation of leaders about the value of public service.

Students benefit from the personal interaction with our association members, whose knowledge, experience, and accessibility are unique teaching tools. During each visit, our bipartisan teams lead classes, meet one on one with students and faculty, speak to campus

media, participate in campus and community forums, and interact with local citizenry. Institutions are encouraged to market the visit to the entire campus community, not just to those students majoring in political science, history, or government. Over the course of 2½ days, hundreds of students from all areas of academic studies are exposed to the former Members' message of public service and civility. The Congress to Campus program has always interviewed and surveyed the former Members and the campus contact to determine how the visit was so our program can continually improve.

This spring semester, the students are being surveyed both before and after the visit. That way, we can provide a way to determine the impact of the program on the students. By gathering this information, the Congress to Campus program can make a clear evaluation on what aspects of the program have the greatest effect, as well as provide tangible data to help find further funding for the program.

This program has also made a number of international visits this academic year, including two visits to the United Kingdom, one trip to Turkey, and one to Canada. Domestically, we had an extremely busy fall semester, coinciding with the elections. We had 13 visits across the country. The 2012 to 2013 academic year included visits to the United States Naval Academy, Palm Beach State College, Suffolk University, Pepperdine University School of Law, Boston University, Penn State, and the McGovern Center for Public Service at the University of South Dakota.

More than 30 former Members participated during this academic year, and I want to thank each of you who donated your time—pro bono—to this vital program. I also want to encourage our newest former Members and those who have not yet had the opportunity to consider doing so to encourage a friend from across the aisle to join you. It's an excellent opportunity to continue your public service after Congress.

You can also make a pledge to connect us with a host school, for example your alma mater, a college in your old district, or the university that your children or grandchildren are attending. Our staff will then follow-up with you to make the arrangements. Sharon Witiw runs the program and has all the information you will need.

As was mentioned earlier, we have continued our excellent partnership with the Stennis Center for Public Service Leadership in the administration of this program. We owe a special debt of gratitude to Brother Rogers of the Stennis Center for his fine work. Our staffs work very closely together to make this program such a success.

As I briefly mentioned, the Congress to Campus program has an international outreach. On average, we send two delegations per year to the United Kingdom for one week, with dozens of

universities and hundreds of British students studying foreign policy and the United States. Let me tell you, as a former Republican Member of Congress, during the height of the Iraq war, it was quite a challenge dealing with our continental friends. And now with the advent of "House of Cards," U.S. version, and I might add the campaign with Will Ferrell, there are a lot of interesting questions coming from students about what it is we do and how we do it. Our former Members actually become quasi-ambassadors on behalf of the United States. They really get to engage with these students.

Recently, we also sent former delegation Members on Congress to Campus visits to Turkey. And just last month, former Members Jim Kolbe, Martin Lancaster, Lincoln Davis, and Ben Chandler spent 10 days visiting universities all over Turkey. This great project was made possible via a partnership with the Mid-Atlantic Federation of Turkic-American Associations, and we thank them very much for putting an extremely productive and, I might add, busy program together.

Just a heads-up to my colleagues: former Member participation in these overseas trips is based on how actively you participate in the not-as-glamorous domestic programs.

Since our last annual meeting, we have also continued our relationship with the People to People programs. That's an organization that provides hands-on learning opportunities for elementary, middle school, and high school students visiting Washington, D.C. On each visit, former Members meet and speak with students about the importance of public service—again pro bono—their personal experiences in Congress, and the value of character and leadership. In the spring of 2013, two speaking engagements were held in congressional panel format. The events take place on the Hill, and not only feature a former Member as a speaker, but also Hill staffers and interns. This gives students the opportunity to learn what it really is like to be in the Congress and work in the Congress. People to People visits are often in the middle of the business day, and we are grateful to those former Members who take time out of their busy schedules to connect with students touring our Nation's capital. It is greatly appreciated by them and by the association.

Finally, I want to say how grateful we are to all of those who have made this Congress to Campus program such a success in the 36 years it has been in existence. We want to strongly encourage you, our friends and colleagues here, to participate in the program, either by making a visit to a school or by recommending a school to the program. As you know, democracy can prosper only if its citizens are both informed and engaged. As former legislators, we have a particular opportunity and responsibility to encourage such involvement. This program is one of our association's best ways to give

back to our community and our Nation.

Thank you very much.

Ms. MORELLA. Thank you, Jack. You're right, it's a great way for us to share our experiences and enthusiasm with the younger group coming into leadership.

Also, we thank Matt McHugh, your colleague, for the great job you've done with the program.

As you may recall, friends, from our last report to Congress, the association has put some energy and focus into this question of bipartisanship and civility in our political discourse. We are furthering this important work via the Common Ground Project. The purpose of the Common Ground Project is to involve citizens in a dialogue about the issues of the day, have a vigorous debate that's both partisan and productive, and benefit from the experience of respecting a different point of view.

Some of our existing undertakings already fit very nicely with this objective, for example, the Congress to Campus program that Jack Buechner just reported. And to give you more background about the Common Ground Project, I invite my colleague from Oklahoma, former Member Mickey Edwards, to share a report.

Thank you, Mickey.

Mr. EDWARDS. Thank you, Connie.

Now, Pete wrote this talk, and so I want to ad lib a little bit and say that, well, first of all, because it mentions my book, and I didn't put that in there.

But I had the opportunity very recently to give a speech at Bradley University, and I was so proud to start out my talk by saying how honored I was to be in the home of Bob Michel and Ray LaHood. And it just meant so much to me to be able to share that with them.

One quick comment to pick up on what Steny had said. One of the things I mentioned in my book is that every place you go to hear a speech, there's a lectern, except in this place, where there's a separate lectern for Republicans and Democrats. So I would paraphrase Ronald Reagan about tearing down this wall. Let's have one lectern, instead of dividing us into separate teams.

Everything we do at the Former Members Association is done in a bipartisan manner. Our leadership is comprised equally of Republicans and Democrats, our delegations are led by bipartisan teams of former Members of Congress, and our projects involve both Republicans and Democrats equally. We truly are a bipartisan organization where Members from across the political aisle come together for a common purpose.

We have found that, for a number of reasons, this type of bipartisan interaction has become more and more difficult for current Members, which is a great concern, I know, to every one of us. After we leave the Chamber today, we will participate in a full-day conference hosted by Senator John

Breaux, where we'll attempt to analyze some of the factors that go into today's dysfunctional political discourse.

This development has many causes, some of which are beyond the control of today's Members. Our association, therefore, has created the Common Ground Project, with the purpose of finding ways in which Democrats and Republicans can work together.

We decided to put some thought and effort into a structured program that could serve to foster a more civil and productive political discourse in this country. We hope to reconnect America's voters with their political process and encourage a respectful and productive debate on the many issues that we face.

Mostly, we achieve this outreach by working together with some of the many reputable and like-minded organizations across the country that are putting their energy and resources into this important topic. One such organization is the Concord Coalition, and we've had a number of events where former Members come together with either the public or with a university student audience to work our way through the Concord Coalition's excellent budget simulation.

Another example is our collaboration with the National Institute for Civil Discourse in Arizona. Together, our two organizations connected a bipartisan group of former Members with a bipartisan group of current Members to have a dialogue about what some of the causes might be that have led to a less civil and, therefore, less productive political climate.

We discussed the role of the media, the influence of campaign fundraising, the realities of our primaries. This was a very good discussion, and our goal is to continue this type of interaction, while expanding the number of participating Members. The next step in the partnership with the Institute for Civil Discourse is to identify congressional committees where there may be an opportunity for across-the-aisle collaboration and interaction. I think we call that getting back to the regular order.<sup>+</sup>

And our most prominent example of how the Common Ground Project can reconnect citizens with Congress is our partnership with the National Archives. This is now our third year of putting programming together at the Archives, where we invite a large audience to discuss with a bipartisan group of former Members the issues of the day.

We had such an event right after the November election to look at the role of money and the role of media in the elections. We had another one at the National Archives in the spring, based on my own book, "The Parties Versus the People," where we talked about the hold that party politics has on our system of government; and we're hosting one tonight examining the interaction between Congress and the White House.

We can learn a lot from each other, and that is certainly what the Common

Ground Project is all about. So on behalf of the organization, I invite my colleagues to become an active participant in this important dialogue, and I hope we will continue to have many opportunities to reengage the public when it comes to their representative government.

Thank you.

Ms. MORELLA. Thank you, Mickey. We very much value your participation.

And by the way, it's a great book, very provocative. I really thought you highlighted some of the very important aspects of what's going on in today's politics and what we need to do about it or think about. And I'm saying that without any cut in royalties.

But a great example of how powerful and productive bipartisanship can be is our annual Congressional Charity Golf Classic. It's chaired by our immediate past president, Dennis Hertel, and by fellow board member, Ken Kramer of Colorado.

I'm now going to yield the floor to Dennis Hertel of Michigan to give us a brief report about the Charity Golf Classic, which has been so successful.

Dennis.

Mr. HERTEL. I want to thank Madam President Connie for all that you're doing for the organization.

And I want to talk about the golf tournament, but the first thing I want to reassure everybody about this tournament is you don't have to be Tiger Woods to play. And I'm probably the best example of somebody who's not really a golfer participating all these years in this tournament.

It goes back 35 years. Remember, we used to play out at Andrews Air Force Base. And Bob Michel, our great leader, I remember when Bob Michel beat us on this floor in 1981, and we still all liked him on this side of the aisle. Bob Michel and Tip O'Neill were there for our tournament; and it was a very quiet tournament, a private tournament at Andrews Air Force base.

And then, because they changed the rules here in the House, and all the rest, to attract current Members, but mostly, as our other endeavors to do something for others, we established this charitable tournament 6 years ago to help the wounded warriors.

And with Zach Wamp and others, we used to meet in Zach's office, as co-chair. We got more active Members, current Members to play. And this year we've got over 20 current Members signed up. Our problem, our former Members: we only have a handful, so we really need more of you to participate in this to go forward.

It's going to be July 22 at the Army-Navy Country Club, so we've gone up as far as where we're playing the tournament. And they've just redone the entire club, and it's fantastic. The courses are new, and the clubhouse is brand new. It really is beautiful.

During each of our past tournaments, we've had dozens of current and former Members from both sides of the aisle

come together, and they have met with dozens of wounded warriors, many of whom give ball-striking demonstrations or play in our foursomes, and they're just tremendous young people.

They have even had double amputees included in their numbers who hit further and straighter than a lot of our Members, certainly much better than I. And it's an incredibly humbling, rewarding, and memorable experience to spend a day in the presence of these inspiring men and women.

Last year we had two outstanding current Member honorary chairs: Joe Baca of California and ANDER CRENSHAW of Florida. And I want to thank them, as well as Ken Kramer, our association's cochair, for all they've done to make our tournament such a success.

I want to thank Joe Baca, who didn't return for the 113th Congress, for how much he did as far as his energy in getting Members to play and to go forward with our tournament.

Now we have Congressman MIKE MCINTYRE of North Carolina as our Democratic cochair, who's just been tremendous in being a fusion to get current Members to play.

And we're so fortunate to have JIMMY DUNCAN from Tennessee, who a lot of us served with in the Congress, to be our Republican cochair. There's just no better invaluable supporter than JIMMY DUNCAN getting current Members to play.

I want to thank our sponsors for their generous contributions, and particular thanks to DSUSA and the PGA for being such steadfast and important partners. And PGA wants to take it up another level and get more professionals to play with us and to participate and to become a greater sponsor.

It's really an honor for us to help our Nation's heroes in this small way. Again, the next tournament is July 22. This tournament can only be successful if our Members, both current and former, give it their time and attention. Please let us know if you can play. We would really like to see you July 22.

Ms. MORELLA. Thank you, Dennis.

Ms. KENNELLY. The Chair recognizes the distinguished Speaker of the House, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. BOEHNER).

Mr. BOEHNER. Good morning. Tanner is giving me this look like, Hey, it's just BOEHNER. Leave him alone.

Let me say on behalf of all of my colleagues, welcome. Thank you for your years of service here in this institution. Let me congratulate Ray LaHood on being this year's Distinguished Service Award winner. I'm not sure I would have given it to him, but you all did. Just teasing.

But, listen, I'm trying to keep this institution focused on a couple of simple things. One is growing the economy. You all know the economy is not growing the way it should be. It's not creating jobs as fast as it should be, and wages aren't going up as quickly.

And so there's a lot of things that I think we need to continue to do to get our economy going again. But having said that, there are always other things that crop up around here.

You're all familiar with Benghazi, and now the Justice Department's investigation of the Associated Press, and then the IRS of all things. So in spite of trying to keep the institution focused on what the American people are most interested in, we end up also having to do our other responsibility, which is providing oversight of the executive branch, and we will do that.

In addition to that, I continue to believe and continue to work to make this a more open and fairer process for all the Members. If you look over the last couple of years, the minority has gotten more than its fair share of amendments. If committee chairs and others can't defend their product, it's not up to me to protect them. So I'm a big believer that people ought to have their shot. I think my colleagues on the other side of the aisle would agree that I've been more than fair in terms of what comes to the floor and how it's to be considered.

So, opening up the process, I believe, is very important because the more open process there is on the floor, the more work that the committees have to do to reach across the aisle and build bipartisan support for whatever proposal they have. Over time, I think this will break down some of the scar tissue that's built up over the years around here and be good for the institution.

So, I'm just here to say good morning and it's nice to see all of you.

Spratt, how are you? You're looking good. Don't have more hair than last time I saw you, though.

But really, it's nice to see all of you, and welcome back. Thank you.

Ms. MORELLA. Thank you, Mr. Speaker, for sharing those words with us, particularly understanding the number of issues that are appearing before you, the little things that you mention.

I also wanted to thank Dennis for what he's done, too, with the golf tournament and for his leadership. We're honored that we, as an association, can play a small role in the rehabilitation of these amazing men and women who are the wounded warriors.

So as we continue, in addition to the domestic programs we have just described, our association also has a very active and far-reaching international focus. We conduct programs that are focused on Europe and Asia, and we bring current Members of Congress together with their peers in legislatures overseas.

Ms. KENNELLY. The Chair recognizes our leader, NANCY PELOSI.

Ms. MORELLA. This is an abundance of riches, isn't it?

Ms. PELOSI. Thank you, Madam Chair. I certainly did not want to take the floor from our distinguished colleague, Connie Morella. It's so wonder-

ful to see you. Maybe good news for you, I've lost my voice. I know it will be good news for the Speaker, but we'll see later in the day.

I join him in welcoming you back to the Capitol. I hope it is always a source of joy to you to set foot on this floor, this place our Founders decided was the marketplace of ideas, where we would compete in the marketplace of ideas and find common ground to go forth. Your legacy is an important one to us. As I look around and see all of you, I see contributions that you have made over the years that we still benefit from.

It's an honor to be here with Bob Michel. I think he enjoyed the job of minority leader more than I do. What do you think, Bob? What do you think? We were all there to celebrate his birthday recently. It was a bipartisan fiesta, wasn't it? That was just a couple months ago we celebrated a landmark birthday. Happy birthday again.

But all of you, I heard what the Speaker said about this openness on the floor, and I thought that was really good news, because we've been trying to get a budget to the floor for a very long time but without much success to allow our budget to come to the floor. So I'm going to take the words that I just heard to CHRIS VAN HOLLEN and tell him that happy days are here again and that our amendment will be made in order in the Rules Committee.

Martin, Governor, Bob, all of you, we all are on a first-name basis. Last night, rightfully all of you honored the distinguished Secretary, Mr. LaHood. He has done a remarkable, remarkable job. We couldn't be prouder of him as a legislator and as a Secretary in the Cabinet even if he had been a Democrat. He's just absolutely wonderful. We love him, and he brings bipartisanship to all of what we do. And that's really what is, I think, not to get to a partisan place, Madam Chair, but is on the ballot in the next election: bipartisanship. It's something that is the most popular concept in politics. People would vote for that in overwhelming numbers; and hopefully, in this election, whatever the outcome is, bipartisanship will prevail.

I always say to people that you can win an election, that's up to the public, but the idea has to prevail, and that is what we're striving to do here. That's what we hope the election will impact. It already did have an impact in the last election with immigration. All of a sudden, it became an issue near and dear to the hearts of so many more people in the Congress who never had an interest in it before, because when the people spoke in such a big way, especially Hispanics, it became a priority for many more people in the Congress.

So, again, when all of you were here, we worked in a very, very civil and respectful way. We hope that we can return to that. But that doesn't diminish the contribution that you made in so many ways regarding the substance, the values, and the ethics that make our country so great.

So it really is a joy to see each and every one of you. I hope your lives are very happy. You certainly look well. There seems to be a good life after Congress, but it brings us such pride to see so many of you come back to continue this bonding. Thank you. It's an honor to see you.

Madam Speaker, how does it feel up there? It feels good, huh? It feels good. Welcome, Barbara. Thank you all very much for being here.

Ms. MORELLA. We are very honored that our minority leader chose to join us again to greet us as well as the Speaker of the House and STENY HOYER.

So let's continue on with our program. We were talking about programs that focus on Europe and Asia and bringing current Members of Congress together with their peers and legislatures overseas, which actually helps in terms of what we discussed with people knowing each other and therefore finding it easier to work together noting that they have common objectives.

We work with the Department of State to talk about representative democracy with audiences overseas. We partner with former parliamentarians from other countries for democracy-strengthening initiatives. This is a very active outreach to emerging democracies. My colleague from Texas, Martin Frost, instituted the so-called Frost-Solomon Task Force when he was in Congress, and many of the legislative-strengthening projects that we conduct are actually modeled on his good work.

It is now a pleasure to yield the floor to our friend from Texas, Martin Frost.

Mr. FROST. Thank you, Connie. Since we have to be off the floor at 9:30, I'm going to truncate these remarks a little bit.

A number of years ago, we created the International Election Monitors Institute under the leadership of then-president Jack Buechner. It is a joint project of the U.S. Association of Former Members of Congress, the Association of Former Members of the European Parliament, and the Canadian Association of Former Parliamentarians. In addition to conducting multiple workshops for former legislators to train them for election-monitoring missions, this group sent delegations to monitor elections in places such as Morocco, Ukraine, and—our most ambitious undertaking—Iraq. The original intent of the International Election Monitors Institute was to train former legislators and prepare them for the task of observing an election. We have since broadened and expanded this to focus and are now incorporated as the Global Democracy Institute, again in partnership with our colleagues from Ottawa and Brussels. Former legislators from all political walks of life can be a tremendous asset to these organizations that seek to strengthen democracy across the globe.

In addition to that, this organization has undertaken a number of trips. I

had the privilege, along with Connie and some other people in this room, to take part in an exchange in China last year. This was one of a series of those. I know that we're going to be doing that again. I encourage you to take part in these. They are educational. For some reason, the people in China think that former Members of Congress still have some influence, so they treat us very well. It is interesting to learn about the evolution of their particular democratic process. It's slow, but I think it's important that we continue to show interest. I think it's very helpful for our country.

We have participated in a variety of projects in Turkey and in the United Kingdom, as well as in Nigeria. I just think that when you're asked as a former Member to take part in one of these trips, try and find some time to do it. You will find that you have a lot to offer to emerging democracies to talk about how our system works. I think it's very good for us as a country and an association that we continue this work.

Connie, you've got a couple of other speakers. I'm going to yield back the balance of my time and again thank you for what you've done for the association.

Ms. MORELLA. Thank you.

I am now going to yield time to my colleague from Maryland, Beverly Byron, to report on some of the other activities of the association.

Ms. BYRON. Thank you, Connie. Let me thank Martin for his interest in furthering the U.S. Association of Former Members in the world.

Another important international undertaking which involves the Former Members is our new Middle East fellowship program. Now in its third year, it brings young professionals from the Middle East and from North Africa to Washington for a 1-month immersion program. It is chaired by former Members Scott Klug and Larry LaRocco, and I want to thank them for their leadership in this program.

In the spring of 2009, the Former Members began a partnership with Legacy International, a Virginia-based NGO, which has been in existence for 30 years, for the Middle East Legislative Fellows Program. Initiated by the Department of State and the Bureau of Educational and Cultural Affairs, the LFP hosted young professionals from Egypt, Libya, and Tunisia this spring. Previous delegations have included young professionals from Kuwait, Morocco, and Oman. Our guests are in the D.C. area for a month-long fellowship working in congressional offices and NGOs.

The program is designed to promote a positive relationship between the U.S. and the gulf states, which, in light of the Arab Spring, is now more vital than ever. The fellows—candidates with strong leadership skills who represent the top talent in their fields in their countries—have an opportunity to gain practical experience and direct

interaction with the U.S. Government and its officials. This is an invaluable opportunity on both sides. For one who has hosted a dinner each year for a number of the individuals, they are very, very sharp, they're bright, they're articulate; and we will be looking to them in the future to be leaders of their country.

Our association connects the fellows with former Members who work together. The former Members act as a kind of mentor of the young men and young women through one-on-one meetings, roundtable discussions, and by attending program discussions and events. The former Members have a great opportunity to expand their understanding of where we are.

In an exciting extension to the LFP, at the conclusion of each program, a team of former Members completes the exchange by then leading a delegation to the region to conduct workshops and gain firsthand experience of that area. The goal of this program is to seek a better understanding between the cultures and establish an avenue of dialogue between nations. LFP is an unprecedented opportunity to augment a constructive political and cultural discourse between the U.S. and the Middle East. I am pleased that our association is part of this new, vital program; and every time has been a wonderful opportunity to meet with the young people that come.

Thank you.

Ms. MORELLA. Thank you, Bev, for your leadership and your active involvement in this great program. As a former Ambassador, I am acutely aware of the power of personal interaction and people making a difference to bridge the cultural divide. This is, indeed, a great program for our association.

Not all of our programs focus exclusively on former Members, as you may already have discerned. As was mentioned earlier, we have a number of projects that benefit from former-Member leadership but involve primarily current Members and their peers overseas. We call these programs Congressional Study Groups, and our focus is on Germany, Turkey, Japan, and Europe as a whole. To give you more background about the Congressional Study Groups, I invite former Member Bart Gordon of Tennessee to the dais.

Bart, maybe you will give us a synopsis.

Mr. GORDON. Thank you, Connie, for those kind words, but, more importantly, thank you for the grace that you show as you lead us. You continue to be our ambassador to the world.

Ms. MORELLA. You're so political, Bart.

Mr. GORDON. No, no. You know that's true. We all know that's true here.

Let me first say, as I look around and see everyone, many of you I spent all of my 26 years with, and some a part of that. It's sort of a kaleidoscope of

memories that just wash over you. I think almost every one of us sat down together somewhere on the floor and talked about business or what was going on at home. Fortunately, Jim Walsh and I are next-door neighbors in our offices. I'm glad to see my Tennesseans again. We don't get to see each other enough, but it's like we were just here and again like that conversation just continues. This is, I think, one more real benefit of the association, and I'm glad to have a chance to join that.

Pete, many thanks to you for assembling the really excellent staff that you have. They have just a little bitty office, but they really churn out lots and lots of good work. A part of that good work is the Congressional Study Groups.

We have Congressional Study Groups on Germany, Japan, Turkey, and Europe, the flagship international programs of the Former Members of Congress. The study groups are independent, bipartisan legislative exchanges for current Members of Congress and their senior staff and serve as educational forums and invaluable tools for international dialogue with the goal of creating better understanding and cooperation between the United States and its most important strategic and economic allies.

The Congressional Study Group on Germany celebrates its 30th anniversary this year and remains one of the largest and most active parliamentary exchange programs between the United States Congress and the legislative branch of another country.

With your permission, Madam President, I'm going to ask that the remainder of my remarks be made part of the Record—since we're supposed to be out of here at 9:30—and just say that these are very good programs.

Our world is becoming smaller. We do need allies around the world. And I think by making parliamentarians of other countries and the United States come together, it really is forming great ties that will benefit us.

The other thing, I don't think you can be around here and not be a bit of a junky—political junky, that is. These programs are for the active Members, but there are a number of programs here in the United States and Washington that allow parliamentarians and others to come together and discuss the issues of the day, which I think that you will find very interesting and I hope that you will have a chance to participate in those.

It gives me great pleasure to report on the work of The Congressional Study Groups on Germany, Japan, Turkey and Europe, the flagship international programs of FMC. The Study Groups are independent, bipartisan legislative exchanges for current Members of Congress and their senior staff and serve as educational forums and invaluable tools for international dialogue with the goal of creating better understanding and cooperation between the United States and its most important strategic and economic partners.

The Congressional Study Group on Germany celebrates its 30th anniversary this year and remains one of the largest and most active parliamentary exchange programs between the U.S. Congress and the legislative branch of another country. In the 113th Congress, Representative TIM RYAN of Ohio and Representative CHARLIE DENT of Pennsylvania lead the Study Group on Germany in the House, following on two successful years of service by Representative PHIL GINGREY of Georgia and Representative RUSS CARNAHAN of Missouri. In the Senate, Senator JEFF SESSIONS of Alabama and Senator JEANNE SHAHEEN of New Hampshire serve as Co-Chairs.

The Study Group's programming consists of periodic roundtable discussions on Capitol Hill for Members of Congress featuring visiting dignitaries from Germany or U.S. government officials. In addition, Annual Seminars are conducted abroad and at home, as well as Study Tours geared toward senior Congressional staff. This year, the 30th Annual Congress-Bundestag Seminar brought together a record nine Members of Congress with their counterparts in Berlin and Munich for in-depth, substantive discussions, including a meeting with Chancellor Angela Merkel.

This 30th anniversary of the Seminar was particularly special as FMC awarded its first ever International Statesmanship Award to Hans-Ulrich Klose, Chair of the Bundestag's U.S.-German Parliamentary Friendship Group, "for his longstanding service to strengthening the U.S.-German relationship and in appreciation of his leadership championing The Congressional Study Group on Germany." Thank you again, Mr. Klose.

A few highlights from the Study Group's domestic programming include: a German parliamentarian at the start of discussions for a transatlantic free trade agreement last June; the Vice-Chancellor of Germany; a roundtable with international journalists providing a unique analysis of the November 2012 elections; the Editor-in-Chief of leading European broadcaster ZDF; and the State Secretary from the German Federal Ministry of Economics and Technology.

Since its establishment, The Congressional Study Group on Germany has received financial support from The German Marshall Fund of the United States, and we are grateful to Craig Kennedy and Maia Comeau. The Association also receives additional funding from a group of organizations making up the Study Group's Business Advisory Council. The Study Group's current Business Advisory Council members are Airbus Americas, Allianz, BASF, Daimler, Deutsche Telekom, DHL Americas, Eli Lilly and Company, Fresenius, Lufthansa, RGIT, and Volkswagen.

Also celebrating a milestone anniversary is the Association's Congressional Study Group on Japan, founded in 1993. In the House of Representatives, Congressman JIM McDERMOTT of Washington and Congresswoman SHELLEY MOORE CAPITO of West Virginia continue to serve as Co-Chairs in the 113th Congress. In the Senate, Senator LISA MURKOWSKI of Alaska serves as the Republican Co-Chair, and Senator MAZIE HIRONO of Hawaii—the first Japanese immigrant to serve in the Senate. The Study Group would also like to extend special acknowledgement to its Honorary Co-Chairs, former Speakers Dennis Hastert and Tom Foley, who remain active in our programming.

Since its inception, The Congressional Study Group on Japan has been funded by the Japan-U.S. Friendship Commission, and the Association would like to extend a special thanks to the Paige Cottingham-Streater and Margaret Mihori.

This year, the Study Group also launched a strategic partnership with the Sasakawa Peace Foundation USA. Thanks to the support of President Junko Chano, Director Takahiro Nanri, and Senior Fellow Daniel Bob, The Congressional Study Group of Japan has undergone significant revitalization.

The Congressional Study Group on Japan is also grateful for the support of the Japanese business community here in Washington, DC, represented by the Study Group's Business Advisory Council. The nine companies of the 2013 Council are The Bank of Tokyo-Mitsubishi UFJ, Japan Railways-JR Central, Hitachi, Honda, Marubeni, Mitsubishi, Mitsui, Sojitz, and Toyota Motor North America.

With this expanded and diversified funding base, the Study Group has been able to increase both the quality and quantity of its programming. Already in the 113th Congress, the Study Group has convened eight events, with plans for many more. Featured speakers have included a senior counselor to the new Prime Minister; Ambassador Demetrios Marantis, then Deputy U.S. Trade Representative; a delegation from the American Chamber of Commerce of Japan; and the Chairman of the Japanese Diet's Committee on Foreign Affairs.

The Congressional Study Group on Japan was also honored to convene a roundtable discussion at the home of Ambassador Sasae earlier this year. Seventeen current Members of Congress participated—including 8 freshman Members—which constitutes the largest delegation from Congress to the Embassy in recent memory, and shows promise for the future strategic U.S.-Japan alliance.

The Congressional Study Group on Turkey was founded in 2005, supported by generous grants from TEPAV, the Economic Policy Research Foundation of Turkey. Since the Arab Spring, there has been increasing interest in bilateral relations with one of our strongest allies in an often unstable region.

In the 113th Congress, Representative ED WHITFIELD (R-KY) and Representative GERALD CONNOLLY (D-VA) continue leading the Study Group, and I am happy to share that the past Co-Chairs, VIRGINIA FOXX of North Carolina and STEVE COHEN of Tennessee, also remain active.

Similar to our other Study Groups, Turkey's programming consists of periodic roundtable discussions on Capitol Hill for Members of Congress featuring visiting dignitaries from Turkey, U.S. government officials and other experts. A recent highlight from this year was our roundtable discussion with the Turkish Minister for EU Affairs and Chief Negotiator for EU Accession. The Study Group also convened programs on the "Southern Energy Corridor" and Secretary Kerry's first official visit to Turkey.

Additionally, last month, Former Members Jim Kolbe of Arizona, Martin Lancaster of North Carolina, Lincoln Davis of Tennessee, and Ben Chandler of Kentucky travelled to Turkey with FMC's "Congress to Campus" program to meet with Turkish high school and university students to discuss the U.S. presidential system, federalism, and the U.S. political process, as well as reforming the Turkish

Constitution. FMC is grateful to The Mid-Atlantic Federation for Turkic-American Associations who helped to organize and fund the trip.

The Congressional Study Group on Turkey looks forward to organizing a Study Tour for Members of Congress to Turkey in the coming programming year.

At the end of 2011, the Association established the Congressional Study Group on Europe, which serves as an outreach to the broader transatlantic relationship. Programming focuses not just on Brussels and the European Union, but capitals throughout Europe.

Together, Representative JEFF FORTENBERRY of Nebraska and Representative PETER WELCH of Vermont chair the Study Group in the 113th Congress. These gentlemen follow the successful leadership of the inaugural co-chairs, now-former Congressman Ben Chandler of Kentucky and Representative CHARLIE DENT of Pennsylvania, who has joined the leadership of The Congressional Study Group on Germany.

The Study Group continues to work closely with European-focused caucuses and embassies to provide Capitol Hill programming. Program highlights from the past year include a Senior Fellow of the European Council on Foreign Relations, discussing Franco-German relations; a delegation from the EU Parliament's Economic and Monetary Affairs Committee, led by the Committee Chairwoman; and Ambassador Miriam Sapiro, Deputy U.S. Trade Representative, who addressed the proposed Transatlantic Trade and Investment Partnership just days after it was announced at the State of the Union.

Finally, this year marks the second year of the Association's Diplomatic Advisory Council. Initially envisioned as a sister program to The Congressional Study Group on Europe, the Diplomatic Advisory Council now has nearly 25 Ambassadors who advise and participate in all of our programming. Their interest and commitment to multilateral dialogue is a valued addition to The Congressional Study Groups.

As former Members of Congress, we are proud to bring the important services provided The Congressional Study Groups to our colleagues still in office and are proud to play an active role in our continued international outreach.

Ms. MORELLA. I want you to know he has a very extensive report to give on the congressional study groups because they've been very, very active, and they involve current Members of Congress. So you current Members of Congress who may be watching, please link up with the congressional study groups and you'll have some great opportunities to continue to work overseas.

I appreciate his abbreviating his report in deference to the time.

Right now I just want to mention to you—and again, I'm going to be very brief—that we have the Statesmanship Award Dinner. This is one of our major ways of raising money. So to tell you something about that as part of our overall number of activities is our colleague, Jim Walsh.

Mr. WALSH. Thank you, Connie. Good morning, everyone. I'm pleased to tell you this is the last report of the morning prior to our election, which I

suspect will go very swiftly and without controversy.

I'd like to thank Connie for her gracious leadership. I'd also like to thank Lou Frey for the remarkable job that he does organizing us and keeping the ducks in a row as we work on this fundraiser, which is really key to our success every year.

On March 19, the association was proud to host its 16th annual Statesmanship Award Dinner, with almost 500 guests in attendance. For the 16th dinner, we decided to continue the very successful expansion we initiated last year. In addition to our traditional Statesmanship Award, we created two additional award categories: the Civic Statesmanship Award and the Corporate Statesmanship Award.

We continued to present the dinner under the theme of "A Salute to Service," and all four of our honorees very clearly fit into that category of outstanding public service. The focal point of the evening was the presentation of the Statesmanship Award, which recognizes a former or current Member of Congress for their devotion to public service. We were very pleased to recognize the leadership throughout their careers of Senator Sam Nunn and Senator Dick Lugar as our Statesmanship Honorees for their outstanding political careers, service to our country, and bipartisan accomplishments that have made the world a safer place.

The Civic Statesmanship Award honors a person or a nonprofit for having made significant improvement to our society. The 2013 recipient was award-winning actor Gary Sinise and the Gary Sinise Foundation. Mr. Sinise does so much to help wounded warriors and first responders, and we were very pleased to honor him at the dinner.

The Corporate Statesmanship Award recognizes outstanding corporate citizenship, and we chose Margery Kraus, founder and chief executive officer of APCO Worldwide. Not only has she established a culture of corporate philanthropy with APCO, but she is also one of the driving forces behind the Close Up Foundation—which many of you dealt with when you served here—which brings youngsters from across the country to D.C. to learn about their government.

I'd also like to take this opportunity to thank Pulitzer Prize-winning columnist Colbert I. King, who was our master of ceremonies and did a fantastic job for the event and lent wonderful grace to the event.

The evening is a wonderful way to showcase our association and recognize outstanding public service. In addition, the dinner is our financial lifeline. All the programs you've heard about are self-financed by your association. Not a single taxpayer dollar is appropriated for this organization and for the many projects that we conduct. Therefore, success of the fundraising dinner translates directly into success for the association.

The evening is a lot of fun, and it's also of great importance to the organi-

zation. I hope that all former Members currently in attendance can be counted upon when Lou Frey picks up the phone next summer and gives you a call to help recruit you for our dinner.

Thank you very much.

Ms. MORELLA. Thank you, Jim.

All the programs that we have described of course require both leadership and staff to implement, and I want to say openly and very enthusiastically our association is blessed to have top people in both categories.

I want to take this opportunity to thank our board of directors—30 former Members divided equally between parties—for their advice and their counsel. We really appreciate it.

The membership is going to vote on new board members in just a moment. You might notice that this year's slate is larger than in past years. That's because at our most recent board meeting we voted to increase the number of directors so that we have open slots available for newer former Members.

Also, I would be remiss if I didn't thank the other members of the association's executive committee: our vice president, Barbara Kennelly, who eventually will be president. You notice we'll have two women, president and vice president, et cetera. Just a point of observation.

Our vice president, Barbara Kennelly; our treasurer, Jim Walsh; our secretary, Bill Delahunt; our past president, Dennis Hertel, who has given me a lot of advice and counsel through the year—you've all made the association a stronger and better organization than it's ever been. Thank you all.

Now, to administer these programs, it takes a staff of dedicated and enthusiastic professionals. I've often felt, to paraphrase the 23rd Psalm: my rod and my staff, they comfort me and prepare the papers for me in the presence of my constituents. And boy, this staff has really done that—small staff, a lot of work.

Rachel Haas has joined our association as office manager just 6 months ago. Already we can't imagine what we ever did without her. Just stand. We're not going to have applause for everybody. Hold your applause. I just want them to stand.

Andrew Shoening, who is our international programs officer, does such a terrific job implementing all the Capitol Hill events that you've heard about. He started as an intern and has now been with us full-time for over a year.

Sharon Witiw, she is our member services manager. She takes exceptionally good care of our 600 association members and all their various requests, needs, and inquiries. She is also in charge of the Congress to Campus program.

We have Meltem Ercan, who is our international programs manager, with particular focus on the wonderful Turkey program that you've heard about and will read about. She served for many years as the head of protocol at the U.S. Embassy in Ankara.

Sabine Schleidt is our international programs director. She oversees all the current Member programs, which is so impressive and important. I'm very impressed with the kind of work that she has done in her outreach. In less than 2 years, she has created two international outreaches that are already a big success: the Congressional Study Group on Europe; and the Diplomatic Advisory Group, which has about 25 to 30 Ambassadors from the region who are part of it.

Peter Weichlein is the chief executive officer, 14 years with the Association, 10 years in top positions, and he works so darn hard.

So I'd like you to give a round of applause to the staff. But before you do that, I want to add somebody else who is such a great communications expert, Dava Guerin. She has taken on the role of our communications director. She tells our story, connects us with the media, all at a ridiculously low rate.

I want to thank Dava, and I want to thank all the staff.

Now will you give them a round of applause. I wish we had more time for me to tell you more about what they do, but you will get to know them as you get more involved with the association.

Now, every year at our annual meeting, we ask the membership to elect new officers and board members. In the past we've done so in a separate business meeting of the membership, but it occurred to us that there is no better place for holding a vote than the Chamber of the House of Representatives. I therefore now read you the names of the candidates for officers and board members. They're all running unopposed. I would have never known what that was like ever, but I do now. I therefore ask for a simple "yea" or "nay" as I present to you the list of candidates as a slate. I'm going to do it quickly because, again, in the interest of time.

For the association's board of directors, the candidates are:

Russ Carnahan of Missouri  
Bob Carr of Michigan  
Bob Clement of Tennessee  
Jim Courter of New Jersey  
Lou Frey of Florida  
Bart Gordon of Tennessee  
Dennis Hertel of Michigan  
Jim Jones of Oklahoma  
Scott Klug of Wisconsin  
Ron Sarasin of Connecticut  
Olympia Snowe of Maine  
Cliff Stearns of Florida  
Steve LaTourette of Ohio.

All in favor of these 13 former Members to our board of directors please say "yea." All opposed? Hearing no objection, the slate has been elected by the membership.

Next, we will elect our executive committee. Barbara Kennelly, Dennis Hertel, and I are finishing the first year of our 2-year term and are therefore not up for election. The candidates for a 1-year term on our executive committee are Jim Walsh of New York for treasurer and Bill Delahunt of Massachusetts for secretary. All in favor of

electing these two former Members to a 1-year term on our executive committee, please say "yea." All opposed? Hearing no opposition, the slate has been elected by the membership. Thank you.

It is my sad duty to inform the Congress of those former and current Members who have passed away since our last report. I ask all of you, including the visitors in the gallery, to rise as I read the names; and at the end of the list, we will pay our respect to their memory with a moment of silence. We honor these men and women for their service to our country. They are:

Jack Brooks of Texas  
 Cardiss Collins of Illinois  
 David Cornwell of Indiana  
 John Durkin of New Hampshire  
 Mervyn Dymally of California  
 Joseph Early of Massachusetts  
 Bob Edgar of Pennsylvania  
 Robert Gammage of Texas  
 Sam Gibbons of Florida  
 James Grover of New York  
 Daniel Inouye of Hawaii  
 Ed Koch of New York  
 Peter N. Kyros of Maine  
 George McGovern of South Dakota  
 David O'Brien Martin of New York  
 Charlie Rose of North Carolina  
 William Royer of California  
 Warren B. Rudman of New Hampshire  
 Arlen Specter of Pennsylvania  
 Sam Steiger of Arizona  
 Donald Tewes of Wisconsin  
 Richard Tonry of Louisiana  
 Charlie Wilson of Ohio

We will have a moment of silence.

Thank you.

It's sad to have lost those Members, but they live on in our memory and love.

That concludes the 43rd report to Congress by the U.S. Association of Former Members of Congress. We thank the Congress, the Speaker, and the minority leader for giving us the opportunity to return to this revered Chamber and to report on our association's activities. We look forward to another active and productive year.

Thank you.

Ms. KENNELLY. The Chair terminates the meeting.

The meeting adjourned at 9:32 a.m.

□ 1200

#### AFTER RECESS

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

#### PRAYER

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

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

We ask Your blessing this day upon the Members of the people's House. May their labors be graced by Your gifts of wisdom, patience, and charity, that truth and righteousness might prevail in all of their proceedings.

We take special note this day, May 15, National Peace Officers Memorial

Day, of the 123 peace officers who have died this past year in the line of duty. We ask that You grant them eternal rest for having paid the ultimate price in protecting us.

Give their families consolation in mourning their loss. May they be assured that we, as a nation, hold them in our hearts and understand that we will always be indebted to them.

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

Amen.

#### THE JOURNAL

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

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

#### PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

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

Mr. VEASEY led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

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

#### ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

#### WHITE HOUSE ASSAULTS FREEDOM OF PRESS

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

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, the expansion of Big Government is a threat to the American people. According to Politico, the administration:

had obtained records that listed incoming and outgoing calls and the duration of these calls for work and personal phone numbers of AP reporters and phone lines for AP offices in New York; Hartford, Connecticut; and Washington, as well as the main number for AP reporters in the House of Representatives press gallery. The government seized records—which listed incoming and outgoing calls and the call's length—for more than 20 separate lines assigned to the AP and its reporters.

The American people are losing their trust in the White House. The recent admissions reveal that the President and his administration will do whatever it takes to extend power, including violating First Amendment rights. Even the media is at risk of Big Government intrusion. Over the coming weeks, it's my hope that this is thor-

oughly investigated and those responsible will be held accountable.

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

#### SUPPLEMENTAL NUTRITION ASSISTANCE PROGRAM

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

Mrs. BEATTY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to denounce the proposed cuts to the Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program, known as SNAP, in the House farm bill.

Last week, I had the opportunity to witness a mother feeding her two children and giving them a jump-start because of SNAP, and then a young lawyer came and talked to us about being able to make an investment in this country because she was assisted.

I'm from Ohio, and in Ohio, SNAP reaches 16 percent of the State's population. Eighty-four percent of the households receiving SNAP have incomes below the poverty line. SNAP has helped to lift about 4.7 million Americans above the poverty line in 2011, including 2.1 million children.

For many of the poorest Americans, SNAP is the only form of income assistance they have. Mr. Speaker, we must protect our most at-risk children and families in this Nation. Let's save SNAP.

#### REPEAL OBAMACARE

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

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, what was ObamaCare's central claim? The Affordable Care Act, as it was termed by President Obama, was supposed to make health care more affordable for the American people. Many who believed that claim, however, now have buyer's remorse.

ObamaCare was to help save families \$2,500 on their health care premiums. But that's not true. Family premiums have increased \$3,000 since 2008.

Even workers who make \$25,000 a year will pay more for health care because of ObamaCare. Young people struggling to pay off debt and find careers in this jobless economy could see their health premiums rise by as much as 189 percent.

In spite of lofty promises, health insurance costs are higher. More than 30 studies have found ObamaCare will make health care premiums less affordable by the time it's fully implemented.

Promises for affordable health care have delivered a true train wreck to the American people. It's time to repeal ObamaCare and all of its broken promises once and for all.

SUPPLEMENTAL NUTRITION  
ASSISTANCE PROGRAM

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

Ms. LEE of California. Mr. Speaker, as if voting to repeal the Affordable Care Act for the 37th time is not enough, Republicans are adding insult to injury by marking up a farm bill this week that doubles down on their indiscriminate sequester.

The Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program, formerly known as the Food Stamp program, is one of our Nation's first lines of defense against hunger and among the most effective forms of economic stimulus. Every \$1 in SNAP benefits generates \$1.70 in economic activity. Yet the Republican farm bill cuts nearly \$21 billion from our Nation's antihunger program while millions of Americans continue to struggle from the impacts of the Great Recession. These cuts would end food assistance for nearly 2 million low-income people, mostly working families, children, and seniors, already hit by the sequester.

Mr. Speaker, when I was a student and a single mother, the American people provided a lifeline in the form of food stamps while I struggled to make a better life for my children. That's true today for millions of families across the country, including 4.3 million Californians who need this critical lifeline.

Cutting SNAP is morally wrong and an economic disaster. We should reject these cuts, stop sequestration, and create jobs.

□ 1210

THE GOSNELL TRIAL

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

Mr. PITTENGER. Mr. Speaker, on Monday, justice was served in Philadelphia when a monster by the name of Dr. Kermit Gosnell was convicted of the murder of three small babies in his abortion clinic. Each and every life is precious, Mr. Speaker, and murdering an innocent baby for the sake of convenience or greed is terribly, terribly wrong.

In the last 40 years, Mr. Speaker, the lives of over 50 million young babies have been taken. How do we know that God did not place in the lives of these individuals a cure for cancer, a cure for Alzheimer's, a cure for Parkinson's? We won't know that until eternity. We grieve over those losses.

May I quote Thomas Jefferson, Mr. Speaker, for the sake of our Nation:

God, who gave us life, gives us liberty. Can liberties of a nation be secure when we have removed a conviction that these liberties are a gift of God? Indeed, I tremble for my country when I reflect that God is just, that His justice cannot sleep forever.

IN OPPOSITION TO PROPOSED  
SNAP CUTS

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

Mr. VEASEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to speak against the proposed cuts to the Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program, or SNAP. As the Nation's most important antihunger program, SNAP offers nutrition assistance to 46 million low-income Americans and provides economic benefits to communities. SNAP also allows families to more easily set aside a portion of their resources for food and not have to outsource all of their meals and to prioritize a healthier, more consistent diet without compromising as much on obligations such as rent, utilities, transportation and other basic needs.

Over 80 percent of SNAP households have incomes below the poverty line and 40 percent have incomes below half of the poverty line. For many of these Americans, SNAP is the only form of income assistance they receive. We cannot allow the budget to be balanced on the backs of the poor and most vulnerable in our country.

The proposed farm bill up for a vote in the House Agriculture Committee today would cut \$20 billion from the program. I join my colleagues in opposing these draconian cuts to ensure that 46 million people who rely on this program will have food.

CONGRATULATING THE GRADUATING CLASS OF FLINTHILLS HIGH SCHOOL

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

Mr. POMPEO. Mr. Speaker, this Sunday, I had the good fortune of being in Rosalia, Kansas, at the high school graduation for Flinthills High. Flinthills High has 11 strong graduating in 2013, but it was remarkable. With all the challenges the country faces, we had young people going to be nurses, young people entering our Nation's Army National Guard. We had a young man who was off to attend school but who knew that he was going to be coming back to help his father and mother on the farm.

With all of the challenges we face today, it was incredibly heartening to see this next generation of leaders being raised in the heartland. Congratulations to those 11, six young women and five young men.

Go, Mustangs.

IN OPPOSITION TO PROPOSED  
SNAP CUTS

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

Ms. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Speaker, today the Agriculture Committee marks up a farm bill, cutting \$20 billion from food

support for the poorest, most vulnerable Americans. The Republican SNAP cuts will cut 210,000 children off the school lunch program and deny 2 million Americans food.

The Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program, SNAP, is a lifeline for nearly 50 million Americans to have access to healthy, affordable food and avoid hunger. More than half of SNAP recipients live in deep poverty. That's an income of less than \$10,000 a year for a family of three. Right now, the daily SNAP benefit is \$3.78.

Two out of three SNAP recipients in Minnesota are poor children, seniors and adults with disabilities. To reduce the budget deficit by inflicting hunger on children, seniors and people with disabilities is simply immoral.

I urge my colleagues to reject this cruel and harmful proposal to increase hunger in America.

IRS SCANDAL

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

Mr. GRAVES of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to speak out against the IRS for targeting Americans because of their political beliefs. What is clear is that the IRS has violated the public trust in a serious and disturbing way. It's sickening to learn that the IRS not only targeted Tea Party conservative groups but also groups that criticized the government or even taught the United States Constitution.

The United States is a beacon of hope and freedom for the oppressed all across the world, but the coordinated suppression of President Obama's political opponents undermines who we are and what we stand for.

Mr. Speaker, who gave the orders to target Americans who disagree with this administration? Who gave the orders? The American people deserve to know, and our Republic depends on us finding out that answer.

I represent a lot of Georgians who are sick and tired of the IRS targeting them. It is time for this House, the people's House, to instead now target the IRS. We must find the full truth and we cannot stop until we have full accountability.

FREEDOM OF THE PRESS

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

Mr. HIMES. Mr. Speaker, it is the fashion amongst many of us to blame the press for our troubles, and that's, of course, because the press reports our troubles. At their best, the media keeps us honest, it keeps us in our constitutional lanes, and it reports our failures. It is essential for democracy. There is a reason why freedom of the press is not the Second or Fourth or 10th Amendment. It's the First Amendment.

So, Mr. Speaker, I am profoundly concerned over the Department of Justice's overbroad and chilling behavior with respect to the Associated Press. Seeking records for 20 phone lines, giving the AP no notice, refusing at this point to discuss their behavior feels to me like overreach.

Mr. Speaker, it's time for the Department of Justice to stand back. You can imagine that there is somebody out there today who has a failure to report who is chilled and says, I will not do that because of the approach that the Department of Justice has taken.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud to serve in the very core of democracy, but this Chamber rests on foundations, and a key part of that foundation is a free and competent press.

---

#### THE 29ERS

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

Mr. McCLINTOCK. Madam Speaker, across the country, employers are holding office meetings and the announcements are going something like this: We love you guys, but here's what we make, and here's what ObamaCare will cost us. We can't stay in business with ObamaCare, but if we cut everybody back to 29 hours a week, we can avoid the mandate and stay in business.

There's even a name for them now: the 29ers. ObamaCare was sold on three claims, all of which were false:

That it would save people money. In fact, it's producing crippling increases in health plans costs.

That it would be good for the economy. In fact, the CBO estimates it will cost the economy a net loss of 800,000 jobs.

That if you like your plan, you can keep it. Well, many are finding not only is that a lie but they can't keep their jobs either.

Madam Speaker, let's pull the plug on this before it wrecks our health care and our jobs.

---

#### SUPPORTING GARMENT WORKERS

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

Ms. KAPTUR. Just this past Sunday, our Nation celebrated Mother's Day, a day that honors the mothers of our Republic. In March, we observed Women's History Month, honoring the progress toward full equality of over half our population.

Thus, one would have thought that when over 1,100 garment workers in Bangladesh—seamstresses, sewers, cutters, helpers—died working in dangerous factory conditions for an average wage of \$38 a month, America's retailers would have been the first to sign the landmark international safety agreement to improve the working conditions of these workers, who are predominantly women.

Surely, when 20 percent of Bangladesh's exports, mostly garments, are destined for U.S. buyers, our Nation's clothing firms should be on the front lines fighting for decent working conditions and a fair day's pay, not exploiting women workers.

But only Tommy Hilfiger and Calvin Klein have stood up for women garment workers, millions of invisible hands working in death traps, making so much of the clothing we wear that is marketed in our country.

So, where are Walmart and Sears? Where is the Gap? Where is Target? They appear to be missing in action. We need to reward those companies that care about workers and women workers in particular. When you think about buying clothing, think Tommy Hilfiger and Calvin Klein and ask, Where are the others? Without conscience and, obviously, on the wrong side of honor.

---

□ 1220

#### REPEAL OBAMACARE: ECONOMIC REASONS

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

Mr. BROOKS of Alabama. America struggles under President Obama's economic policies:

Nearly 12 million Americans are out of work. Last month, almost 280,000 Americans were forced into part-time jobs because their hours were reduced or they couldn't find a full-time job;

The average workweek and weekly take-home pay for Americans dropped;

The best measure for employment, the Labor Participation Rate, is at 63.3 percent, the worst since the economic malaise of President Jimmy Carter.

With the Obama economy doing so poorly, why implement a law we know will kill, according to the Congressional Budget Office, some 800,000 American jobs?

ObamaCare undermines the ability of American companies to hire workers. It stymies economic growth, and it's only going to get worse. Even top Democrats admit as much. One of the law's authors, Senator MAX BAUCUS, called it a "train wreck."

Madam Speaker, we must stop the train before the wreck. It's time to repeal ObamaCare before it does even more damage to the American economy.

---

#### WHAT HAPPENED TO THE "REPLACE" IN REPUBLICANS' "REPEAL AND REPLACE"?

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

Mr. DEFAZIO. Okay, 38th time repealing all or part of the Affordable Care Act. Now, the Republican mantra was "Repeal and Replace," but somewhere along the way they forgot about the "replace" part. So tomorrow, total repeal.

Well, what does that mean? I've got a few concerns.

It means insurance companies can go back to rescinding, that is, taking away your policy when you get sick even if you've been paying premiums. They could do that until this law passed.

And 3.1 million young adults, 18 to 26, oops, you're off your parents' policy. Sorry. No insurance.

5.3 million seniors who got their doughnut hole reduced last year, sorry, you're back in the bill doughnut hole.

3.54 million people in private plans who got free preventative procedures last year, sorry, those aren't free anywhere.

Up to 17 million children with pre-existing health conditions would again be denied coverage.

105 million people in health care plans that previously had lifetime limits, well, your lifetime limit is back.

So total repeal, no replace, doing incredible damage to seniors, children, and many other insured Americans.

---

#### IRS TARGETS CONSERVATIVE GROUPS

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

Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas. Madam Speaker, you know, during a commencement address in 2009 President Obama "joked" about the IRS auditing university officials for failing to award him an honorary degree. Now fast-forward to last Friday, when we learned that the IRS has been targeting conservative groups.

Madam Speaker, the misuse of the IRS power is no laughing matter. As Chief Justice John Marshall once said, "The power to tax is the power to destroy."

Folks and groups back home seeking to express their support for our hard-fought freedoms and liberties, for limited government, and for a better America should never be subjected to intimidation because of their political beliefs—never.

The use of the IRS as a political weapon is unacceptable. What's worse, this is the same agency that will be enforcing ObamaCare.

We must hold those responsible accountable. That's why the Ways and Means Committee will hold a hearing this Friday.

The American people deserve the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth. And if you're as outraged as I am, call the White House at this number that's right there in front of you. We must make sure it never happens again.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Ms. FOXX). Members are reminded to direct their remarks to the Chair.

---

#### SUPPLEMENTAL NUTRITION ASSISTANCE PROGRAM

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

minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. LANGEVIN. Madam Speaker, today I rise in strong support of the Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program and against the proposed \$20 billion cut in SNAP funding under the House Republican farm bill.

Coming on the heels of a sequester-induced reduction, SNAP beneficiaries continue to feel the pain and the cruel pinch of this Congress' misguided priorities.

SNAP, better known as food stamps, helps millions of Americans living in poverty put food on the table. That may very well be the difference between a child or a family going hungry or not. In the wealthiest nation in human history, it is unconscionable that every American cannot afford life's basic necessities.

Eighty percent, Madam Speaker, of the households receiving SNAP earn below the Federal poverty line. That translates into millions of working families. With these cuts, make no mistake about it, millions will go hungry and be forced to make decisions between food and other vital needs that nobody should ever have to confront.

Madam Speaker, we can do better. I call on my colleagues to reject these cuts.

---

#### REPEAL OF OBAMACARE

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

Mr. HULTGREN. Madam Speaker, the President's health care law is full of broken promises, and these are only becoming more evident as the law begins to take effect.

His law promised affordable health insurance for all Americans, a fine goal. But since 2008, health care premiums have actually increased by over \$3,000.

His law promised universal health care coverage, but according to the Congressional Budget Office, the law will leave 30 million Americans without insurance.

His law promised to help Americans with preexisting conditions, but the program it set up to care for them is already turning qualified applicants away.

And the once promising future of medical innovation in America has been stifled by his new taxes and regulations, including its poorly conceived tax on medical devices, the repeal of which I have cosponsored here in the House.

Madam Speaker, we've also already seen that it's caused small businesses to cut back worker hours. And the uncertainty over pending regulation makes businesses, small and large, hesitate to hire new people or make new investments, slowing down our economic recovery.

It's time for repeal and real reform.

#### STOP CHILD ABUSE IN RESIDENTIAL PROGRAMS FOR TEENS ACT

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

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. Madam Speaker, today I'm reintroducing the Stop Child Abuse in Residential Programs for Teens Act. This legislation will protect teenagers attending residential treatment programs from abuse by staff personnel.

These programs range from boot camps to behavior modification facilities. They are often a last resort for parents trying to help a child deal with behavioral or other issues. But investigations by our committee found that these programs are not always run in a safe manner.

Just last year, the Tampa Bay Times confirmed that problems continue, with stories of children being bruised, bloodied, and choked to unconsciousness at these programs, all in the name of discipline.

My bill would make it illegal for a residential facility to deny a child essential water, food, clothing, shelter, or medical care, whether under the guise of discipline or therapy.

It would also ensure that parents have the information needed to make safe choices for their children about these programs. When a parent turns to these programs for help, they should trust that their child will not suffer neglect, injury, or even death while undergoing therapy.

I encourage my colleagues to support this legislation.

---

#### ACCOUNTABILITY AND CONSEQUENCES FOR THE IRS

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

Mr. YODER. Madam Speaker, I stand today with Americans rightfully outraged and stunned that their government has admitted to harassing Americans with audits and paperwork simply based upon their political beliefs.

The American people expect the institutions of their government at their most basic, most simple levels to be fair. They expect not to be discriminated against or targeted based on their beliefs—religious, political, or otherwise.

But, Madam Speaker, we've learned over the past days about gross violations of our constitutional rights, an appalling overreach by the Internal Revenue Service which has admitted to targeting certain Americans for heightened tax scrutiny and additional burdensome and costly audits based solely on political affiliations. These anti-American violations strike at the heart of our free and democratic society and they confirm the worst fears that many Americans have about their

government. What makes matters worse is Congress was misled into believing that this wasn't happening.

Madam Speaker, we must get to the bottom of these very serious admissions by the IRS. There must be accountability and consequences for those involved, and we must ensure that this never happens again.

□ 1230

#### SUPPLEMENTAL NUTRITION ASSISTANCE PROGRAM

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

Mr. HORSFORD. Madam Speaker, I come to the floor today opposed to looming cuts to the Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program, or SNAP. I urge the House Agriculture Committee and this Congress to refrain from slashing funding for this vital program.

SNAP is our Nation's most important antihunger program. It provides food assistance to approximately 46 million Americans and it kept 4.7 million people out of poverty in 2011, including 2.1 million children.

SNAP has cut the number of children living in extreme poverty in half. We should not be cutting the safety net for our most vulnerable while maintaining costly government subsidies for the well-off and the junk food, oil, and gas industries.

A Nevada child in my district who receives \$1.48 per meal is not the problem with the Federal budget. The problem is corporate welfare and the special interest giveaways that litter our Tax Code.

I urge my colleagues not to cut SNAP and to invest in our children and their nutrition safety.

---

#### DEVASTATING EFFECTS OF OBAMACARE

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

Mr. MCHENRY. Madam Speaker, last week, I held a telephone townhall meeting with my constituents. Towards the end of that call, I heard from a constituent who had already seen her hours cut at the local grocery store from 36 hours down to 28.

As a result of ObamaCare, industries, corporations, and people are posed with this very tough challenge: either they pay for very expensive health care, cut people's hours, or lay people off. Unfortunately, her grocery store decided to limit hours and make more part-time workers.

Sadly, as a result of this, she lost \$140 a month. That prevented her from being able to pay for the very affordable health insurance plan she currently is on. Other coworkers could no longer afford car payments, for instance.

These devastating effects are a terrible result of bad public policy, and

that is why we must repeal ObamaCare.

#### NATIONAL POLICE WEEK

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

Mr. KENNEDY. Madam Speaker, I rise today in recognition of National Police Week. A month ago this very day, those of us from Massachusetts had every reason to be proud of our first responders and our police officers. Over the course of that week, I heard from so many of my colleagues, Democrats and Republicans, who said how proud they were to be Americans because of the response that our law enforcement officials took in reaction to the marathon bombings.

It is not just in disasters, however, that our first responders and our police officers answer the call. I want to recognize Sergeant Michael Murphy from Brookline and Sergeant Jim Machado from Fall River, who are here this week.

As a former prosecutor, you realize every day that the routine is anything but. Every time a car is stopped, every call that a police officer responds to, they literally put their life on the line.

We need to only remember the acts of MIT Officer Sean Collier to recognize how dangerous the job is that they perform each and every day to enforce our laws and to keep us and our neighbors safe. And so, as a Member of the Fourth District of Massachusetts and on behalf of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, I want to take a brief moment to all of our police officers and say thank you.

#### ACTIONS OF TREASURY SECRETARY AND THE IRS COMMISSIONER FALL ON PRESIDENT'S SHOULDERS

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

Mr. HUELSKAMP. Madam Speaker, on Monday, President Obama claimed that the IRS was an "independent agency." Mr. President, that is not true. As your chart shows, the President can remove both the Treasury Secretary and the IRS Commissioner at will. They both serve at the pleasure of President Barack Obama.

In recent weeks, months, and perhaps years, President Obama has increasingly claimed little or no responsibility for the actions of his administration. Whether it is the Benghazi cover-ups, the ObamaCare failures, or this targeting of conservative groups by the IRS, President Obama has flipped the moniker of President Truman on its head. Instead of "the buck stops here," Obama's theme has become "the buck never stops here."

The evidence is clear. The IRS targeted Tea Party and other conservative

groups, and the IRS Commissioner knew about it. This gross misuse of political power is an absolute outrage.

Mr. President, the IRS Commissioner and the Treasury Secretary serve at your will, and thus, the responsibility for their outrageous actions falls squarely on your shoulders.

#### SUPPLEMENTAL NUTRITION ASSISTANCE PROGRAM

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

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY. Madam Speaker, are you kidding me? Taking food out of the mouths of hungry children—is that the reason that any of us would come to Congress? But that is exactly what the farm bill that's being considered today does. It takes food out of the mouths of hungry children.

Not only will 1 million children lose their SNAP funding—the money that puts food on the table—but 200,000 of them will also lose their school lunches. This in the richest country in the world? This in the name of deficit reduction? This in a country where already tens of millions of children go to sleep hungry?

There's not a district in this Nation, there's not a Member of Congress who doesn't have constituents who have to line up at a food pantry because otherwise they and their children would go to sleep hungry. This is the most incredibly mean-spirited piece of legislation.

I urge a "no" vote on the \$20 billion cut in SNAP.

#### ASIAN PACIFIC AMERICAN HERITAGE MONTH

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

Ms. TITUS. Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize Asian Pacific American Heritage Month and to celebrate the many contributions of this vibrant community to Nevada's First District and to the country at large.

Asian Pacific Americans comprise the fastest-growing minority group in Las Vegas, having doubled in size between 2000 and 2010. Along Spring Mountain Road, we find the Chinatown Plaza, built in 1995 by Mr. and Mrs. James Chen; Korea Town, developed by Mr. Hae Un Lee and Mr. James Yu; and hundreds of Thai, Chinese, Japanese, and Vietnamese restaurants, markets, and shops that enrich our society and enhance our economy.

Along Maryland Parkway is a flourishing Filipino district, and numerous cultural festivals are held across the valley throughout the year featuring music, dance, costumes, and food from the thriving Asian Pacific community.

As we celebrate APA Heritage Month, let us acknowledge the value immigrants bring to our lives every

day and recognize how much we all stand to gain by enacting immigration reform that honors our country's legacy as the "land of opportunity."

#### SUPPLEMENTAL NUTRITION ASSISTANCE PROGRAM

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

Mr. DEUTCH. Madam Speaker, I stand here today because the Supplemental Nutritional Assistance Program, SNAP, is not a form of government waste. There is nothing wasteful about a program that, through providing modest assistance to low-income families, has nearly eliminated severe hunger in the United States of America.

The average SNAP benefit provides only \$1.40 per meal. Already, this forces many seniors and families with young children to skip meals throughout the week or face a shortage in food by the end of the month. We already know that children who go hungry are more likely to struggle in school and face serious health problems and less likely to escape poverty as adults.

The GOP's proposed cuts to SNAP of \$20 billion amount to punishing children who struggle with hunger that is beyond their control. Don't we have a national interest in protecting families who are struggling to feed themselves?

Our budget is a moral document. And, Madam Speaker, there is nothing moral about abandoning America's families and American children who are struggling with hunger.

□ 1240

#### PASS THE AMERICAN JOBS ACT NOW

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

Ms. WILSON of Florida. Madam Speaker, it has now been 864 days since I arrived in Congress, and the Republican leadership has still not allowed a single vote on serious legislation to address our unemployment crisis. We need to pass the American Jobs Act now. It deserves a vote.

Unemployment is now higher than the 7.5 percent we hear about in the news. Another full percent of the workforce can find only short-term, unreliable work. Another half percent has stopped looking because there is no opportunity. Another 5 percent is stuck working part-time when they want full-time work. So our real unemployment rate is closer to 14 percent.

Madam Speaker, these people are not lazy. It's this Congress that's lazy. We are doing nothing to create opportunity for Americans who are suffering. Our mantra should be: jobs, jobs, jobs.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER  
PRO TEMPORE

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

Record votes on postponed questions will be taken later.

RULEMAKING DEADLINE  
EXEMPTING CERTAIN SECURITIES

Mr. McHENRY. Madam Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 701) to amend a provision of the Securities Act of 1933 directing the Securities and Exchange Commission to add a particular class of securities to those exempted under such Act to provide a deadline for such action, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 701

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

## SECTION 1. RULEMAKING DEADLINE FOR EXEMPTING CERTAIN SECURITIES.

Section 3(b)(2) of the Securities Act of 1933 (15 U.S.C. 77c(b)(2)) is amended in the matter preceding subparagraph (A) by striking “The Commission” and inserting “Not later than October 31, 2013, the Commission”.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. McHENRY) and the gentlewoman from California (Ms. WATERS) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from North Carolina.

## GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. McHENRY. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and to submit extraneous materials for the RECORD on H.R. 701, as amended, currently under consideration.

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

There was no objection.

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

My colleagues, this is a bipartisan, straightforward bill, and it had unanimous support within the Financial Services Committee.

This bill codifies an intended deadline within the JOBS Act. This legislation simply puts a reasonable date for the deadline for an improved Regulation A, which came out of a bipartisan bill before the House of Representatives just over a year ago and then the JOBS Act the President signed more than a year ago. The deadline is very achievable, setting an October 31 deadline for the SEC to write regulations. It is nearly 19 months after the JOBS Act was signed into law, and it is, in

fact, 5 months before the due date of the SEC’s recurring review of a renewed Regulation A.

Regulation A is a very interesting provision within securities regulation. It is a sensible and philosophically sound exemption that should help millions of small- and moderate-sized businesses, but it’s actually unused by all small businesses. The JOBS Act language includes raising the cap on Regulation A securities offerings from \$5 million to \$50 million, which is existent in the law; but the act also requires that we have meaningful regulatory improvements to Regulation A so it can, in fact, be utilized by small businesses as it was intended.

Stakeholders and academics have testified that Regulation A should be a covered security or that the SEC should radically simplify Reg A’s registration and qualifications if small businesses are to ever use and utilize this well-intentioned exemption again. For proof of whether State exemption matters, merely look at the dominance of rule 506, even for issuances of \$1 million, compared to those other exemptions; and let’s just face it—the numbers speak for themselves.

Additionally, other areas of critical consideration include quiet periods, testing-the-waters activities, comment period turnaround, and even the number of Securities and Exchange Commission staff dedicated to small business exemptions. We’ve made that very clear to the Securities and Exchange Commission the concerns we have on those issues. The SEC must conduct a holistic review of Federal and State regulations on these matters to learn which have impeded entrepreneurs from accessing external capital, which is really the intention of Regulation A.

If you look back at a GAO report, it asserted that, from 1997 to 2011, the number of Regulation A filings decreased from 116 annually to 19, and that’s only the number of filings. To go to the next step of an offering, it’s even further reduced. It reduced from 57 in 1998 to just one offering, under this important regulation, in 2011. Now, that’s very disturbing. The same GAO report maintains that the SEC has never evaluated the abandonment of Regulation A, an exemption solely created to capitalize small- and moderate-sized businesses and to empower everyday investors. That’s absurd. It’s high time the SEC gets around to this and gets it done. That’s what this bill is all about.

The Small Business Administration asserts that there are more than 5 million small businesses in the U.S. with fewer than 20 employees, representing 20 percent of our national employment, and that firms with fewer than 100 employees employ more than 36 percent of our national employment. These millions of small businesses do not utilize Reg. A or other exemptions actually intended for them. There are bad consequences for this because they are not able to get the capital they need to grow and prosper and to perhaps go

from being small businesses to big businesses or from small businesses to more successful small businesses. They are the ones that are at a loss, and at a time of high unemployment we need to make sure that we are able to get those capital-starved businesses access to the moneys they need to grow and to prosper in these tough economic times.

This is a bipartisan bill that has garnered the support of my colleagues from across the aisle, Ms. ESHOO and Mr. SCOTT, as well as the support of my colleagues on this side of the aisle, Mr. SCHWEIKERT and Mr. GARRETT, who have long been proponents of these reforms and necessary changes.

With that, I reserve the balance of my time.

CHAMBER OF COMMERCE  
OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

*Washington, DC, May 13, 2013.*

TO THE MEMBERS OF THE U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES: The U.S. Chamber of Commerce, the world’s largest business federation representing the interests of more than three million businesses and organizations of all sizes, sectors, and regions, as well as state and local chambers and industry associations, and dedicated to promoting, protecting and defending America’s free enterprise system, strongly supports H.R. 701, which would amend a provision of the Securities Act of 1933 to help ensure the success of the JOBS Act, which became law last year.

H.R. 701 is a bi-partisan bill which would place a deadline of October 31, 2013, for the Securities and Exchange Commission to complete the changes to Regulation A as required under the Jumpstart Our Business Startups Act (“JOBS Act”). The bi-partisan JOBS Act mandates the modernization of certain regulations critical to the capital formation of emerging growth companies. The Chamber is concerned that the pace of regulatory implementation is too slow, and H.R. 701 would help ensure the timely implementation of this legislation important to new businesses.

The Chamber believes H.R. 701 would help speed the implementation of the JOBS Act, thereby assisting the capital formation needed for robust economic growth and job creation. The Chamber strongly supports H.R. 701.

Sincerely,

R. BRUCE JOSTEN,  
*Executive Vice President,  
Government Affairs.*

—  
NASDAQ OMX,  
*Washington, DC, May 7, 2013.*

Hon. JEB HENSARLING,  
*Chairman, House Committee on Financial Services,  
Rayburn House Office Building, Washington, DC.*

DEAR CHAIRMAN HENSARLING: Rep. Patrick McHenry has proposed legislation, H.R. 701, which seeks to impose a deadline on the Securities and Exchange Commission (SEC) for completion of an important section of the JOBS Act signed into law on April 5, 2012. Specifically, the legislation requires the SEC to issue its rules with respect to Regulation A by October 31st of this year.

NASDAQ OMX supports this legislation’s goal to induce timely action on a key feature of the JOBS Act. As rules are finalized, small businesses should have the regulatory certainty necessary to make critical capital funding decisions that can allow them to grow and create jobs—the purpose behind the JOBS Act and NASDAQ OMX’s support of that legislation.

Please let me know if I can be of further service to the Committee.

Thank you,

TERRY G. CAMPBELL,  
*Vice President,*  
*Global Government Relations.*

BIOTECHNOLOGY  
INDUSTRY ORGANIZATION,  
*Washington, DC, May 13, 2013.*

DEAR MEMBER OF CONGRESS: On behalf of the Biotechnology Industry Organization (BIO) and its more than 1,100 members, I am writing in strong support of H.R. 701, sponsored by Rep. Patrick McHenry. I urge swift consideration and passage of this important legislation by the House of Representatives.

H.R. 701 will speed the implementation of a key provision in the Jumpstart Our Business Startups (JOBS) Act, which passed both houses of Congress last year with broad, bipartisan majorities. Title IV of the JOBS Act directed the SEC to make revisions to Regulation A that will increase access to capital for growing companies, including biotech innovators.

Before the JOBS Act was enacted, Regulation A allowed companies to conduct direct public offerings of up to \$5 million; the JOBS Act increased the offering limit to \$50 million. Once this change is implemented, Regulation A will spur fundraising for emerging biotech companies, for which a \$50 million capital influx could support groundbreaking research and stimulate job creation.

H.R. 701 will give the SEC a deadline to complete rulemaking on Regulation A. The current delay at the SEC has blunted the potential capital formation impact of the JOBS Act at a time when research-intensive small businesses are in dire need of funding for their innovative R&D. Changing the eligibility threshold for Regulation A offerings will provide a new source of private capital to finance the search for cures and breakthrough medicines.

BIO supports expeditious implementation of the JOBS Act. On behalf of BIO's membership, I urge you to support H.R. 701 when it is considered by the House of Representatives.

With Sincerest Regards,

JAMES C. GREENWOOD,  
*President and CEO.*

CONNECT,  
*May 15, 2013.*

Hon. PATRICK MCHENRY  
*U.S. Capitol,*  
*Washington, DC.*

Hon. DAVID SCOTT

DEAR REPRESENTATIVES MCHENRY AND SCOTT: As a leading voice for tech start-ups and emerging companies, CONNECT enthusiastically endorses your efforts to pass H.R. 701. This straightforward legislation, to set an October 31 deadline for the SEC to promulgate rules to implement the JOBS Act increase for Regulation A offerings, is specifically targeted to increase the flow of capital to start-up and emerging companies which represent the best job-creating engine to spur America's economic recovery.

CONNECT was birthed out of the University of California—San Diego over twenty-five years ago with the mission to propel creative ideas and emerging technologies to the marketplace by training entrepreneurs and connecting them to the comprehensive resources they need to sustain viability and business vibrancy. Since 1985, CONNECT has assisted in the formation and development of over 3,000 companies and is recognized as one of the world's most successful regional innovation development programs. CONNECT is the recipient of the 2010 "Innovation in Regional Innovation Clusters" award presented by the U.S. Department of Commerce.

As you are well aware, one of the barriers to start-up company growth is access to capital. Although the Reg A offerings are supposed to help emerging companies get access capital, the cost of compliance with regulatory burdens made the \$5 million cap unworkable. Congress was absolutely right to pass the JOBS Act requiring the SEC to promulgate rules to raise the cap to \$50 million. Doing so will open new pathways by which startups and emerging companies, including those stuck in the proverbial "valley of death," can access capital, allowing them to grow and create new jobs. But more than a year after this bipartisan triumph for innovators, the SEC hasn't even published Reg A rules. H.R. 701 will fix this and is urgently needed.

There is much talk in Washington about helping start-ups, but your bill takes tangible action toward achieving that goal and ensuring the promise of the JOBS Act is realized. We commend you for finding a bipartisan solution that will have real-world benefits for America's entrepreneurs and innovators. CONNECT stands ready to assist you as the bill advances in the House and strongly encourages Majority Leader Reid to promptly place the bill on the Senate floor calendar.

Sincerely,

TIMOTHY TARDIBONO, M.A., J.D.,  
*Vice President of Public Policy.*

Ms. WATERS. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

As you know, the Jumpstart Our Business Startups Act, or the JOBS Act as it is commonly known, was signed into law about 1 year ago. This bill received the support of both Democrats and Republicans on the Financial Services Committee.

Some of us, including me, have some concerns about this legislation. We are basically taking a chance that investors will not be harmed, but we're taking a chance because we are so anxious to create jobs, and this legislation is possibly yet another approach to creating jobs.

□ 1250

This is not the American Jobs Act, but this is a jobs act. And I believe that my colleague on the opposite side of the aisle, Mr. MCHENRY, really believes that this is going to create jobs. So we're going to take a chance that this will create jobs.

Regulation A currently allows certain companies to raise up to \$5 million a year through a streamlined, less costly registration process, providing smaller companies with much-needed capital without overly burdening them with registration requirements. In the JOBS Act, we raise that level to \$50 million, thus providing small companies with a greater ability to develop new products and create much-needed jobs for their local economies.

The JOBS Act did not set a deadline under which the Commission needed to complete this rulemaking. Given the tremendous workload the Commission is managing—including setting up new offices under the Wall Street Reform Act, regulating new markets such as the over-the-counter derivatives market, and completing various other

rulemakings under the JOBS Act—it is understandable that the SEC has not yet completed the Regulation A update. H.R. 701 would basically require that the SEC complete the Regulation A rulemaking by October 31 of this year.

While I am reluctant to impose accelerated rulemaking timetables on the Commission, given the resource constraints they face, I will support this bill and my colleagues are supporting this bill, particularly since we understand that the SEC has indicated that they will finish the rulemaking before October 31 anyway, even without this legislation.

Finally, I would ask that my colleagues support adequate funding for the Commission so that they have the staff resources to carry out this and other outstanding rulemakings under both the Wall Street Reform Act and the JOBS Act. This is very important.

The SEC has a great responsibility carrying out the rulemaking for all that we have placed on them. As I know that they like to do this rulemaking in a timely fashion, we must recognize that they don't have all the resources they need. So I hope that as we're taking a chance with our colleagues on the opposite side of the aisle, hoping that this bill is going to produce the kinds of jobs that have been indicated, we want our friends on the opposite side of the aisle to reciprocate with support for the SEC and the funding that they need.

With that, Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MCHENRY. A 418 percent increase since the late nineties with the Securities and Exchange Commission in terms of funding, I think, is adequate; but I certainly appreciate my colleague's concerns.

We passed this provision in the fall of 2011 in this House with a floor vote of 421-1. This enhances this provision and provides for a deadline that is 19 months after the original act was signed. I think that's more than generous and sufficient.

With that, I would like to yield 2½ minutes to my colleague from Florida (Mr. ROSS), who is a quite vocal proponent of getting capital to small business.

Mr. ROSS. Madam Speaker, as my colleague mentioned earlier, the JOBS Act passed into law with broad bipartisan support.

It hasn't been easy for Republicans and Democrats to agree on a lot of things; but when it came to directing the SEC to get out of the way and allow small public companies to raise capital and create jobs in America, we agreed.

Over a year later, we're still waiting for the SEC to implement several portions of a bill that should have been noncontroversial. This isn't the first instance. In title II of this act, the SEC failed in a time certain to follow the will of Congress and promulgate rules. That's why we're here today.

Now, it's unclear when the SEC is going to promulgate the rules under title IV, which will allow faster capital formation for smaller public companies. But like the job creators and the unemployed in my district, I'm tired of waiting. We're down here today urging Members to support legislation to require the SEC to do their job and implement the rules under this title by the end of October.

It's disheartening that we have to waste taxpayer dollars to do this, but I urge Members to vote in favor of H.R. 701. Madam Speaker, it's time for the SEC and all the regulators to stop stalling and stop ignoring the will and direction of Congress. It's time for regulators to do their jobs so Americans can go back to work and do their jobs, and it's time that Congress hold all regulators accountable.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman, for this bill.

Ms. WATERS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Texas (Mr. AL GREEN) control the time for the remainder of the debate.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. PITTSINGER). Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. AL GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MCHENRY. We're prepared to close.

Mr. AL GREEN of Texas. I will await your closing.

Mr. MCHENRY. If the gentleman yields back his time, I will then close. As the majority party, we have the right to close.

Mr. AL GREEN of Texas. I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. MCHENRY. Mr. Speaker, I would like to just simply close by saying that we should help small businesses.

When we have congressional Members acknowledging pop culture, as I did in committee, there is always a debate about that. But as Beyonce once said, "If you like it, you should have put a ring on it." Likewise, we should put a deadline on it. That's what this bill is all about.

As I close, I will not quote Jay-Z, but I will say we should help small businesses. And I ask my colleagues for their support as I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to H.R. 701. While I applaud the bipartisan efforts of my colleagues to help small businesses grow and create jobs, the sting of the effects of financial deregulation is still too strong to allow me to support this bill.

I voted against similar legislation in the 112th Congress because I think raising the Securities and Exchange Commission (SEC) Regulation A threshold is a bad idea. I note that Congress has raised this threshold five times already. In each of those instances, though, Congress approved a modest increase that was relative to the rate of inflation and the purchasing power of the dollar. H.R. 701 would mandate an unprecedented tenfold

increase in the current threshold of \$5 million to \$50 million. Such an increase strikes me as grotesquely large, especially since inflation has risen only 165 percent since 1980.

H.R. 701 will force the SEC—without additional appropriations—to do something that constitutes a tremendous incitement to perpetrate fraud on investors. I cannot in good conscience support this bill and urge my colleagues to vote it down.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. MCHENRY) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 701, as amended.

The question was taken.

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

Mr. AL GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays. The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

### HOMES FOR HEROES ACT OF 2013

Mr. MCHENRY. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 384) to establish the position of Special Assistant for Veterans Affairs in the Office of the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development by transferring the Special Assistant for Veterans Affairs to the Office of the Secretary of HUD, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 384

*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 "Homes for Heroes Act of 2013".

#### SEC. 2. SPECIAL ASSISTANT FOR VETERANS AFFAIRS IN THE DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT.

(a) TRANSFER OF POSITION TO OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY.—Section 4 of the Department of Housing and Urban Development Act (42 U.S.C. 3533) is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

“(h) SPECIAL ASSISTANT FOR VETERANS AFFAIRS.—

“(1) POSITION.—There shall be in the Office of the Secretary a Special Assistant for Veterans Affairs, who shall report directly to the Secretary.

“(2) APPOINTMENT.—The Special Assistant for Veterans Affairs shall be appointed based solely on merit and shall be covered under the provisions of title 5, United States Code, governing appointments in the competitive service.

“(3) RESPONSIBILITIES.—The Special Assistant for Veterans Affairs shall be responsible for—

“(A) ensuring veterans have fair access to housing and homeless assistance under each program of the Department providing either such assistance;

“(B) coordinating all programs and activities of the Department relating to veterans;

“(C) serving as a liaison for the Department with the Department of Veterans Affairs, including establishing and maintaining

relationships with the Secretary of Veterans Affairs;

“(D) serving as a liaison for the Department, and establishing and maintaining relationships with the United States Interagency Council on Homelessness and officials of State, local, regional, and nongovernmental organizations concerned with veterans;

“(E) providing information and advice regarding—

“(i) sponsoring housing projects for veterans assisted under programs administered by the Department; or

“(ii) assisting veterans in obtaining housing or homeless assistance under programs administered by the Department;

“(F) coordinating with the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development and the Secretary of Veterans Affairs in carrying out section 3 of the Homes for Heroes Act of 2013; and

“(G) carrying out such other duties as may be assigned to the Special Assistant by the Secretary or by law.”.

(b) TRANSFER OF POSITION IN OFFICE OF DEPUTY ASSISTANT SECRETARY FOR SPECIAL NEEDS.—On the date that the initial Special Assistant for Veterans Affairs is appointed pursuant to section 4(h)(2) of the Department of Housing and Urban Development Act, as added by subsection (a) of this section, the position of Special Assistant for Veterans Programs in the Office of the Deputy Assistant Secretary for Special Needs of the Department of Housing and Urban Development shall be terminated.

#### SEC. 3. ANNUAL SUPPLEMENTAL REPORT ON VETERANS HOMELESSNESS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of Housing and Urban Development and the Secretary of Veterans Affairs, in coordination with the United States Interagency Council on Homelessness, shall submit annually to the Committees of the Congress specified in subsection (b), together with the annual reports required by such Secretaries under section 203(c)(1) of the McKinney-Vento Homeless Assistance Act (42 U.S.C. 11313(c)(1)), a supplemental report that includes the following information with respect to the preceding year:

(1) The same information, for such preceding year, that was included with respect to 2010 in the report by the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development and the Secretary of Veterans Affairs entitled “Veterans Homelessness: A Supplemental Report to the 2010 Annual Homeless Assessment Report to Congress”.

(2) Information regarding the activities of the Department of Housing and Urban Development relating to veterans during such preceding year, as follows:

(A) The number of veterans provided assistance under the housing choice voucher program for Veterans Affairs supported housing (VASH) under section 8(o)(19) of the United States Housing Act of 1937 (42 U.S.C. 1437f(o)(19)), the socioeconomic characteristics of such homeless veterans, and the number, types, and locations of entities contracted under such section to administer the vouchers.

(B) A summary description of the special considerations made for veterans under public housing agency plans submitted pursuant to section 5A of the United States Housing Act of 1937 (42 U.S.C. 1437c-1) and under comprehensive housing affordability strategies submitted pursuant to section 105 of the Cranston-Gonzalez National Affordable Housing Act (42 U.S.C. 12705).

(C) A description of the activities of the Special Assistant for Veterans Affairs of the Department of Housing and Urban Development.

(D) A description of the efforts of the Department of Housing and Urban Development

and the other members of the United States Interagency Council on Homelessness to coordinate the delivery of housing and services to veterans.

(E) The cost to the Department of Housing and Urban Development of administering the programs and activities relating to veterans.

(F) Any other information that the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development and the Secretary of Veterans Affairs consider relevant in assessing the programs and activities of the Department of Housing and Urban Development relating to veterans.

(b) COMMITTEES.—The Committees of the Congress specified in this subsection are as follows:

(1) The Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs of the Senate.

(2) The Committee on Veterans' Affairs of the Senate.

(3) The Committee on Appropriations of the Senate.

(4) The Committee on Financial Services of the House of Representatives.

(5) The Committee on Veterans' Affairs of the House of Representatives.

(6) The Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. MCHENRY) and the gentleman from Texas (Mr. AL GREEN) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from North Carolina.

#### GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. MCHENRY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and submit extraneous materials for the record on H.R. 384, as amended, currently under consideration.

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

There was no objection.

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

Today I rise in support of H.R. 384, the Homes for Heroes Act of 2013.

This bill was introduced by my colleague from Texas, Congressman AL GREEN, who I had the pleasure of having serve alongside of me as the ranking member of the Oversight Investigation Subcommittee on the Financial Services Committee.

This bill would establish the position of Special Assistant for Veterans Affairs within Housing and Urban Development to coordinate services provided to homeless veterans and to serve as HUD's liaison to the Department of Veterans Affairs, the U.S. Interagency Council on Homelessness, State and local officials, and nonprofit service organizations. The position is currently in the Office of the Deputy Assistant Secretary for Special Needs. This transfer highlights the importance of addressing the housing needs of our veterans.

H.R. 384 would also require HUD to submit a comprehensive annual report to Congress on the housing needs of homeless veterans and the steps undertaken by HUD to meet those needs.

□ 1300

H.R. 384 is a version, in part, of the Homes for Heroes Act of 2011, 2009, and

2008, all of which passed this House with well over 400 votes each.

As our service men and women continue to serve our country both here and abroad, the least we can do is ensure they have proper access to the services that are offered to them when they return.

This bill represents a step in that direction, and I urge my colleagues to support this worthy endeavor.

With that, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. AL GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to start by thanking Mr. HENSARLING, the chairperson of the committee. He gave me his word. He said this bill would come to the floor, and he has kept his word. I would like to thank the ranking member, Ms. WATERS. She committed to help with this bill. In fact, the genesis of this was a conversation I had with her, and she kept her word. I'd like to thank Mr. MCHENRY. Indeed, he and I do serve on Oversight and Investigations, and I appreciate very much his being here today to help us by managing this piece of legislation. I believe he and I will accomplish additional things on a bipartisan basis. This is a bipartisan piece of legislation.

I'd also like to thank the staff. While I will stand here and hopefully rise to the occasion, it really takes greater people to make the occasion. These people are the staffers that work long into the night on many occasions to try to reach a consensus on legislation. The staff really put a lot of time into this legislation, Mr. Speaker, and I think they should be complimented.

I especially would recognize one staffer in particular, Ms. Harmeet Kaur. This is her last week in our congressional office. She's a fellow, and I'm honored to say she worked with us on this piece of legislation.

Finally, I'd like to thank our veterans. Mr. Speaker, we stand here in the well of the House and enjoy many of the freedoms that we have because there are people who are willing to go to distant places, willing to risk their lives. Indeed, Mr. Speaker, many of them do not return the way they left. I just believe, Mr. Speaker, that the least a grateful Nation can do is make sure that when they return home, they return home to good jobs, the best health care, and good housing. I believe that it's almost sinful to see a veteran standing on the corner with a sign that reads, "Homeless, hungry." I believe that we ought to do everything within our power to help people who are willing to risk their lives for us.

I had the good fortune or misfortune, I'm not sure which, to pass by a VA hospital with a sign out front that read, "Come in and see the price of freedom."

Something that bears repeating: "Come in and see the price of freedom."

The price of freedom is quite high, Mr. Speaker. The price of freedom will

cost some in the prime of their lives things that you and I can never replace, money can't buy. And when money can't buy and you and I can't replace, the least we can do is all that we can. This is why we're asking that this Special Assistant be placed in the Office of the Secretary of HUD, that this be codified into the law; that it is not going to be easy now for this person to be replaced or this position to be removed.

And, Mr. Speaker, I must say also that HUD has been quite helpful. HUD has established a similar position in another part of the Department, but this would place a person in the office with the Secretary. And this person in the Office of the Secretary would try to help us with some of the statistics that we find abhorrent.

We find that there are approximately 76,000 to 144,000 veterans who are homeless. This is unacceptable. We find that on any night in 2012 about 62,000 veterans were homeless. This is unacceptable. And what this assistant will do is work with the homeless veterans organizations, serve as a liaison person to the Department of Veterans Affairs, the U.S. Interagency Council on Homelessness, and with State and local officials, and not-for-profit organizations. This assistant will coordinate services with these various entities.

Mr. Speaker, this is not enough, but it is a start. It is a continuation, if you will, of what we've been trying to accomplish. Mr. Speaker, I beg that my colleagues—I would besiege them and implore them to please support this legislation because you're really supporting our veterans.

Mr. Speaker, in closing, I will remind us that the greatness of America is not going to be measured by how we treat people who live in the sweets of life. The greatness of America is often going to be judged by how we treat people who live in the streets of life. Too often, we have people who have served their country living in the streets of life. They literally live on the streets. It is time for us, the richest country in the world, where one out of every 100 persons is a millionaire, to acknowledge what our veterans have done to make it possible for us to enjoy these great and noble American ideals as extolled in the Pledge of Allegiance, liberty and justice for all, and in the Constitution, wherein we would have all people be created and treated equally.

So, Mr. Speaker, I just beg in closing that we, Members, take advantage of this opportunity to support our veterans. It is not something that is going to break the bank. In fact, it has a minimal impact on the deficit, but it can have a huge impact on our veterans.

I thank you, Mr. MCHENRY, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. MCHENRY. Wishing to close, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I want to commend my colleagues to this bill. I would like to

congratulate my colleague, Mr. GREEN, on putting forward such a worthy proposal that is both sensible and at the same time deeply honors our most-treasured resource in this country, our returning veterans, to ensure they're well cared for. So I ask my colleagues to support this measure.

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

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, today I rise in support of the Homes for Heroes Act of 2013 (H.R. 384).

This bill would establish within HUD a Special Assistant for Veterans Affairs to ensure veterans receive fair access to housing and homeless assistance programs and serve as a HUD liaison to the VA.

I am fully committed to strengthening the benefits and fulfilling the obligations a grateful nation owes to its veterans.

The men and women of our Armed Forces unselfishly answer the call of duty to defend our freedom. Congress has a moral obligation to support their returns with housing and other necessities.

I am proud to live in a country that has such brave men and women, and a country where citizens recognize and appreciate the sacrifices our military makes to defend us. I urge my colleagues to stand with our Veterans and support this bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. MCHENRY) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 384, as amended.

The question was taken.

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

□ 1310

#### HILL CREEK CULTURAL PRESERVATION AND ENERGY DEVELOPMENT ACT

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 356) to clarify authority granted under the Act entitled "An Act to define the exterior boundary of the Uintah and Ouray Indian Reservation in the State of Utah, and for other purposes".

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 356

*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 "Hill Creek Cultural Preservation and Energy Development Act".

#### SEC. 2. CLARIFICATION OF AUTHORITY.

The Act entitled "An Act to define the exterior boundary of the Uintah and Ouray Indian Reservation in the State of Utah, and for other purposes", approved March 11, 1948

(62 Stat. 72), as amended by the Act entitled "An Act to amend the Act extending the exterior boundary of the Uintah and Ouray Indian Reservation in the State of Utah so as to authorize such State to exchange certain mineral lands for other lands mineral in character" approved August 9, 1955, (69 Stat. 544), is further amended by adding at the end the following:

"SEC. 5. In order to further clarify authorizations under this Act, the State of Utah is hereby authorized to relinquish to the United States, for the benefit of the Ute Indian Tribe of the Uintah and Ouray Reservation, State school trust or other State-owned subsurface mineral lands located beneath the surface estate delineated in Public Law 440 (approved March 11, 1948) and south of the border between Grand County, Utah, and Uintah County, Utah, and select in lieu of such relinquished lands, on an acre-for-acre basis, any subsurface mineral lands of the United States located beneath the surface estate delineated in Public Law 440 (approved March 11, 1948) and north of the border between Grand County, Utah, and Uintah County, Utah, subject to the following conditions:

"(1) RESERVATION BY UNITED STATES.—The Secretary of the Interior shall reserve an overriding interest in that portion of the mineral estate comprised of minerals subject to leasing under the Mineral Leasing Act (30 U.S.C. 171 et seq.) in any mineral lands conveyed to the State.

"(2) EXTENT OF OVERRIDING INTEREST.—The overriding interest reserved by the United States under paragraph (1) shall consist of—

"(A) 50 percent of any bonus bid or other payment received by the State as consideration for securing any lease or authorization to develop such mineral resources;

"(B) 50 percent of any rental or other payments received by the State as consideration for the lease or authorization to develop such mineral resources;

"(C) a 6.25 percent overriding royalty on the gross proceeds of oil and gas production under any lease or authorization to develop such oil and gas resources; and

"(D) an overriding royalty on the gross proceeds of production of such minerals other than oil and gas, equal to 50 percent of the royalty rate established by the Secretary of the Interior by regulation as of October 1, 2011.

"(3) RESERVATION BY STATE OF UTAH.—The State of Utah shall reserve, for the benefit of its State school trust, an overriding interest in that portion of the mineral estate comprised of minerals subject to leasing under the Mineral Leasing Act (30 U.S.C. 181 et seq.) in any mineral lands relinquished by the State to the United States.

"(4) EXTENT OF OVERRIDING INTEREST.—The overriding interest reserved by the State under paragraph (3) shall consist of—

"(A) 50 percent of any bonus bid or other payment received by the United States as consideration for securing any lease or authorization to develop such mineral resources on the relinquished lands;

"(B) 50 percent of any rental or other payments received by the United States as consideration for the lease or authorization to develop such mineral resources;

"(C) a 6.25 percent overriding royalty on the gross proceeds of oil and gas production under any lease or authorization to develop such oil and gas resources; and

"(D) an overriding royalty on the gross proceeds of production of such minerals other than oil and gas, equal to 50 percent of the royalty rate established by the Secretary of the Interior by regulation as of October 1, 2011.

"(5) NO OBLIGATION TO LEASE.—Neither the United States nor the State shall be obli-

gated to lease or otherwise develop oil and gas resources in which the other party retains an overriding interest under this section.

"(6) COOPERATIVE AGREEMENTS.—The Secretary of the Interior is authorized to enter into cooperative agreements with the State and the Ute Indian Tribe of the Uintah and Ouray Reservation to facilitate the relinquishment and selection of lands to be conveyed under this section, and the administration of the overriding interests reserved hereunder."

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Utah (Mr. BISHOP) and the gentleman from the Northern Mariana Islands (Mr. SABLON) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Utah.

#### GENERAL LEAVE

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. I yield myself such time as I may consume.

H.R. 356 is called the Hill Creek Cultural Preservation and Energy Development Act, and it's to promote economic development within the Uintah and Ouray Indian Reservation and to increase funding for public education within the State of Utah, as well as to protect some culturally and environmentally sensitive lands that are within that particular reservation.

This is a bipartisan bill. It's supported by the entire Utah congressional delegation, the oil and gas industry, the Ute Tribe, the Wilderness Society. Actually, everybody with an IQ over 7 is in support of it. It's a non-controversial measure that will authorize the Secretary of the Interior to resolve a decades-old land tenure issue in a manner that's supported by all parties.

In 1948, Congress extended the Uintah and Ouray Reservation, surrounding about 18,000 acres of school trust lands and mineral leases that were within that portion. In 1955, Congress attempted to solve the dispute amongst some of these lands, and actually failed in doing so. So the Ute Tribe has long protected the southern portion of this Hill Creek area for cultural and environmental reasons. It's also in an area that's known as the Book Cliffs, which is one of the most remote and rugged places within the State of Utah.

The Utah School Institutional Trust Lands Administration, or SITLA, which manages the school lands in Utah, has a constitutional mandate to generate income from trust lands to fund the public education.

So, to achieve the desires of the State, for funding education, and the Tribe, to promote their cultural areas, both parties have worked together in a

cooperative way to craft a plan that authorizes the Secretary to exchange land so that areas that are now with SITLA in the southern part that want to be preserved will be sent over to the reservation.

Areas in the northern part that have mineral resources on them will be given over to SITLA on an acre-by-acre basis. And once the exchange is complete, both the tribe and SITLA will jointly develop oil and gas resources located within the northern portion of Hill Creek and share in that revenue. American taxpayers will also share in the mineral revenue.

So, Mr. Speaker, Congress needs to take note that this model of how you resolve land tenure issues is an extremely effective one. Divisive issues in the past can be resolved through a collaborative process that allows for all points of view to be considered and heard, as was done in this particular bill. In this example, we're able to balance these multiple views and, as a result, we will protect some of our wildest places in Utah and also allow for responsible oil and gas production that will help in funding the education system in Utah.

So I'm hoping to replicate this collaborative model to resolve some of the other longstanding issues that are public land conflicts in my home State of Utah.

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

Mr. SABLAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself as much time as I may consume.

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

Mr. SABLAN. Mr. Speaker, H.R. 356 clarifies existing law regarding the Federal Government's authority to permit land exchanges within the boundaries of the Ute Indian Reservation in northeastern Utah and resolve the tribe's split estate problem caused by Federal error over 50 years ago.

The legislation returns the subsurface mineral estate to the Ute Tribe in a portion of its reservation that the tribe considers culturally and environmentally significant and, thus, preserves the area's pristine wilderness from development.

Last Congress, the House passed a virtually identical bill under suspension of the rules by voice vote, and again, I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 356.

Mr. Speaker, I have no further speakers. I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Mr. Speaker, the State and the tribe have been trying to get Congress to act on this measure for a number of years. It's a widely popular proposal. It's supported by the State. It's supported by local governments. It's supported by the tribes. It is a bipartisan bill, and I urge my colleagues to support it.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by

the gentleman from Utah (Mr. BISHOP) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 356.

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

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### PILOT PROJECT OFFICES OF FEDERAL PERMIT STREAMLINING PILOT PROJECT

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 767) to amend the Energy Policy Act of 2005 to modify the Pilot Project offices of the Federal Permit Streamlining Pilot Project, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 767

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

#### SECTION 1. PILOT PROJECT OFFICES OF FEDERAL PERMIT STREAMLINING PILOT PROJECT.

*Section 365 of the Energy Policy Act of 2005 (42 U.S.C. 15924) is amended by striking subsection (d) and inserting the following:*

*“(d) PILOT PROJECT OFFICES.—The following Bureau of Land Management Offices shall serve as the Pilot Project offices:*

*“(1) Rawlins Field Office, Wyoming.*

*“(2) High Plains District Office, Wyoming.*

*“(3) Montana/Dakotas State Office, Montana.*

*“(4) Farmington Field Office, New Mexico.*

*“(5) Carlsbad Field Office, New Mexico.*

*“(6) Grand Junction/Glenwood Springs Field Office, Colorado.*

*“(7) Vernal Field Office, Utah.”*

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Utah (Mr. BISHOP) and the gentleman from the Northern Mariana Islands (Mr. SABLAN) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Utah.

#### GENERAL LEAVE

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. I yield myself such time as I may consume.

We are in strong support of this particular piece of legislation, which would be a name change in the Montana Pilot Project office in Billings, Montana, to include the words “Montana/Dakotas State Office.” It's extremely important in this pilot process that we don't actually just limit it only to the area of Montana, especially because the area of North Dakota is so important in the development of these pilot projects.

With that, Mr. Speaker, I yield as much time as he may consume to the

gentleman from North Dakota (Mr. CRAMER).

Mr. CRAMER. Thanks to my colleague from Utah.

I also want to thank the chairman of the Natural Resources Committee, Mr. HASTINGS, and the ranking member, Mr. MARKEY, and especially thank the chairman of the Subcommittee on Energy and Minerals, Mr. LAMBORN, and the ranking member, Mr. HOLT. We worked together on this, and I'm very proud of the outcome. It's a rather benign bill that has rather major ramifications, I believe.

I also want to thank the leadership at the Bureau of Land Management for not only doing an excellent job in managing the Federal lands in North Dakota, but their support of this bill and their guidance, frankly, in helping to craft it in a way that meets the objectives.

The Energy Policy Act of 2005 established a Federal permit streamlining pilot project to improve the processing of oil and gas applications for drilling on Federal lands. The Montana BLM office in Miles City was included in the pilot project, but what was not known to the drafters of the legislation then was that North and South Dakota are under the direct jurisdiction of that regional office in Miles City. So, without the word “Dakotas” in the Energy Policy Act, North Dakota was excluded from this pilot project.

That, in normal times, may not be all that important. But as it turns out, North Dakota really is the heart of the largest oil play and the most exciting oil play going on on the continent.

So the streamlining process itself, I think, deserves some explanation, because I think what I want to do is to calm the fears of anybody that might think we're looking at cutting corners or expediting regulatory process that deserves the rigor that it is receiving.

□ 1320

What the streamlining process does is not cut corners, but rather, it streamlines by co-locating all of the various federal agencies that have jurisdiction, like the EPA, like the Bureau of Land Management, perhaps the USDA and USGS. And by co-locating them, you actually not only enjoy the efficiency of everybody working together in the same place, but you actually get some synergy as well, because you have the experts in the same room on the same plot of land at the same time.

This is a bill, as I said, that doesn't cut corners and streamlines, but it also has broad ramifications because I think that North Dakota is the perfect laboratory for a pilot project like this. The reason I say that is because there's high demand for processing and a lot of applications for drilling on very few acres.

North Dakota is blessed to largely be private and State land, not much Federal land. But there are about 2 million Federal acres that BLM has direct

oversight of; that is to say, we have 2 million mineral acres, and there are over 700 permits or applications for permits to drill on that small plot of land.

In North Dakota, the average number of days for getting a permit processed by the State regulatory body is about 20 days. For the Federal lands, it's anywhere from 225 to 300 or more days. That's too much. I certainly don't advocate, nor do I think anybody else could advocate, streamlining this to the point of where it only takes 10 or 20 days to issue a permit on Federal lands. Clearly, there are 325 million owners of those Federal lands. It requires a more robust environmental protection regime. But we can do better than that, and I think we ought to do better than that.

I think the North Dakota experiment is one that people will look back on and say, that's the way to do it, that's the right way to do it. We in North Dakota care a great deal about our land, about our water, and about our air, and we look forward to working closely with the Federal officials who have an equal care in making this work.

I might also just add that this similar bill was passed last year in the Senate. It did not get a hearing in the House. The same, a companion bill, has been introduced again in the Senate this year by Senator HOEVEN and co-sponsored by Senator HEITKAMP. It has bipartisan support in the Senate. It has passed the committee over there. It has not gotten to the floor yet.

So, again, I appreciate the leadership that the chair and ranking members have provided on this and urge my colleagues to pass this important bill.

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

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

Mr. SABLAN. Mr. Speaker, H.R. 767 will broaden the geographic reach of a pilot program created in 2005 to provide additional resources to some BLM field offices to permit oil and gas development and conduct environmental reviews.

The Bureau of Land Management has testified that this pilot program has led to increased oil and gas inspection and enforcement capability as a result of hiring more skilled specialists. The Bureau of Land Management has also stated that the increase in inspections has led to better compliance by the industry and a reduction in major violations due to the increased number of inspectors in the field.

We do not oppose this bill, and I ask support for H.R. 767.

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

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. It's an excellent bill. I urge adoption of it, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Utah (Mr. BISHOP) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 767, as amended.

The question was taken.

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

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

#### AMENDMENT TO PUBLIC LAW 93-435 WITH RESPECT TO NORTHERN MARIANA ISLANDS

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 573) to amend Public Law 93-435 with respect to the Northern Mariana Islands, providing parity with Guam, the Virgin Islands, and American Samoa.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 573

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

#### SECTION 1. AMENDMENT.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The first section and section 2 of Public Law 93-435 (48 U.S.C. 1705, 1706) are amended by inserting “the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands,” after “Guam,” each place it appears.

(b) REFERENCES TO DATE OF ENACTMENT.—For the purposes of the amendment made by subsection (a), each reference in Public Law 93-435 to the “date of enactment” shall be considered to be a reference to the date of the enactment of this section.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Utah (Mr. BISHOP) and the gentleman from the Northern Mariana Islands (Mr. SABLAN) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Utah.

#### GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Again, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on this bill under consideration.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. I yield myself such time as I may consume.

This bill is a great bill that treats the Northern Marianas the same way as other colonies by expanding their submerged territorial miles. That would be the same as with American Samoa, Guam, and the Virgin Islands. It is compatible with all other acts. It's a great bill that we passed last year by a very close vote of 397-0.

I urge adoption of this bill again. I hope this time the Senate will be wise enough to pick it up. With that, I reserve the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. SABLAN. Mr. Speaker, I also rise in support of H.R. 573. The bill conveys to the Commonwealth of the Northern Marianas the 3 miles of submerged lands surrounding each of our 14 islands. I want to thank leaders from both sides of the aisle, Chairman DOC HASTINGS and Ranking Member ED MARKEY of the Natural Resources Committee, and my good friend, Dr. JOHN FLEMING, chairman of the Fisheries, Wildlife, Oceans and Insular Affairs Subcommittee, and my good friend, Mr. BISHOP from Utah, for managing today's bill, all for their support of H.R. 573.

The Northern Marianas is the only coastal jurisdiction that does not have ownership of the submerged lands off its coasts. H.R. 573 corrects that irregularity. It provides the same ownership rights over the submerged lands as are provided by Federal law to Guam, the United States Virgin Islands, and American Samoa.

Today will be the third time that the House will vote to convey these lands. In both the 111th and the 112th Congress, we approved this transfer unanimously. I hope that the House will make the same decision again today.

And I hope that the other body will this time, finally, also agree that the Northern Mariana Islands should have the rights of ownership of our offshore submerged lands and natural resources as other coastal areas of America enjoy.

For thousands of years, the people of the Northern Marianas certainly believed these resources were ours. It was not until a 2005 ruling by the Ninth Circuit Court of Appeals that we were informed that these were not our lands but instead belonged to the Federal Government. We were grateful that there were Members of Congress who quickly responded to our plight, for at the time we had no representation here. Then-Congressman, now-Senator JEFF FLAKE, introduced a bill conveying these lands shortly after the Ninth Circuit ruling.

New Mexico Senator Pete Domenici introduced a companion to the Flake measure. As the first representative from the Northern Mariana Islands, I have continued their work on this issue, as I have said, in the 111th, the 112th, and now in the 113th Congress.

In summary, H.R. 573 costs nothing. Congress has the constitutional authority to enact it. The bill will simply provide parity—the ownership and responsibility for submerged surrounding lands and waters that every other coastal area of our Nation enjoys.

I want to thank all 36 Members who are cosponsors of this bill, and I ask that my colleagues here today support H.R. 573.

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

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Mr. Speaker, it's a great bill. Let's hope the third time is the charm in the process. I urge support of this bill and yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Utah (Mr. BISHOP) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 573.

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

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

### RECESS

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

Accordingly (at 1 o'clock and 29 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1704

### AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. TERRY) at 5 o'clock and 4 minutes p.m.

### COMMUNICATION FROM THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Clerk of the House of Representatives:

OFFICE OF THE CLERK,  
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,  
Washington, DC, May 15, 2013.

Hon. JOHN A. BOEHNER,  
*The Speaker, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.*

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Pursuant to the permission granted in Clause 2(h) of Rule II of the Rules of the U.S. House of Representatives, the Clerk received the following message from the Secretary of the Senate on May 15, 2013 at 4:23 p.m.:

That the Senate passed S. 601.

With best wishes, I am  
Sincerely,

KAREN L. HAAS,  
*Clerk.*

### ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

Votes will be taken in the following order:

H.R. 767, by the yeas and nays;

H.R. 701, by the yeas and nays;

H.R. 384, by the yeas and nays.

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

### PILOT PROJECT OFFICES OF FEDERAL PERMIT STREAMLINING PILOT PROJECT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and pass the

bill (H.R. 767) to amend the Energy Policy Act of 2005 to modify the Pilot Project offices of the Federal Permit Streamlining Pilot Project, as amended, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 415, nays 1, not voting 16, as follows:

[Roll No. 147]

YEAS—415

Aderholt	Daines	Hastings (FL)
Alexander	Davis (CA)	Hastings (WA)
Amodei	Davis, Danny	Heck (NV)
Andrews	Davis, Rodney	Heck (WA)
Bachmann	DeGette	Hensarling
Bachus	Delaney	Herrera Beutler
Barber	DeLauro	Higgins
Barletta	DeBene	Himes
Barr	Denham	Hinojosa
Barrow (GA)	Dent	Holding
Barton	DeSantis	Holt
Beatty	DesJarlais	Honda
Becerra	Deutch	Horsford
Benishek	Diaz-Balart	Hoyer
Bentivolio	Dingell	Hudson
Bera (CA)	Doggett	Huelskamp
Bilirakis	Doyle	Huffman
Bishop (GA)	Duckworth	Huizenga (MI)
Bishop (NY)	Duffy	Hultgren
Bishop (UT)	Duncan (SC)	Hunter
Black	Duncan (TN)	Hurt
Blackburn	Edwards	Israel
Blumenauer	Ellison	Issa
Bonamici	Ellmers	Jackson Lee
Bonner	Engel	Jeffries
Boustany	Enyart	Jenkins
Brady (PA)	Eshoo	Johnson (OH)
Brady (TX)	Esty	Johnson, E. B.
Braley (IA)	Farenthold	Johnson, Sam
Bridenstine	Farr	Jones
Brooks (AL)	Fattah	Jordan
Brooks (IN)	Fincher	Joyce
Broun (GA)	Fitzpatrick	Kaptur
Brown (FL)	Fleischmann	Keating
Brownley (CA)	Fleming	Kelly (IL)
Buchanan	Flores	Kelly (PA)
Bucshon	Forbes	Kennedy
Bustos	Fortenberry	Kildee
Butterfield	Foster	Kilmer
Calvert	Fox	Kind
Camp	Frankel (FL)	King (IA)
Cantor	Franks (AZ)	King (NY)
Capito	Frelinghuysen	Kingston
Capps	Fudge	Kinzinger (IL)
Capuano	Gabbard	Kirkpatrick
Cárdenas	Gallego	Kline
Carson (IN)	Garamendi	Kuster
Cartwright	Garcia	Labrador
Cassidy	Gardner	LaMalfa
Castor (FL)	Garrett	Lamborn
Castro (TX)	Gerlach	Lance
Chabot	Gibbs	Langevin
Chu	Gibson	Lankford
Cicilline	Gingrey (GA)	Larsen (WA)
Clarke	Gohmert	Larson (CT)
Clay	Goodlatte	Latham
Cleaver	Gosar	Latta
Coble	Gowdy	Lee (CA)
Coffman	Granger	Levin
Cohen	Graves (GA)	Lewis
Cole	Graves (MO)	Lipinski
Collins (GA)	Grayson	LoBiondo
Collins (NY)	Green, Al	Loeb sack
Conaway	Green, Gene	Lofgren
Connolly	Griffin (AR)	Long
Conyers	Griffith (VA)	Lowenthal
Cook	Grijalva	Lowe y
Cooper	Grimm	Lucas
Costa	Guthrie	Luetkemeyer
Cotton	Gutierrez	Lujan Grisham
Courtney	Hahn	(NM)
Cramer	Hall	Lujan, Ben Ray
Crawford	Hanabusa	(NM)
Crenshaw	Hanna	Lummis
Crowley	Harper	Lynch
Cuellar	Harris	Maffei
Cummings	Hartzler	

Maloney	Peterson	Simpson
Carolyn	Petri	Sinema
Maloney, Sean	Pingree (ME)	Sires
Marchant	Pittenger	Slaughter
Marino	Pitts	Smith (NE)
Massie	Pocan	Smith (NJ)
Matheson	Poe (TX)	Smith (TX)
Matsui	Polis	Smith (WA)
McCarthy (CA)	Pompeo	Southerland
McCarthy (NY)	Posey	Speier
McCaul	Price (GA)	Stewart
McClintock	Price (NC)	Stivers
McCollum	Radel	Stockman
McDermott	Rahall	Stutzman
McGovern	Rangel	Swalwell (CA)
McHenry	Reed	Takano
McIntyre	Reichert	Terry
McKeon	Renacci	Thompson (CA)
McKinley	Ribble	Thompson (MS)
McMorris	Rice (SC)	Thompson (PA)
Rodgers	Rigell	Thornberry
McNerney	Roby	Tiberi
Meadows	Roe (TN)	Tierney
Meehan	Rogers (AL)	Tipton
Meeks	Rogers (KY)	Titus
Meng	Rogers (MI)	Tonko
Messer	Rohrabacher	Tsongas
Mica	Rokita	Turner
Michaud	Rooney	Upton
Miller (FL)	Ros-Lehtinen	Valadao
Miller (MI)	Roskam	Van Hollen
Miller, Gary	Ross	Vargas
Miller, George	Rothfus	Veasey
Moore	Roybal-Allard	Vela
Moran	Royce	Velázquez
Mullin	Ruiz	Visclosky
Mulvaney	Runyan	Wagner
Murphy (FL)	Ruppersberger	Walberg
Murphy (PA)	Rush	Walden
Nadler	Ryan (OH)	Walorski
Napolitano	Ryan (WI)	Walz
Neal	Salmon	Waters
Negrete McLeod	Sánchez, Linda	Watt
Neugebauer	T.	Weber (TX)
Noem	Sanchez, Loretta	Weber (FL)
Nolan	Sarbanes	Welch
Nugent	Scalise	Westrup
Nunes	Schakowsky	Westmoreland
Nunnelee	Schiff	Whitfield
O'Rourke	Schneider	Williams
Olson	Schock	Wilson (FL)
Owens	Schrader	Wilson (SC)
Palazzo	Schwartz	Wittman
Pallone	Schweikert	Wolf
Pascrell	Scott (VA)	Womack
Pastor (AZ)	Scott, Austin	Woodall
Paulsen	Sensenbrenner	Yarmuth
Payne	Serrano	Yoder
Pearce	Sessions	Yoho
Pelosi	Sewell (AL)	Young (AK)
Perlmutter	Shea-Porter	Young (FL)
Perry	Sherman	Young (IN)
Peters (CA)	Shimkus	
Peters (MI)	Shuster	

NAYS—1

Amash

NOT VOTING—16

Bass	Clyburn	Richmond
Burgess	Culberson	Scott, David
Campbell	DeFazio	Wasserman
Carney	Johnson (GA)	Schultz
Carter	Markey	Waxman
Chaffetz	Quigley	

□ 1729

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

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

### COMMUNICATION FROM THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication from the Clerk of the House of Representatives:

OFFICE OF THE CLERK,  
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,  
Washington, DC, May 15, 2013.

Hon. JOHN BOEHNER,  
Speaker, House of Representatives,  
Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: I have the honor to transmit herewith a copy of the Certificate of Election received from the Honorable Mark Hammond, Secretary of State of South Carolina, indicating that, at the Special Election held on May 7, 2013, the Honorable Mark Sanford was duly elected Representative in Congress for the First Congressional District, State of South Carolina.

With best wishes, I am  
Sincerely,

KAREN L. HAAS,  
Clerk.

Enclosure.

THE STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA  
By Her Excellency

The Governor and Commander-In-Chief In  
and Over the State Aforesaid

CERTIFICATE OF ELECTION FOR TWO-YEAR TERM  
To the Clerk of the United States House of  
Representatives

This is to Certify Pursuant to South Carolina Code §7-17-330 that on this Seventh Day of May, 2013 Mark Sanford, First Congressional District, was duly chosen by the qualified electors of the state of South Carolina as representative in Congress from said state to represent said state in the House of Representatives of the United States for the term of two years, beginning on the fifteenth day of May 2013.

Witness: Her Excellency our Governor Nikki Haley, and our seal hereto affixed at Columbia, South Carolina this fourteenth day of May, in the year of our Lord, 2013.

NIKKI R. HALEY,  
Governor.

MARK HAMMOND,  
Secretary of State.

[State Seal Affixed]

**SWEARING IN OF THE HONORABLE  
MARK SANFORD, OF SOUTH  
CAROLINA, AS A MEMBER OF  
THE HOUSE**

The SPEAKER. Will Representative-elect Sanford and the members of the South Carolina delegation present themselves in the well.

All Members will rise and the Representative-elect will please raise his right hand.

Mr. SANFORD appeared at the bar of the House and took the oath of office, as follows:

Do you solemnly swear that you will support and defend the Constitution of the United States against all enemies, foreign and domestic; that you will bear true faith and allegiance to the same; that you take this obligation freely, without any mental reservation or purpose of evasion; and that you will well and faithfully discharge the duties of the office on which you are about to enter, so help you God.

The SPEAKER. Congratulations, you are now a Member of the 113th Congress.

**WELCOMING THE HONORABLE  
MARK SANFORD TO THE HOUSE  
OF REPRESENTATIVES**

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the gentleman from South Carolina

(Mr. WILSON) is recognized for 1 minute.

There was no objection.

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, South Carolina is very fortunate. Due to the quality of life in South Carolina, tens of thousands are moving to the Palmetto State from the Midwest and Northeast, and from around the world.

South Carolina has gained a new seat in Congress to include the communities of Myrtle Beach and Florence, now held by TOM RICE. This new Seventh District rotated all districts, creating a unique district of the First. The First District of South Carolina is virtually 10 miles wide along the Atlantic Coast from McClellanville in Charleston County to Defauskie Island in Beaufort County. It's a special district to TOM and myself in that we were both born in Charleston, America's most historic city. The district is a composite of America.

In the district's first election, TIM SCOTT was elected as only the second African American from South Carolina elected to Congress in 100 years. We are grateful Governor Nikki Haley appointed Congressman TIM SCOTT to serve in the U.S. Senate. This created a replacement primary with 16 participants, the largest number ever in a congressional primary.

We are here today to recognize the survivor of the primary, run-off, and general election—Congressman MARK SANFORD.

I yield to Congressman DAVID PRICE of North Carolina.

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in place of the dean of the South Carolina delegation, Congressman JIM CLYBURN, who is away this week on family medical leave, and asked me to read this statement:

Swearing-in Day is always about new beginnings. In that spirit, I want to extend the hand of collegiality to Mark Sanford as he begins a new chapter of service to the people of South Carolina and this great country in the U.S. House of Representatives. Though our past differences have been widely chronicled and we bring different sets of experiences to the public square, I will always work to find common ground as we fulfill our duties and responsibilities to the people who sent us here.

Mr. Speaker, MARK SANFORD's colleagues in the Carolinas delegations join Mr. CLYBURN in wishing MARK well and welcoming him back to the House.

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. I yield to Congressman MARK SANFORD of the First District of South Carolina.

Mr. SANFORD. Mr. Speaker, ladies and gentlemen of the House of Representatives of the United States Congress, I look forward to working with each one of you. Republican and Democrat, different perspectives we may hold, but at the end of the day we are here to represent the people of South Carolina, and I look forward to going about that business with you.

I see friends, like ELIOT ENGEL, who were so kind to call me in the wake of

the events of 2009, Democrat that he may be. I see a whole host of Republicans, long friends; and it is, indeed, an honor to be back with each one of you.

I look forward to working with you on a whole host of issues. Obviously, the greatest among them for me will be efforts to get our financial house back in order here in Washington, D.C. But above all else, here on this day, I am simply humbled to be here.

Each one of our lives involves different journeys, but on that journey I think that we can, in essence, be taken to places wherein we develop levels of appreciation perhaps that we never had before.

And so I stand here before each one of you more appreciative than I ever could have been for the honor of working with each one of you here in the United States Congress, the Congress of the Nation most blessed of all nations here on this Earth. I stand before you most appreciative of the people of the First Congressional District of South Carolina that JOE just alluded to, a people who have taught me a whole lot about love and humility, about wisdom, and about grace. I stand before you, I guess, with a whole new appreciation, indeed, for a God of second chances, and how in the events of our lives, up or down they may be, how every one of us can be refined as human beings in that process. I stand before you as a human being most appreciative in whole new ways for the significance of family and friends.

In that regard, I see Belen up there; I see my sons Marshall and Landon; I see my sister Sarah and her husband, Bill; I see my mom, Peg; I see a long list of different friends.

□ 1740

I would thank them for their presence here to share this day. I would thank a long list of friends, whether that's Buff Chace, whom I've known for the whole of my life, or somebody like Joe Taylor, who was my Secretary of Commerce while I was Governor.

In essence, each one of them is an emissary, a representative, to thousands who were so kind to hold me up through the last couple of years and to be instrumental in this election that brought me to this very place. Above all else, though, I am simply humbled to be here, and I look forward to working with each one of you.

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

**ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER**

The SPEAKER. Under clause 5(d) of rule XX, the Chair announces to the House that, in light of the administration of the oath to the gentleman from South Carolina, the whole number of the House is 434.

**RULEMAKING DEADLINE  
EXEMPTING CERTAIN SECURITIES**

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 701) to amend a provision of the Securities Act of 1933 directing the Securities and Exchange Commission to add a particular class of securities to those exempted under such Act to provide a deadline for such action, as amended, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. McHENRY) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, as amended.

This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 416, nays 6, not voting 11, as follows:

[Roll No. 148]

YEAS—416

Aderholt	Coble	Fudge
Alexander	Coffman	Gabbard
Amash	Cole	Gallego
Amodei	Collins (GA)	Garamendi
Andrews	Collins (NY)	Garcia
Bachmann	Conaway	Gardner
Bachus	Cornally	Garrett
Barber	Conyers	Gerlach
Barletta	Cook	Gibbs
Barr	Cooper	Gibson
Barrow (GA)	Costa	Gingrey (GA)
Barton	Cotton	Goodlatte
Bass	Courtney	Gosar
Beatty	Cramer	Gowdy
Becerra	Crawford	Granger
Benishek	Crenshaw	Graves (GA)
Bentivolio	Crowley	Graves (MO)
Bera (CA)	Cuellar	Green, Al
Bilirakis	Cummings	Griffin (AR)
Bishop (GA)	Daines	Griffith (VA)
Bishop (NY)	Davis (CA)	Grijalva
Bishop (UT)	Davis, Danny	Grimm
Black	Davis, Rodney	Guthrie
Blackburn	DeFazio	Gutierrez
Blumenauer	DeGette	Hahn
Bonamici	Delaney	Hall
Bonner	DeLauro	Hanabusa
Boustany	DelBene	Hanna
Brady (PA)	Denham	Harper
Brady (TX)	Dent	Harris
Braley (IA)	DeSantis	Hartzler
Bridenstine	DesJarlais	Hastings (FL)
Brooks (AL)	Deuth	Hastings (WA)
Brooks (IN)	Diaz-Balart	Heck (NV)
Broun (GA)	Doggett	Heck (WA)
Brown (FL)	Doyle	Hensarling
Brownley (CA)	Duckworth	Herrera Beutler
Buchanan	Duffy	Higgins
Bucshon	Duncan (SC)	Himes
Burgess	Duncan (TN)	Hinojosa
Bustos	Edwards	Holding
Butterfield	Ellison	Horsford
Calvert	Ellmers	Hoyer
Camp	Engel	Hudson
Cantor	Enyart	Huelskamp
Capito	Eshoo	Huffman
Capps	Esty	Huizenga (MI)
Capuano	Farenthold	Hultgren
Cárdenas	Farr	Hunter
Carson (IN)	Fattah	Hurt
Carter	Fincher	Israel
Cartwright	Fitzpatrick	Issa
Cassidy	Fleischmann	Jackson Lee
Castor (FL)	Fleming	Jeffries
Castro (TX)	Flores	Jenkins
Chabot	Forbes	Johnson (GA)
Chaffetz	Fortenberry	Johnson (OH)
Chu	Foster	Johnson, E. B.
Cicilline	Fox	Johnson, Sam
Clarke	Frankel (FL)	Jones
Clay	Franks (AZ)	Jordan
Cleaver	Frelinghuysen	Joyce

Kaptur	Mulvaney
Keating	Murphy (FL)
Kelly (IL)	Murphy (PA)
Kelly (PA)	Napolitano
Kennedy	Neal
Kildee	Negrete McLeod
Kilmer	Neugebauer
Kind	Noem
King (IA)	Nolan
King (NY)	Nugent
Kingston	Nunes
Kinzinger (IL)	Nunnelee
Kirkpatrick	O'Rourke
Kline	Olson
Kuster	Owens
Labrador	Palazzo
LaMalfa	Pallone
Lamborn	Pascrell
Lance	Pastor (AZ)
Langevin	Paulsen
Lankford	Payne
Larsen (WA)	Pearce
Larson (CT)	Pelosi
Latham	Perlmutter
Latta	Perry
Lee (CA)	Peters (CA)
Levin	Peters (MI)
Lewis	Peterson
Lipinski	Petri
LoBiondo	Pingree (ME)
Loeb	Pittenger
Loeb	Pitts
Lofgren	Pocan
Long	Poe (TX)
Lowenthal	Polis
Lowe	Pompeo
Lucas	Posey
Luetkemeyer	Price (GA)
Lujan Grisham	Price (NC)
(NM)	Radel
Lujan, Ben Ray	Rahall
(NM)	Rangel
Lummis	Reed
Lynch	Reichert
Maloney,	Renacci
Carolyn	Ribble
Maloney, Sean	Rice (SC)
Marchant	Richmond
Marino	Rigell
Massie	Roby
Matheson	Roe (TN)
Matsui	Rogers (AL)
McCarthy (CA)	Rogers (KY)
McCarthy (NY)	Rohrs (MI)
McCaul	Rogersbacher
McClintock	Rokita
McCollum	Rooney
McDermott	Ros-Lehtinen
McGovern	Roskam
McHenry	Ross
Grimm	Rothfus
McIntyre	Roybal-Allard
McKeon	Royce
McKinley	Ruiz
McMorris	Runyan
Rodgers	Ruppersberger
McNerney	Rush
Runyan	Ryan (OH)
Ruppersberger	Ryan (WI)
Rush	Salmon
Ryan (OH)	Sánchez, Linda
Ryan (WI)	T.
Salmon	Sanchez, Loretta
Sánchez, Linda	Sanford
T.	Sarbanes
Sanchez, Loretta	Scalise
Sanford	Schiff
Sarbanes	Schneider
Scalise	Schock
Schiff	
Schneider	
Schock	

NAYS—6

NOT VOTING—11

Campbell	Gohmert	Markey
Carney	Grayson	Quigley
Clyburn	Green, Gene	Wasserman
Culberson	Honda	Schultz

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE  
The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. TERRY) (during the vote). There is 1 minute remaining.

□ 1746

Mr. HOLT changed his vote from "yea" to "nay."

Schrader	Smith (NE)
Schwartz	Smith (NJ)
Schweikert	Smith (TX)
Scott (VA)	Smith (WA)
Neal	Southerland
Scott, Austin	Speier
Scott, David	Stewart
Sensenbrenner	Stivers
Serrano	Stockman
Sessions	Stutzman
Sewell (AL)	Swalwell (CA)
Shea-Porter	Takano
Sherman	Terry
Shimkus	Thompson (CA)
Shuster	Thompson (MS)
Simpson	Thompson (PA)
Sinema	Thornberry
Sires	Tiberi
Slaughter	Tierney
Smith (NE)	Tipton
Smith (NJ)	Titus
Smith (TX)	Tonko
Smith (WA)	Tsongas
Southerland	Turner
Speier	Upton
Stewart	Valadao
Stivers	Van Hollen
Stockman	Vargas
Stutzman	Veasey
Swalwell (CA)	Vela
Takano	Velázquez
Terry	Visclosky
Thompson (CA)	Wagner
Thompson (MS)	Walberg
Thompson (PA)	Walden
Thornberry	Walorski
Tiberi	Walz
Tierney	Waters
Tipton	Watt
Titus	Waxman
Tonko	Weber (TX)
Tsongas	Webster (FL)
Turner	Welch
Upton	Wenstrup
Valadao	Westmoreland
Van Hollen	Whitfield
Vargas	Williams
Veasey	Wilson (FL)
Vela	Wilson (SC)
Velázquez	Wittman
Visclosky	Wolf
Wagner	Womack
Walberg	Woodall
Walden	Yarmuth
Walorski	Yarmon
Walz	Yoder
Waters	Yoho
Watt	Young (AK)
Waxman	Young (FL)
Weber (TX)	Young (IN)
Webster (FL)	
Welch	
Wenstrup	
Westmoreland	
Whitfield	
Williams	
Wilson (FL)	
Wilson (SC)	
Wittman	
Wolf	
Womack	
Woodall	
Yarmuth	
Yarmon	
Yoder	
Yoho	
Young (AK)	
Young (FL)	
Young (IN)	

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

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated for:

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 148, had I been present, I would have voted "yea."

**HOMES FOR HEROES ACT OF 2013**

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 384) to establish the position of Special Assistant for Veterans Affairs in the Office of the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development by transferring the Special Assistant for Veterans Affairs to the Office of the Secretary of HUD, and for other purposes, as amended, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 420, nays 3, not voting 10, as follows:

[Roll No. 149]

YEAS—420

Aderholt	Cartwright	Duckworth
Alexander	Cassidy	Duffy
Amodei	Castor (FL)	Duncan (SC)
Andrews	Castro (TX)	Duncan (TN)
Bachmann	Chabot	Edwards
Bachus	Chaffetz	Ellison
Barber	Chu	Ellmers
Barletta	Cicilline	Engel
Barr	Clarke	Enyart
Barrow (GA)	Clay	Eshoo
Barton	Cleaver	Esty
Bass	Coble	Farenthold
Beatty	Coffman	Farr
Becerra	Cohen	Fattah
Benishek	Cole	Fincher
Bentivolio	Collins (GA)	Fitzpatrick
Bera (CA)	Collins (NY)	Fleischmann
Bilirakis	Conaway	Fleming
Bishop (GA)	Cornally	Flores
Bishop (NY)	Conyers	Forbes
Bishop (UT)	Cook	Fortenberry
Black	Cooper	Foster
Blackburn	Costa	Fox
Blumenauer	Cotton	Frankel (FL)
Bonamici	Courtney	Franks (AZ)
Bonner	Cramer	Frelinghuysen
Boustany	Crawford	Fudge
Brady (PA)	Crenshaw	Gabbard
Brady (TX)	Crowley	Gallego
Braley (IA)	Cuellar	Garamendi
Bridenstine	Cummings	Garcia
Brooks (AL)	Daines	Gardner
Brooks (IN)	Davis (CA)	Garrett
Brown (FL)	Davis, Danny	Gerlach
Brownley (CA)	Davis, Rodney	Gibbs
Buchanan	DeFazio	Gibson
Bucshon	DeGette	Gingrey (GA)
Burgess	DelBene	Gohmert
Bustos	DeLauro	Goodlatte
Butterfield	DelBene	Gosar
Calvert	Denham	Gowdy
Cantor	Dent	Granger
Capito	DeSantis	Graves (GA)
Capps	DesJarlais	Graves (MO)
Capuano	Deuth	Grayson
Cárdenas	Diaz-Balart	Green, Al
Carson (IN)	Dingell	Green, Gene
Carter	Doggett	Griffin (AR)
	Doyle	Griffith (VA)

Grijalva	Matheson	Runyan
Grimm	Matsui	Ruppersberger
Guthrie	McCarthy (CA)	Ryan (OH)
Gutierrez	McCarthy (NY)	Ryan (WI)
Hahn	McCaul	Salmon
Hall	McClintock	Sánchez, Linda
Hanabusa	McCollum	T.
Hanna	McDermott	Sanchez, Loretta
Harper	McGovern	Sanford
Harris	McHenry	Sarbanes
Hartzler	McIntyre	Scalise
Hastings (FL)	McKeon	Schakowsky
Hastings (WA)	McKinley	Schiff
Heck (NV)	McMorris	Schneider
Heck (WA)	Rodgers	Schock
Hensarling	McNerney	Schrader
Herrera Beutler	Meadows	Schwartz
Higgins	Meehan	Schweikert
Himes	Meeks	Scott (VA)
Hinojosa	Meng	Scott, Austin
Holding	Messer	Scott, David
Honda	Mica	Scott, David
Horsford	Michaud	Sensenbrenner
Hoyer	Miller (FL)	Serrano
Hudson	Miller (MI)	Sessions
Huelskamp	Miller, Gary	Sewell (AL)
Huffman	Moore	Shea-Porter
Huizenga (MI)	Moran	Sherman
Hultgren	Mullin	Shimkus
Hunter	Mulvaney	Shuster
Hurt	Murphy (FL)	Simpson
Israel	Murphy (PA)	Sinema
Issa	Nadler	Sires
Jackson Lee	Napolitano	Slaughter
Jeffries	Neal	Smith (NE)
Jenkins	Negrete McLeod	Smith (NJ)
Johnson (GA)	Neugebauer	Smith (TX)
Johnson (OH)	Noem	Smith (WA)
Johnson, E. B.	Nolan	Southerland
Johnson, Sam	Nugent	Speier
Jones	Nunes	Stewart
Jordan	Nunnelee	Stivers
Joyce	O'Rourke	Stockman
Kaptur	Olson	Stutzman
Keating	Owens	Swalwell (CA)
Kelly (IL)	Palazzo	Takano
Kelly (PA)	Pallone	Terry
Kennedy	Pascrell	Thompson (CA)
Kildee	Pastor (AZ)	Thompson (MS)
Kilmer	Paulsen	Thompson (PA)
Kind	Payne	Thornberry
King (IA)	Pearce	Tiberi
King (NY)	Pelosi	Tierney
Kingston	Perlmutter	Tipton
Kinzinger (IL)	Perry	Titus
Kirkpatrick	Peters (CA)	Tonko
Kline	Peters (MI)	Tongas
Kuster	Peterson	Turner
Labrador	Petri	Upton
LaMalfa	Pingree (ME)	Valadao
Lamborn	Pittenger	Van Hollen
Lance	Pitts	Vargas
Langevin	Pocan	Veasey
Lankford	Poe (TX)	Vela
Larsen (WA)	Polis	Velázquez
Larson (CT)	Pompeo	Vislosky
Latham	Posey	Wagner
Latta	Price (GA)	Walberg
Lee (CA)	Price (NC)	Walden
Levin	Radel	Walorski
Lewis	Rahall	Walz
Lipinski	Rangel	Waters
LoBiondo	Reed	Watt
Loeb sack	Reichert	Waxman
Lofgren	Renacci	Weber (TX)
Long	Ribble	Webster (FL)
Lowenthal	Rice (SC)	Welch
Lowe y	Richmond	Wenstrup
Lucas	Rigell	Westmoreland
Luetkemeyer	Roby	Whitfield
Lujan Grisham	Roe (TN)	Williams
(NM)	Rogers (AL)	Wilson (FL)
Luján, Ben Ray	Rogers (KY)	Wilson (SC)
(NM)	Rogers (MI)	Wittman
Lummis	Rohrabacher	Wolf
Lynch	Rooney	Womack
Maffei	Ros-Lehtinen	Woodall
Maloney,	Roskam	Yarmuth
Carolyn	Ross	Yoder
Maloney, Sean	Rothfus	Yoho
Marchant	Roybal-Allard	Young (AK)
Marino	Royce	Young (FL)
Massie	Ruiz	Young (IN)

NAYS—3

Amash	Broun (GA)	Rokita
-------	------------	--------

NOT VOTING—10

Campbell	Holt	Rush
Carney	Markey	Wasserman
Clyburn	Miller, George	Schultz
Culberson	Quigley	

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). There are 2 minutes remaining.

□ 1753

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

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The title of the bill was amended so as to read: "to transfer the position of Special Assistant for Veterans Affairs in the Department of Housing and Urban Development to the Office of the Secretary, and for other purposes."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. CARNEY. Mr. Speaker, I wish to clarify my position for the RECORD on rollcall votes 147 through 149 cast on May 15, 2013.

On rollcall vote No. 147, on consideration of H.R. 767 I did not vote. It was my intention to vote "aye."

On rollcall vote No. 148, on consideration of H.R. 701 I did not vote. It was my intention to vote "aye."

On rollcall vote No. 149, on consideration of H.R. 384 I did not vote. It was my intention to vote "aye."

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 45, REPEAL OF PATIENT PROTECTION AND AFFORDABLE CARE ACT

Mr. SESSIONS, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 113-59) on the resolution (H. Res. 215) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 45) to repeal the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act and health care-related provisions in the Health Care and Education Reconciliation Act of 2010, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

□ 1800

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 1062, SEC REGULATORY ACCOUNTABILITY ACT

Mr. SESSIONS, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 113-60) on the resolution (H. Res. 216) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 1062) to improve the consideration by the Securities and Exchange Commission of the costs and benefits of its regulations and orders, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

RECOGNIZING CLARA BANCROFT

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

Mr. TIPTON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Clara Bancroft of Durango, Colorado. Clara is one of the exceptional stories to come out of our Nation's complex immigration system. An Argentine by birth, Clara chose to pursue a United States citizen residency and eventual citizenship. She did so entirely within the legal immigration system.

Born in Las Garcitas in the Chaco province of northern Argentina in 1967, Clara was the ninth of 13 children. Her parents were poor ranchers who often struggled to afford food, and her childhood home had no electricity. When Clara was only 8 years old, she had to leave school and become the sole caretaker for her grandmother. After the passing of her grandmother, she moved to Buenos Aires at the age of 16, where she worked as a nanny and returned to school. In 2001, while working as a receptionist at the BV Group, she met her soon-to-be husband, Paul Bancroft.

In February of 2002, Clara came to visit her future husband as a tourist under the U.S. visa waiver program. While she was in America, that program was unexpectedly ended with Argentina. Respecting U.S. immigration law, Mrs. Bancroft returned to her home country as she worked to be able to get her visa. While still navigating the immigration system, Mr. and Mrs. Bancroft were married in October of 2002, and after nearly a year of legal battles, Mrs. Bancroft returned to the United States and reunited with her husband in January of 2003.

Since coming to America, Mrs. Bancroft has learned English, and in 2008 the Bancrofts welcomed their son, Bill, into their family. On November 15, 2012, Clara took the oath of citizenship in the United States. She is a proud citizen and loves her adopted country.

Mr. Speaker, it is an honor to recognize Mrs. Clara Bancroft for overcoming adversity and achieving the American Dream by becoming a citizen of the United States of America.

ADDRESSING CLIMATE CHANGE

(Mr. BEN RAY LUJÁN of New Mexico asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BEN RAY LUJÁN of New Mexico. Mr. Speaker, the news that carbon dioxide in the atmosphere passed 400 parts per million for the first time in human history should serve as a wake-up call that we can no longer ignore the threat of climate change. Now, I know there are some that still don't believe in science and still believe that climate change isn't real, but we should all agree that this is a problem that we have to confront.

Addressing climate change is not only important for our environment, but also for our economy. Creating a clean energy economy powered by

solar, wind, and other renewable resources will spur new jobs, new technological advancements, and grow our economy.

In order to ensure that we can compete and win in the global market to develop clean energy technologies, it is vital that we have a trained workforce ready to work. That's why this week I reintroduced the Community College Energy Training Act, legislation to support clean energy job-training programs in our community colleges. Community colleges play an integral role in training and retraining Americans who want to get ahead and learn the skills that will open up new opportunities.

By investing in training programs in the clean energy sector, we can lay the foundation for success in a field that holds such great potential and prepare our students for the good jobs of tomorrow.

---

#### FEDERAL GOVERNMENT ESCAPE ARTISTS

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

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, there's a troubling pattern here in Washington. When wrongdoing occurs involving Federal Government employees, blame falls away from the White House and the wrong-doers get a pass. No one is held accountable.

Exhibit A: Fast and Furious. Government walks guns into Mexico. Two Americans and hundreds of Mexican nationals are killed. White House blames Bush and a low-level employee. Employee resigns; government gets a pass.

Exhibit B: Benghazi. Government denies request for support before and during the attack. Four Americans are killed. Investigation is bungled. Blame is placed on a YouTube video. One Federal employee placed on leave, but still getting a paycheck. Government gets a pass.

Exhibit C: IRS target list. IRS unlawfully targets conservative organizations. Blame is placed on low-level employee, and we're waiting for accountability.

Exhibit D: DOJ subpoenas reporters' phone records to silence a leak. Attorney General Holder recuses himself. We're waiting for who's responsible.

Mr. Speaker, this is a disturbing pattern. The so-called most transparent administration in history appears to be obstinately blocking the truth from the American public. America is tired of unaccountable escape artists in the Federal Government.

This ought not to be, but that's just the way it is.

---

#### MILITARY MENTAL HEALTH AWARENESS DAY

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

Mr. PETERS of California. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to honor Military Mental Health Awareness Day. Mental health issues continue to carry a significant stigma in our country, but it is time that we recognize the challenges that many current servicemembers and veterans are facing, and we work to address their needs.

Post-traumatic stress is all too prevalent in our servicemembers and veterans. As a country, beyond partisanship, we must come together to tackle this issue. Our men and women in uniform deserve our dedication, just as we ask them to dedicate their lives to our Nation's service.

In San Diego, nearly 5,000 veterans were treated for post-traumatic stress in 2011 according to the VA. We are fortunate in San Diego to have medical institutions that provide innovative models of care to our servicemembers and veterans; and it is my hope that with further attention to this issue, we can bring some of those standards of care to the rest of the country.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to help me bring attention to this issue by working with service providers, counselors, and military groups in their communities as we continue to honor the sacrifices these servicemembers make for us.

---

#### FARRM ACT OF 2013

(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, today the House Agriculture Committee is marking up a 5-year farm bill reauthorization, the Federal Agriculture Reform and Risk Management Act of 2013, or FARRM Act.

The FARRM Act is a commonsense package of agriculture reforms that will save taxpayers nearly \$40 billion while strengthening the economic health of our family farms and small businesses. The bill is the product of a multiyear policy assessment designed to modernize Federal agriculture policy and achieve substantial deficit reduction.

The FARRM Act delivers on both fronts, while offering American agriculture the tools to grow and prosper. The bill reduces regulatory burden on small businesses and makes needed reforms to nutrition assistance programs. It will help protect our forests and better manage our lands.

Mr. Speaker, we can no longer allow partisan gridlock to prevent this reauthorization from becoming law. The bill is good for the economy. It promotes jobs and growth. It achieves deficit reduction. And it secures the ability of American agriculture to continue providing the safest and most abundant food supply in the world.

#### NATIONAL POLICE WEEK

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

Ms. GABBARD. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the brave men and women who serve in our police forces. Every day, police officers put their own lives in danger in order to keep our families safe. Many have made the ultimate sacrifice in the line of duty.

This week, we celebrate our local heroes during National Police Week. In order to support the National Law Enforcement Memorial, my sister Davan, a deputy U.S. marshal, joined more than 1,800 officers last weekend in a 300-mile memorial bike ride from New Jersey to Washington, D.C. She honored the memory of three Hawaii officers killed in the line of duty last year: Eric Fontes, Chad Morimoto, and Garret Davis. They've been honored on the national memorial's wall; and in Hawaii, we're working to establish a local memorial, which will be the last State in the country to do so.

Today, I honor these everyday heroes and their families for their unwavering dedication to the safety and service of others.

---

#### DEFENSE AND VETERANS APPROPRIATIONS

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

Mr. FORTENBERRY. Mr. Speaker, America wants Congress to get things done, and lately that's been pretty tough. A deep philosophical divide often separates us, but there are certain things that have to get done. The military has to protect our country, and America has to care for her veterans.

While Congress is stuck in many areas, both parties this morning took a unified step forward in defense of our country and in service to our veterans. Mr. Speaker, in a small hearing room right below here, the Military Construction and Veterans Appropriations Committee said "yes" in a bipartisan manner to meet our Defense Department infrastructure needs and to properly care for our veterans.

The bill spends a little less than the President asked for and a little more than last year. Projects not justified are removed, others are properly funded. The bill also compels both the Department of Defense and Veterans Affairs to use a single integrated electronic health record, ensuring a seamless transition of care for our warfighters leaving service.

Mr. Speaker, this morning we got to a "yes" on that which is essential and right.

---

#### CONGRESSIONAL BLAME GAMES

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

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, this almost seems like the "Curious Case of Benjamin Button," a movie that went backwards, particularly when tomorrow, for the umpteenth time, we'll be debating the repeal of the Affordable Care Act, when over 10 States in the United States, including Texas, have uninsureds up to 28 percent.

What are we thinking?

It's a curious state when, in the Judiciary Committee, someone can come in and offer an audio as testimony that the person who is on there happens to be someone who worked in the Department of Justice with no affirmation of who it is, and then expect the Attorney General to answer questions. And in the instance of who it was supposed to be, Mr. Perez, who has been cited by the OIG as restoring integrity to the voting rights section, or in fact blaming the administration for the Associated Press incident when we're talking about trying to protect the Nation from a terrible attack as it relates to terrorism. And everyone knows that we're unified in protecting the First Amendment rights and shielding reporters. We're not looking for reporters; we're looking for those who leaked something dangerous enough to undermine the security of the United States of America.

This is a curious place. It's nothing but a blame game without revealing any truth whatsoever.

□ 1810

#### RELIGIOUS FREEDOM AND THE PENTAGON

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

Mr. FLEMING. Mr. Speaker, I want to be certain that the administration and Pentagon leadership do not deny our men and women in uniform one of the very freedoms they are fighting to protect.

On Monday, I led on a letter sent to Defense Secretary Hagel demanding details about a meeting between Pentagon officials and anti-Christian extremist, Mikey Weinstein. Weinstein has spent 9 years at war, those are his words, at war with evangelical Christians, who, he says, are committing "spiritual rape" against the U.S. military, Christians who are merely exercising their First Amendment right, or primary duties, in the case of chaplains.

Mr. Weinstein exploits freedom of speech to name-call and to label Christians as the "Christian Taliban" and "al Qaeda." But he seeks to shut down the religious freedom of expression of servicemembers in the process.

I am troubled with several anti-Christian steps the Pentagon has taken in recent years. That is why my colleagues and I seek answers from Secretary Hagel on this important question now.

#### NATIONAL LAW ENFORCEMENT WEEK

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

Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana. This week is National Law Enforcement Week and, as chair of the Homeland Security Committee's Emergency Preparedness, Response, and Communications Subcommittee, and as someone who's worked closely with law enforcement as a former deputy mayor of Indianapolis and U.S. Attorney, I want to mark this moment.

Men and women of law enforcement run into the most difficult situations while the rest of us are trying to get out. They spend their lives in harm's way to keep the rest of us out of it.

When I toured the flood damage just last month in Grant, Howard and Tip-top counties, I learned the police had gone door to door to make sure that everyone had evacuated.

When I was U.S. Attorney, I spoke at the funeral of Officer Jake Laird, who was shot and killed by a mentally ill gunman. Officers ran in to save a neighborhood under siege.

Historically, Indiana law enforcement has lost 406 individuals in the line of duty. These men and women gave their lives for their fellow Hoosiers. We are forever grateful to them and to their survivors, and honor their memories by supporting and honoring their service and those who proudly wear the badge.

#### SERIOUS CONSEQUENCES OF THE IMPLEMENTATION OF OBAMACARE

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

Mr. MARCHANT. Mr. Speaker, it seems like each day a new study or report is released that finds serious consequences coming from ObamaCare's implementation.

The law is already hurting job creation. This was evidenced in the latest jobs report, which showed an increase in the number of part-time workers and a decrease in the average number of hours worked each week.

This law is also raising insurance premiums, increasing deficits, and will reduce the quality of health care for Americans across the country.

Opposition to this law is bipartisan. In fact, a recent Fox News poll found that 56 percent of people that identified themselves as Democrats were against the thousands of pages of ObamaCare regulations and called them "way over the top."

We must now repeal this law and get to work on reforms that lower costs, improve the quality of care, and protect jobs.

#### WHY THE AFFORDABLE CARE ACT MUST BE REPEALED

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MASSIE). Under the Speaker's an-

nounced policy of January 3, 2013, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. MURPHY) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. MURPHY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, we're here tonight to talk about health care, something that is important to all of us, something that we have been discussing in this Chamber for the last few years, trying to make health care affordable and accessible to many American families.

A couple of years ago, out of this Chamber, a bill was passed, one that many didn't even get a chance to read. But we were told, in preparation for that, the American people were told there would be tremendous benefits to passing the President's health care law. The President of the United States himself said it would cut health care costs by \$2,500 per family per year.

We were also told there are a number of benefits, such as no lifetime caps, a number of prevention benefits, certainly ones that many of us agree with. But to get the benefits of the health care bill, we were also told by then-Speaker PELOSI that we had to pass the bill to find out what is in it. We have, since then, found out many of the things that are in it, and many of those we are still discovering as time goes on.

Tonight we'll discuss what is the Affordable Care Act and many aspects of it that concern us deeply, and why it must be repealed, because just the good intentions of the bill are not enough. Good intentions do not guarantee good results.

What we will discuss tonight is a study that has told us some shocking information: how premiums will go up, on average, 96 percent, even more so for young men and for women before retirement.

We will discuss new findings that show massive premiums increases for families, for individuals, for small businesses across the country. To many of these Americans, they will wake up, when they get their health care bills, and find the Affordable Care Act is not affordable.

But first, let us review again some of the promises and the reality of that Affordable Care Act. To seniors, the President's promised that these reforms will not cut your guaranteed benefits. What we've discovered is that there were more than \$500 billion in cuts to Medicare that the administration's own actuary predicts will lead to providers no longer accepting Medicare, meaning that doctors that seniors have been seeing for a while will simply say, we can no longer afford to provide this.

The nonpartisan Congressional Budget Office predicted that, for Medicare Advantage, these cuts "could lead many plans to limit the benefits they offer, raise their premiums, or withdraw from the program."

It's important to understand that Medicare Advantage is the program that provides a wide range of preventative services and disease management

for seniors. The very things that people talked about what we should be doing for health care will be omitted. Translation means that Medicare savings come from cutting payments to doctors and hospitals.

We've also known that this Independent Payment Advisory Board is a problem, also known as IPAB. This 15-member appointed board of which, by law, a majority of them may not be in the health care field, will make additional cuts to Medicare without any Congressional approval or appeal, unless the House and the Senate pass legislation and the President signs it into law. So literally, it would take an act of Congress to change some of these aspects that this independent board will make decisions on with regard to payments and coverage.

The President also promised, "If you like your health care plan, you'll be able to keep your health care plan, period. No one will take it away, no matter what."

But here are some of the facts we've discovered since the bill has passed. The nonpartisan Congressional Budget Office predicted 3 million to 9 million individuals would lose their employer-sponsored coverage. McKenzie Consulting actually has come up with much higher numbers, saying workers losing their employer coverage could be as high as 80 to 100 million.

Over 1,400 waivers had to be granted to employers so they could opt out of this legislation. The Health and Human Services Department had to grant pardons to large businesses like McDonald's, Universal Studios, and labor unions. It is estimated that these waivers cover 3.2 million people.

And Speaker PELOSI said the bill would create 400,000 jobs almost immediately. Let's look again at the results now that the bill is law. The Congressional Budget Office predicted the law will result in 700,000 additional Americans unemployed, 700,000 additional Americans unemployed.

The National Federation of Independent Business predicted the bill will cause a loss of over 1.4 million jobs.

A new insurance tax will also impact a number of private sector jobs, estimated to be between 146,000 to 262,000 jobs, by 2022. And 59 percent of these job losses come from small businesses, the backbone of our Nation's growth, where so many moms and dads and young men and women have their jobs and get their start.

□ 1820

Those small companies, those neighborhood companies, those ones that have the big impact, that sponsor everything from the Little League games to church events as well, many of these businesses are going to say, We just cannot grow and create new jobs. Many worry how they're going to keep workers employed. Many worry how they're going to afford health care coverage for their workers, and many of those workers are wondering if they can keep their job.

The President also said:

I can make a firm pledge that under my plan no family making less than \$250,000 a year will see any form of tax increase, not your income tax, not your payroll tax, not your capital gains taxes, not any of your taxes.

Let's now talk about the facts.

There are over \$835 billion in taxes that will be passed on to families in the form of higher premiums and higher costs. Let's look at some of those taxes. There will be an increase in the Medicare payroll taxes and an increase in other unearned taxes. These Medicare taxes will be a total amount of \$317 billion in taxes that people will see coming off of their paychecks. Indeed, they will see them on their paychecks.

There's a medical device tax. All those medical devices that doctors and dentists use to care for you, that will be a new tax. And even though they say this tax will be paid by the manufacturers, those taxes, indeed, will be passed on in terms of higher costs. Those medical devices so critical for the doctors and nurses to provide good health care for you, that will increase their costs.

There will be a health insurance tax, a health insurance tax on the health insurance companies themselves and on the policies. That will be \$101 billion.

There will also be the individual mandate tax, saying that if you do not have coverage, you will pay an additional tax. That's \$55 billion.

And, of course, if your employer decides to give you a high-level health care plan that covers so many of the things that people want in terms of their doctors' fees, their hospital stay, dental, other medical, eyeglasses, prescription drugs, those may be now labeled as a Cadillac plan, and those will be taxed with a 40 percent excise tax that each family will have to pay in their health insurance, total being about \$111 billion on that alone.

These taxes will indeed cost health care more. There will be higher taxes for families who will be paying out of their paycheck. There's no escaping this part that even though people were told they will not pay higher taxes, indeed they will.

But now the Energy and Commerce Committee has also done a study, and we're going to talk about what's going to happen with premiums in this, because the President said that his plan:

not only guarantees coverage for every American, but brings down the cost of health care and reduces every family's premium by as much as \$2,500.

Even after the bill passed, more promises were made about the benefits of the law. In July 2012, President Obama promised that once the Affordable Care Act has been "fully implemented, your premiums will go down." They have not. In fact, since the Affordable Care Act has passed, people have seen their premiums go up by thousands of dollars. We now have the data showing premiums, in fact, will go

up even more, and quite dramatically for millions and millions and millions of individuals, families and small businesses across the country, and large businesses as well.

Let me describe the study that the Energy and Commerce Committee performed, submitting letters on March 14 of this year from the Oversight and Investigations Subcommittee.

We sent 17 health care insurance companies requests on information about the Affordable Care Act. We asked them, How would it affect premiums? We asked them to tell us the information that they already have. What numbers did they come up with? What are their analysts telling them already it's going to cost in terms of new premiums?

We didn't request the companies create new information, and we didn't ask them to make anything up. We said very specifically, Tell us what you see is going to happen. And we said, Submit your existing analysis to us so we can capture the purest representation of the impact of the Affordable Care Act. Simply said, what is it going to cost families?

As insurers are currently filing their applications to participate in the exchanges, that prediction phase is over, and now we can find out what was in the health care bill and what it will cost families. We went straight to the source to find out what it will be for America's families, and here is what we found out.

First of all, we noted that health care is going to cost, on average, 96 percent more for people who are going to get a new health insurance plan, 73 percent more for those keeping their insurance, and as much as 413 percent more based on age and the plan mandates.

Now, this is important because what this means, basically, is that young men will see a large increase in their health insurance rates. Women who are nearing retirement age will also see a large increase in their insurance rates. Let's go through what some of the reasons for this are.

What was provided to us, for example, by one actual insurance company analysis said that, as you start to look through these cost increases, what may be a new business or an existing one for your employer, there are several essential benefits. Now, up to this point, people have been able to choose a plan based upon its affordability; but instead, what it's going to be is all plans have to look the same. Now, in that sense they say that that increase can be about 15 percent more.

Now, in addition, for the minimum coverage, about 8 to 10 percent more, there will be other guaranteed issues. Removal of any underwriting actions, that will be about another 65 percent to 10 percent. There will be insurer fees. There will be other things like risk adjustment transfer payments, reinsurance risk adjustment, and other effects small employers will have.

Those will also go up by as much as 35 percent.

There will also be an average start—look at the average starting member cost premium per member per month will be \$158. And if you're just doing it on what's called the bronze level, the very low level, which would pay 60 percent premiums, that's about \$182 more per month up to \$200 per month. There are multiple other fees in this.

Basically, what this comes down to is, for those who are new businesses, newly in the plan, 96 percent higher costs; for those who have an established one, about 73 percent higher costs; and in some levels, as high as 413 percent higher.

On a broader sense, to look at how much this will cost you, in 45 States that were analyzed, 35 percent of the market will see a premium increase of greater than 30 percent. Now, what we see here, some States will be less than 10 percent, some States will be greater than 30 percent, some will see 20 to 30 percent, and some will be 10 to 20 percent.

Let's look at some of the individual States.

Now, in these States, I'm just going to pick out a few here to describe. For example, in the State of Georgia, potential premium increases range from 48 to 63 percent in the individual market and 25 percent in the small group market; meaning, if you're buying on your own, it's going to be much higher than if you're in a small group, but still it's pretty considerable.

Indiana, one insurance company said it would be 100 percent increase in the small group market. Illinois, potential premium increases from 27 to 61 percent in the individual market and 25 percent in the small group market.

Look at Nevada, potential premium increases 31 percent; Michigan, 25 to 88 percent for males, and the individual market with premiums to vary greatly throughout the State. In the small group market, an estimated 44 percent of plans will see some decrease in some cases and other areas seeing an increase.

In my State of Pennsylvania, there's an average increase of 30 percent in the individual market and 27 percent in the group market.

Tennessee, which has already had problems over the years with TennCare, will see a potential premium increase of 49 to 54 percent in the individual market and 35 percent in the small group market.

The lists go on and on. We bring this out so the American people can understand that when people say, if you thought health care costs were expensive, wait until you see what they're costing when they're free, quite frankly, there is no free ride on this.

Now, admittedly, some will have some subsidies on this. About 8 percent of those will have some level of subsidy, which will help to offset some of these costs, but many people will not have these subsidies at all.

At this point, I'd like to ask some of my colleagues up to talk about some of these things. On my left is Congresswoman SHELLEY MOORE CAPITO of West Virginia to talk about what this means in terms of the costs for some employees in her State.

□ 1830

Mrs. CAPITO. I'd like to thank my colleague from Pennsylvania. And I'm glad we're talking about this because tomorrow I intend to vote again to repeal ObamaCare and put an end to what its lead author himself said is a "train wreck."

I'd like to read an email that I received about 2 or 3 weeks ago:

I own a daycare center (260 children and 73 staff). Been in business 24 years. I just got the info on ObamaCare from my insurance company. The numbers will cause me to close my business. How can my own government do this? I have worked hard to have a first-rate child care center, seldom taking vacations and easily putting in 10 hours a day year-round. I have always done the right thing for my employees and clients. This is so discouraging to me. Is there any way to fix this?

So I visited the daycare center and talked with the owner of the business. If she moves forward and doesn't offer insurance, she is going to have to pay \$83,000 a year in penalties. She cannot afford this.

So what are her options? She's looking at going from 73 employees down to below 50. Well, that's 24 jobs right there that she's talking about cutting. But let's think of the further implications of cutting 24 jobs in a daycare center. It's over 70 children who are no longer going to have good, high-quality daycare in her small business. She's worked hard for 24 years and she doesn't understand.

She tells me most of the people in her business now have insurance. Those who aren't, because they work at the lower wage scale, are able to access Medicaid and have other health care available to them. She's very, very discouraged.

Another business person in my State of West Virginia just sent me his tax collection for next year for the ObamaCare health plan. He has 105 people. His premiums are going to go up \$180,000 more a year. His annual premium in a small business like this is \$788,000–\$180,000 more than it was the previous year. And this is for a plan that has a \$3,000 deductible, which is going to break the back of a lot of employees in his business.

His change? We heard from the gentleman from Pennsylvania that we were promised that premiums would not go up, that it was going to be affordable and premiums would come down. His premiums have gone up 30 percent.

We've already talked about how many folks across this country are going to lose their coverage, how many are going to lose their jobs. These are just two small businesses that are thinking about either cutting their

full-time employees down to part time to try to get under the threshold—which means that employee has to go out and find another job to supplement the income to be able to have enough income to sustain their families.

We also learned, as the report from the Energy and Commerce Committee has stated, that for younger people and people going on the individual market, the premiums are going to be 96 percent higher. We've also learned that 80 percent of single adults between the ages of 21 and 29, with incomes at just \$16,500, will pay more for their health care than they do today. It's very discouraging to hardworking folks.

I was reading *The Wall Street Journal* the other day and saw an op-ed by Dr. Ezekiel Emanuel, who I think played a large role in creating ObamaCare. He noted that the exchanges would only work if younger Americans decided to participate. The gentleman from Pennsylvania has just pointed out that the younger working population is the one where the premium increase is going to hit the hardest.

But he further suggests that the President, through the force of his popularity with younger Americans—because they voted for him—could convince them to sign up for health plans because of the popularity of the President. It's difficult to encourage people through a sheer force of personality to act against their own economic instincts. I mean, we're talking about young people that will go across the street—and most people in America that will go across the street—to save a nickel on gasoline even if their dad owns the gas station on the other side. In my view, this just doesn't even hit reality of what's actually going to happen with our young people.

He further states that health insurance needs to be seen as an individual responsibility. You know what? Health insurance right now is an individual responsibility in this country. But instead, purchasing insurance after January 1 will be a requirement imposed by Big Government.

I have shared the concerns of mine. We've talked about the taxes. As I was reading through the renewal summary of the small business that has 105, he has three taxes listed here that his insurance company has enumerated for him:

One is the annual fee on health insurance providers called an insurance fee. This is a nondeductible excise tax applied on health insurance to help finance ObamaCare.

Number two, Patient-Centered Outcomes Research Trust Fund. This provides funding for an institute to assist patients, clinicians, purchasers and policymakers to make informed health decisions.

The other is a transitional reinsurance contribution for those who are in high-risk pools.

This is added tax to small businesses, the employers in our country. They're

going to have to make tough choices because it's unaffordable. Even paying the penalties is unaffordable, which is going to result, as you said, in over 700,000 jobs lost in this country.

We have a better way to do this, a more patient-centered, market-based approach where affordability and accessibility are goals that we all want. We could have, I think, a much more economical, and probably a better health approach because it will have the patient-centered doctor/patient relationship in full consideration.

So I would say to you that I have two concrete examples. I would encourage my colleagues throughout—and I'm sure we have—the House and Senate to talk to these employers who have over 50 employees to see what kind of impact this is going to have. Twenty-four possible people losing their jobs in a day care center; 70 children losing after-school care. What are those families going to do?

I tried to help with this business owner to try to help her find solutions. I couldn't come up with one because this is getting rammed down her throat no matter what.

So, with that discouraging bit of a small business viewpoint of the impact of ObamaCare as it approaches, and with the attitude of some of the architects of ObamaCare that it's our responsibility, or because we voted for somebody, we are going to work against our own economic interests, it just doesn't even pass the laugh test in my opinion. So I think we're in for a rough ride.

I want to thank my colleague for letting me join him on this Special Order and all my colleagues here tonight.

Mr. MURPHY of Pennsylvania. I thank my friend from West Virginia, whose district borders mine in southwestern Pennsylvania down there.

But I note and amplify something you said because even when some say, well, you know, if you're a business of less than 50 employees it's not going to affect you, there are a couple things. Some businesses say, well, then, we'll stay under 50 employees. But also, those people are still going to have the taxes. They're going to have higher Medicare taxes, taxes on their paycheck, they're going to see health care costs going up anyway because of the tax on health insurance, tax on prescription drugs, and other taxes that go on. So people will still see higher costs in this.

I'd like to call now upon another one of my colleagues from Texas, Dr. BURGESS, also on the Energy and Commerce Committee, who continues to work very hard for the sake of patients to make sure we come up with an affordable plan for American families.

Mr. BURGESS. I thank the gentleman for yielding and I thank him for holding this hour tonight. It is important that we have this discussion.

We're barely 3 weeks from the third anniversary of that late-night congressional session where the Affordable

Care Act was passed into law. Those of us who were here at the time will remember that this bill that became law that was voted on late that night never went through our committee. We had a bill that went through our committee, but it never saw the light of day. This was a Senate bill that was bounced back over to the House, and we were forced to pass it without a single hearing, without a markup. It basically just came to us and the majority at the time, the Democratic majority, pushed it through.

When you stop and look at what were the American people telling us through the summer of 2009, when we all had those very tense town halls in our district, what were people saying to us? Number one, do not mess up the system that is working well for 65 or 70 percent of us. Number two was, if you're going to do anything at all, can you help us with costs? Well, I think we have the answer to those two questions. Number one, we have messed the system up for the people who were depending upon it, and, the costs are going through the roof.

But when you analyze what this new data means, the real thrust of the cost increases are focused on people who buy in the individual market and people who buy in the small group market. All of the rhetoric from the summer of 2009, through the fall of 2009, to the spring of 2010 was we have to make these changes in our insurance policy. Why? Because we have to help these people in the small group market and the individual market.

□ 1840

This is where the problems occurred; but, in fact, we have made those problems worse, and they continue to grow in severity day by day.

Mr. Chairman, I would also point out, the committee staff on the Energy and Commerce Committee on our Subcommittee on Oversight, has really done an excellent job in compiling this data. We don't get much help from the Department of Health and Human Services. When we say we need information from you about what the cost structure is going to be of this new health care plan, we don't get a lot of help from them.

So the committee staff goes out, actually writes to people who will be in charge of administering the plans for people in the small group and the individual market, and then they compile the data. And the data that they compiled is all up on the Energy and Commerce Web site, and it's startling.

These are the individuals: the small-group market and the individual market. To be sure, the large-group market will be affected, but not nearly as much as those people in the small-group and individual market. It was those people who ObamaCare was supposed to help in the first place, and we've done them the maximum harm.

So a tip of the hat to the Energy and Commerce staff, particularly the staff

on the Oversight and Investigation Subcommittee. I think they've done an excellent job in bringing this information to the Congress in a very usable form. Again, I encourage people to look on the Energy and Commerce Web site because this is information that can directly affect you, your family, your business, your children, and literally your health care for the next three decades.

I wish this thing had never happened. We are going to have a repeal vote later this week, and I welcome the chance to do that. This is the unfinished business of this Congress, to undo this dreadful law that has been visited upon the land.

But in the meantime, we also need to make people aware of how this law is going to affect their lives. It's going to be in a big way: if you like what you have, you can keep it—not so much. If you like your doctor, you can keep your doctor—not so much. ObamaCare, you're going to pay a lot more to get a lot less.

Mr. GRIFFITH of Virginia. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BURGESS. Yes, I'll be happy to yield for a question.

Mr. GRIFFITH of Virginia. I thank the gentleman for yielding for a question.

I am looking at the report that you have referenced that people can go look at online for themselves, and I notice that your home State of Texas has a projected 23 percent premium increase; is that correct?

Mr. BURGESS. That's my understanding.

Mr. GRIFFITH of Virginia. And I also notice that the report says, from the data that was obtained from the insurance companies, that my home State of Virginia is going to have a 31 percent premium increase in the small group; again, not talking about the large group rates, while they will be affected by the taxes.

Now, I'm just kind of curious. How come Texas is getting off light with only a 23 percent increase and Virginia is getting hit with that 31 percent increase? Can you explain that, or is that just another one of the mysteries of ObamaCare?

Mr. BURGESS. If the gentleman will yield?

Mr. GRIFFITH of Virginia. I will yield to the gentleman.

Mr. BURGESS. Well, let me assure the gentleman from Virginia, I can promise you with absolute certainty that there was no favoritism on the part of the Obama administration toward the great State of Texas. If anything, Texas seems to be singled out for special consideration on some other areas. But perhaps it actually relates to the differences in the insurance market and the type of coverage that's sought. I really can't explain that 5 or 6 percent discrepancy.

What I can tell you—and, again, this is with dead certainty—that the Obama administration did not—did not—show

favoritism to the State of Texas or its Governor Perry.

Mr. GRIFFITH of Virginia. If the gentleman will yield further, perhaps for a colloquy, I would ask the gentleman if he suspects that this is because up to this point in time this has always been a State-driven market and, therefore, there are some differences between the States, but that the vast majority of States, according to this report, in the small-group market are going to be facing significant double-digit increases? Is that his understanding from the report?

Mr. BURGESS. There are going to be double-digit increases. And, of course, as the gentleman is well aware, there are different State mandates that have governed the State-regulated insurance market over time, and that may result in some of the discrepancy that you're seeing.

Mr. GRIFFITH of Virginia. And I would further ask the gentleman if it makes him a little nervous that the folks who are going to be trying to get out there and get records and make sure that folks are doing what they're supposed to, either paying the tax or buying the insurance, are in fact the IRS? That would be the same IRS that we found out for political reasons slow-walked and made it difficult for some conservative groups, particularly from Texas and other parts of the country, to actually get their tax exempt status. Does that make the gentleman a little bit nervous?

Mr. BURGESS. It should concern and make nervous every man, woman, and child in this country that the Internal Revenue Service is going to be administering their health care in the future. I think that's an important point that the gentleman has brought up.

One other difference, if I may add, between the cost in Texas and the cost in Virginia. Do bear in mind that Texas enacted significant medical liability reform 10 years ago, and we have seen the benefits of that. If there's one thing that was the missing link in the Affordable Care Act, it was where was their commitment to reforming the medical justice system in this country, which we all know tends to drive costs up, and the creation of defensive medicine, which in turn drives costs up.

Texas has a 10-year history now of caps on noneconomic damages in medical liability suits. I don't know for certain if that has played a role in the lower premium increase in Texas; but if it has, I'm sure they'll be happy to take credit for it.

Mr. GRIFFITH of Virginia. I would say to the gentleman that I'm sure some of those things have played out, not necessarily the differences between Texas and Virginia, because Virginia has a longer history with medical malpractice caps. And we, too, have seen that it has helped us in many ways in the State of Virginia.

I would point out to the gentleman, and I doubt that he is aware of this, and I don't know the truth or veracity

of it, but it is reported in the Court-house News Service, which is a service for lawyers and press folks, that in California the IRS has actually been sued because they had a search warrant to go in to look at a specific employee's financial records. And in the process, according to the allegations made by the attorney, Robert Barnes, when they went in, it happened to be an insurance company or a company that had medical records—we're not sure because it's called a John Doe company—but it had medical records for something like 10 million Californians, including everybody in the judicial system in California. And notwithstanding the fact that they were told those were not financial records of the individual but personal medical records and that they were probably violating some HIPAA rules, they seized these records and they have now been sued by, as I said, the attorney's name is Robert Barnes in the State of Texas.

That gives me some concern that perhaps what we are seeing in regards to the IRS's callousness towards political parties and political philosophy and the Constitution of the United States groups that were trying to promote that, they may also just have a callous disregard that they can be untouched by anybody, when you see that this lawsuit actually was filed in March, and I don't think it got much attention because people probably thought it was not part of their regular pattern.

But now that we have seen what has happened in other parts of the country in regard to those exemptions, that may also be of some concern to people that they're out there compiling all of these records. And, again, we don't know whether it's true. But some of those records that they got from some of the Tea Party groups allegedly, and alleged by a left-leaning or a liberal group, the IRS gave them the information as to who their donors were, is the IRS also going to give out our medical information to folks that we don't necessarily want to have it?

That's the question that we have to ask when you have a scandal like this at the IRS and it directly impacts ObamaCare. Because right now, before ObamaCare comes into effect, the gentleman, I think, would agree with me the IRS really doesn't have anything to do with your medical records. But now we are opening up the door and taking those 16,000 agents, and they are very likely to be looking at your medical records and your company's medical policies as well as the medical records, and that causes me some concern, and I suspect it may cause the gentleman some concern also.

Mr. MURPHY of Pennsylvania. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GRIFFITH of Virginia. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. MURPHY of Pennsylvania. It certainly is a concern, because not only do you have the IRS with these new 16,000 agents, and we already know that it has come from multiple sources

in multiple States, the issue with regard to not only going after conservative groups, but also pro-Israel Jewish groups, the issue of them going into the Gibson Guitar Company, multiple things where they tend to use the heavy hammer for political purposes on those who may not agree with some others.

At this point, there still certainly is a lot of information yet to be garnered from this, but it should give people pause and understanding—what happens if you don't cooperate with the health care plan, will these be the folks who will basically come in and try and enforce that as it goes through?

Mr. GRIFFITH of Virginia. I would ask you in that regard, if someone sees these premium increases that we've been talking about and they decide that they don't want to buy the insurance, what then happens from the IRS's standpoint, or from the government's standpoint in general?

Mr. MURPHY of Pennsylvania. I thank the gentleman for the question.

Look at it this way: let's take a young man who is suddenly going to see his rates go through the roof. He's healthy. In the past, that gentleman in his 20s may have said, you know, I'm going to buy just a little bit of catastrophic insurance if I need it, if at all; or perhaps if it's one that is out-of-pocket, he may decide not to do it.

□ 1850

What does he face?

If the IRS catches him, he pays a \$95 fine. Now, if you're looking at paying thousands of dollars a year for health insurance versus \$95, even though the gentlelady from West Virginia said that they had hoped that people would just out of affection for the President buy it anyway, when someone is having a hard time paying for groceries—and look at the cost of gasoline and its having gone up a couple thousand dollars for the average family, and they're saying electricity has gone up—you can buy a lot of groceries for \$3,000 a year. That's months and months worth of groceries for someone. They may say, I may just pay that \$95 fine. Quite frankly, what also comes up is, if they don't have a plan, they could end up in an ambulance or in an emergency room and sign up when they're there just like they do with Medicaid. Now, what motivation will there be for someone to have that?

The important thing about this place is that it's based upon an assumption that a lot of people when they're healthy will sign up so we'll have that money coming in. I have my doubts for families and individuals who are already struggling who will then make decisions and say, I think I'll take the risk. Even in 2016, when those fines go up to a maximum of \$695—or 2.5 percent income, whatever is greater—I think many individuals may also say, Well, if my choices are paying \$695 or \$6,000 or \$10,000 or \$12,000 for the insurance, maybe I'll just not pay it and see what happens.

Let's face it. A lot of Americans make their health insurance decisions on what the affordability is, just like they make their car insurance decisions. They don't all get a comprehensive policy. They get what they can afford. It's the same thing with other decisions in their lives, whatever that is.

I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. SCALISE).

Mr. SCALISE. I think it's an important point you make about how people make decisions based on price, because every weekend, when I go back home to southeast Louisiana and when I talk to my families and small businesses that are trying to figure out how ObamaCare is going to affect them, there is a recurring theme that comes through, and it's something we hear every single day.

First of all, small businesses have no idea how they're going to be able to comply with this law when they look at the mountains of regulations. We had recently stacked up all of the pages of regulations and rules that have come out, and it's well over 7-feet high. A small business that doesn't have, maybe, five, six, seven employees—they don't have an H.R. shop, they don't have teams of attorneys and accountants, they can't figure all of this out, and they're asking these questions. But we're also hearing this from large companies that provide really good health care for families all throughout southeast Louisiana. I hear this from colleagues from other States, too. When they look at this law, they say, The President promised, if you like what you have, you can keep it. Yet that promise is broken for millions of Americans who are facing these costs that have been discussed.

Look at the drastic increases of 73 percent that will hit families. If you have a good insurance policy that you like, if you have good health care, it's a 73 percent increase for you. If you're trying to get new health care, it's 96 percent more you'll have to pay because of ObamaCare.

I think what's the most frightening to families is when they see the new bureaucracy. This is the new bureaucracy created by ObamaCare. If you look, I think the most sacred relationship in health care is the doctor and the patient. There should be nobody in between the doctor and the patient when it comes to making health care decisions. Yet, under ObamaCare, look at all of this mountain of red tape and agencies that come between families and their doctors in ObamaCare. At the very top of this—again, it's most riveting and has been brought up before—is the Internal Revenue Service.

First of all, does anybody at the IRS have any kind of medical degree or even EMS training?

Now the IRS is the enforcement agency of ObamaCare. Of course, that was riveting before the scandal that came out last week, but in light of the new scandal in which the IRS is literally targeting people, President

Obama's administration is allowing this. Not one person has been fired by the way. The Obama administration made a decision to target Americans based on their beliefs, based on their values, and that's the agency that will be tasked with enforcing ObamaCare. They had little credibility before all of this scandal emerged, but now, in light of this, I think the lead Senate architect, MAX BAUCUS, one of the authors of the bill, just a few weeks ago—they rammed it through, and Speaker PELOSI 3 years ago said that you've got to pass the bill to find out what's in it—said it's a train wreck coming down. In fact, he's not even running for reelection next year.

This kind of bureaucracy should not be put in place for any type of government agency, let alone coming between patients and their doctors. This is the massive bureaucracy that ObamaCare is. This is why we have this vote tomorrow to repeal ObamaCare, and it's a bill I'm proud to cosponsor.

Again, I thank the gentleman from Pennsylvania for his leadership in the hearings that we've had on the Oversight Subcommittee of Energy and Commerce to expose some of this, and also to even get testimony from Obama administration officials who say they're not even ready to comply with the legal deadlines in the law that are coming up in the next few months. This should not be dumped upon our families, whether it's in southeast Louisiana or anywhere else in the country. We need to repeal this bill and actually get back to work on fixing the problems in health care, like cost and access, that are now made even worse with ObamaCare.

Mr. MURPHY of Pennsylvania. I thank the gentleman.

I would also like to call upon the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. JOHNSON), who is also a member of the Energy and Commerce Committee and is also deeply concerned about his constituents in Ohio and what they're going to be facing.

Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I am, indeed, honored to join you and the rest of our colleagues here in sharing some thoughts on what the American people now should expect in the coming months and years from the administration's so-called historic achievement in health care reform. It's historic all right. This massive bill gives the government control over one-sixth of our economy and the authority to manipulate markets and to make individual health care decisions.

So how did President Obama convince the American people to buy into this scheme? He looked the American people right in the TV camera lens, and he promised two things. He pledged that this law would cut costs for American families, and he promised that it would make health care more affordable.

Now, I could stand up here and talk about all of the other economic dan-

gers posed by the so-called Affordable Care Act, like the ever-mounting costs of implementation, the instability it causes in programs that seniors rely on, the fact that this bill contributes substantially to the insurmountable debt we are leaving to our children and our grandchildren, but that's not foremost in the minds of those individuals whom I represent along the Ohio River in eastern and southeastern Ohio.

As the American people continue to search for good-paying jobs, families in my district are trying to figure out how to stretch their paychecks to cover another trip to the grocery store or to buy clothes for their kids or to purchase another tank of gas for the car. Now we're seeing reports that indicate most families will have to factor health care premium increases into their budgets as well—all because of the Affordable Care Act's policies, mandates, taxes, and fees.

Now, does that sound affordable to anyone? It doesn't to me, and it doesn't to the people that I represent along the Ohio River.

I am proud to serve on the Energy and Commerce Committee, and I was recently given the opportunity to question Gary Cohen, the director of the office within HHS in charge of the implementation of the health care law. I asked him directly if premiums were going to go up or down for the American people. Remember, the President promised us lower costs. Mr. Cohen briefly toed the party line, saying, Absolutely, we'll see lower costs. But he went on largely throughout the questioning to repeatedly say, We'll simply have to wait and see.

They don't know. That sounds oddly familiar to me. It reminds me of when the minority leader, the gentlewoman from California, tried to convince the American people that Congress needed to pass the Affordable Care Act in order to find out what was in it. We are now finding out what's in it, and it is a train wreck, as some have stated. Now, wouldn't the responsible thing have been to do the job correctly the first time?

Let me clarify a few things. Let me cite some numbers brought to light by our investigation.

Individual consumers in 90 percent of States will likely face premium increases. In my State of Ohio, men purchasing an individual policy would face increases ranging from 32 to 52 percent. Ohio employers purchasing small group market policies could see a projected premium increase of 28 percent. Nationwide, new businesses could see increases of 96 percent, while existing businesses would be burdened with 73 percent. And age and plan mandates forced on insurers could push premiums up as high as 413 percent in some cases.

□ 1900

Now, do these numbers support the pledge made by the President that Americans would see lower costs, or do

they highlight the dishonesty as a means of pushing a terrible law through Congress? Based on these facts, Mr. Speaker, it is hard to argue that the Affordable Health Care Act will ever become more affordable as long as that law is on the books.

Hard evidence to support the looming premium rate shock should scare the administration as much as it scares the American people, American families, businesses, and health care providers throughout the Nation, particularly along the river where people are still struggling to make ends meet from day to day.

I appreciate the time.

Mr. GRIFFITH of Virginia. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio. Absolutely.

Mr. GRIFFITH of Virginia. I would say to the gentleman that it was very interesting when you talked about the cost of the insurance, and while he said overall that he thought the rates were going to go down, my recollection was—and correct me if I'm wrong—that when you were asking him those questions, part of his position was, Well, we don't know for sure, but we think they'll be lower than what they would have been if we hadn't passed the law, but they're going to be higher than what they were when we passed the law. Wasn't that pretty much his reasoning?

Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio. Yeah, that was pretty much the case. I started to challenge him to a Monopoly game because that's funny money. That's a way of manipulating the numbers, and that's more of the dishonesty that's being perpetrated on the American people with this law.

Mr. GRIFFITH of Virginia. I would also have to point out that, with everything that we've gotten to so far, it appears that their numbers have not been right. They told us that they could produce a long-term care insurance plan, and they backed out of that because they couldn't make the numbers work as they had originally thought they would work on long-term care insurance.

Then we had the whole situation with the catastrophic illness fund that, from the time the bill was passed, was supposed to get folks who had catastrophic illnesses, it was going to cover all of them until ObamaCare came into effect in 2014, but they ran out of money March 1. Do you recall that?

Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio. Absolutely, I do.

Mr. GRIFFITH of Virginia. So those numbers weren't right, and they apparently thought they had enough money built into the budget and gave the Secretary large latitude to take money out of various funds to make things happen, but now she seems to be going around the country asking the very companies that she's overseeing as part of her job for money because they didn't calculate how much money they were going to need to sign everybody up to get into ObamaCare.

So every time we turn around on the committee, it looks like we're finding something new where their numbers were always funny money numbers, Monopoly money, however you want to look at it. And it seems to me that your point is exactly right, that it's not only going to cost the people of southern Ohio, but it's also going to cost the people of southwest Virginia and every part of these United States more money than was ever projected, and it's going to come right out of the pockets of the working poor and hurt them the most.

Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio. Absolutely.

Every time we asked Mr. Cohen who are premiums going to go down for, he avoided the question. He couldn't tell us that premiums were going to go down for anyone.

We asked him, Are they going to go down for the young? Are they going to go down for the old? Are they going to go down for women? Are they going to go down for men? He had no answers. We'll have to wait and see. That's a far cry from the promise that the President made of lowering costs and making health care more affordable.

Mr. MURPHY of Pennsylvania. Certainly that was part of the promise that was given to so many Americans on why they supported this image.

Look, we as Republicans, we know there are a number of things we want to see happen. We want to make sure that we're preventing illnesses, and we want to make sure that we're caring for those who are chronically ill. Sadly, regarding the high-risk pool, the door was closed on that. Many people who are chronically ill will not be getting additional care.

We want to make sure that doctors can be paid for coordinating care of those chronically ill. Right now, getting people to make sure they take their medication, there's follow-up to get to their appointment, doctors can consult back and forth, a patient can call with other questions, nobody gets paid for that. They do get paid if they have more tests. So there's a fee-for-service plan. Quite frankly, it's tough for doctors to try to reduce costs under that plan. We would like to see those costs go down even more, and we support that.

We want to maintain coverage for the sick. We don't want to see people cut because they're ill. And we believe that if people have a preexisting condition, they ought to have an opportunity to maintain insurance. We agree with those.

What we don't agree with is this massive bureaucracy that Mr. SCALISE showed us before that's going to require a lot of tax money to pay for it, increased taxes, 10 years worth of taxes to cover 6 years worth of plans; and already we see Health and Human Services running out of money and so they have to call up insurance companies and other groups and say, Can you give us more money to help convince people that this is a good idea? It's tough going with that.

Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio. It is very tough going.

Mr. MURPHY of Pennsylvania. So we do know that these costs are going to continue to climb for many people, even though people in the administration have told us they're not quite sure yet what is going to go on. We know these costs are going to continue.

Let me point out again something very important, Mr. Speaker. I worry about how the American families are going to afford this. Their electricity rates have gone up and will continue to go up. This administration has pushed to have coal-fired power plants to close down, has spent billions of dollars for energy subsidies for companies that have gone belly up. Gasoline prices have gone up thousands of dollars for families, unemployment has been above 7 percent for years, hundreds of thousands have been put out of work because of the aspects of this health care bill.

It's tough for families to say, How am I going to pay for this? How are they going to pay, as they say, 96 percent more for those who get a new plan, 73 percent more for those keeping their insurance, and up to 413 percent because of some of the age issues and other things going on with that?

These are tough concerns for American families and ones that they're asking us to then say, Please, repeal this bill and let us get to something that really works to take care of those issues, to help the uninsured, to help those who are ill, to help put doctors back in charge of people's health care plans. We're deeply concerned about those issues as they go on; and, quite frankly, these costs are going to be ones that people are not going to be able to afford.

I now want to recognize one of my colleagues, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. LANCE), who also wants to speak on this bill. He is another member of our committee who is deeply dedicated to making sure that he is dealing with the affordability of the health care bill.

Mr. LANCE. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I'm very pleased to be able to speak this evening on this important issue.

In my judgment, the Affordable Care Act was a poor piece of legislation and it was not well thought out. In 2009 and 2010, when the leaders of the then-House Democratic majority were rallying support for the President's health care legislation, the American people were told that health insurance premiums for individuals and small businesses would decrease under ObamaCare. That was stated repeatedly. Three years later, we have come to learn that this is just not the case.

Internal documents from the Nation's largest health insurance companies reveal the health care law's policies, mandates, taxes, and fees will cause major premium increases for consumers, the individual, the small group and large group markets; and I

think it might be particularly onerous on young people who are just starting out at a time when the economy is not as strong as any of us would like.

Many small businesses are already feeling the impact of higher monthly premiums. Just this week, I heard from a small business owner in the district I serve, Susan Schwartz of System Builders, in Westfield, Union County, New Jersey. She is seeing her company rates jump by nearly 40 percent in 1 year, Mr. Speaker.

We must work together to provide much-needed relief to the small and large businesses being crushed under this burdensome law.

I thank you, Chairman MURPHY, and certainly I commend you for your efforts and the efforts of the Energy and Commerce Committee, of which I am a proud member under your leadership in that committee as one of the subcommittee chairs, the committee as a whole, under Mr. UPTON's leadership, and really all of us in Congress who believe that this law was poorly designed and will lead to massive increases in premium payments for many of the American people.

Mr. MURPHY of Pennsylvania. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Speaker, may I inquire as to how much time we have remaining?

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MESSER). The gentleman has 4 minutes remaining.

Mr. MURPHY of Pennsylvania. With that, then, Mr. Speaker, I'll wrap up here with a couple of comments.

First of all, I really want to thank the Energy and Commerce Committee staff for bringing out this important study. We only wish this was the kind of information we had a couple of years ago when Members were called upon to blindly support this bill and so many other organizations were called upon to support this bill.

□ 1910

These are going to be high costs, and people are going to have to make decisions now about what kind of health care they are going to have, can they afford it. Well, they'll also see the impact on top of their gasoline prices and utility prices and worries about their jobs. They're going to be making decisions about do I not have health care now and run the risk of having the IRS come after me and charge me \$95. People will be making those kinds of decisions. That's not what we should be doing.

Out of care and concern for every mother and father and grandparent and child in America, to make sure that we work on an affordable health care plan, that makes sure that people who are ill, people who have preexisting conditions are not cut, and to make sure that the high-risk pool has money in it to help those who have high risks for health care, not use money for other purposes, and to make sure that we're working on prevention and caring for the ill. That is what we should be doing

to help make health care affordable, not offering a 96 percent increase for those getting a new plan, up to 73 percent for those keeping their insurance, and up to 413 percent for others.

Look, we understand some people are going to see their health insurance rates go down. Many will see their rates go up. That is part of the frightening thing for America's family.

#### GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. MURPHY of Pennsylvania. 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 topic of my Special Order.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. MURPHY of Pennsylvania. With that, Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleagues for speaking tonight. I thank the Energy and Commerce staff for also being part of this tonight. And I thank the American people for continuing to communicate with us and understand that we want to make health care affordable, but we think the Affordable Care Act is neither.

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

#### INTERNET SALES TAX

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2013, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. MASSIE) for 30 minutes.

#### GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. MASSIE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on the topic of my Special Order.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. MASSIE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to speak in opposition to H.R. 684 and S. 743, the Marketplace Fairness Act, otherwise known as the Internet sales tax. Or as I call it, the interstate commerce sales tax.

I'm concerned that this new tax on American consumers passed the Senate too quickly without enough debate and has the quiet support of several Members here in the House. Unfortunately, many of my colleagues opposed to the bill here in the House have taken a quiet wait-and-see attitude. They don't want to rock the boat, so to speak. Well, it's time to quit being quiet on this issue. The American public deserves a full and open debate on this bill before any legislative action is taken in this body.

This evening, my colleagues and I will begin that debate. I'm confident that when Members and their constituents grasp the full ramifications of this

onerous piece of legislation, they will oppose it as well.

Many States in this country are in dire financial straits. They've lavished overly generous pension plans on their State employees and offered tax credits and financial incentives to their favorite businesses. They've promised more than they can deliver, while sometimes letting essential services go neglected. State governments bear the responsibility for their financial situations; yet they're looking to the Federal Government for a bailout. Make no mistake, this Internet tax is the bailout they're seeking. Without raising taxes, State governments can expect billions of dollars of Americans' hard-earned money to flow to their treasuries if this bill passes. And how would this happen? By passing a bill that proclaims to impose fairness.

Who else is for this bill? Large retailers. They've got lots of representatives up here talking to us. They're on the Internet and they're off the Internet, but they're for this bill. They're weary of competing with small and nimble businesses. And that's natural to want to have economic barriers to entry because it's an economic fact that in the absence of innovation in a market with no barriers to entry, profits go to zero in the long run.

But how do we create barriers to entry in the United States? How do we compete? Through innovation.

America is the country of innovation. You can invent something. You can make a new piece of music. You can be nicer to your employees than the other company is. Or you can come up with a new, more efficient way of manufacturing your products. But I suggest to you, Mr. Speaker, that sending representatives to Washington, D.C. to impose financial hardships on your competitors is not the American way.

Some have said that this bill is about States' rights, and I'm a strong proponent of States' rights; but this bill does nothing to protect States' rights. In fact, this bill changes the very fabric, the constitutional fabric of the United States of America by subjecting people and businesses in one State to the taxes and regulations of another State. This is unprecedented. For the first time in history, this bill would grant States jurisdictions beyond their physical borders. If this bill passes, we'll have a virtual United States of America where borders no longer mean anything.

Justice Marshall ruled that the power to tax is the power to destroy, and we were reminded last week by the IRS's admission that the power to tax is the power to harass.

I urge other Members of Congress to consider the dangerous implications of granting individual States authority over individuals in other States.

Before my colleagues get into the details of this new tax, I'd like to point out that no one, not a single person, has argued that this bill will help our

economy. Even proponents of this bill must concede that it increases taxes on American consumers and adds burdensome regulations to small businesses. That's where this debate will begin and end. This bill is bad for our economy.

I now yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. DeSANTIS. I thank the gentleman from Kentucky, and thank you for your leadership on getting out ahead of this and really leading the charge. You're right, this will not be good for the economy. People will say it's not really a tax increase because some of these taxes are essentially use taxes that are already due. The fact of the matter is this will hurt consumers because they are going to have to pay more, and that is not the recipe for success in a high-unemployment, low-growth economy, which is what we have now and is what we've had for a number of years.

In terms of making consumers pay more in taxes, I for one am sick of politicians in Washington and in State capitals throughout the country putting the interest of government ahead of the interests of the people. Our job is not to extract as much money as possible from our fellow citizens, but it's instead to provide a framework that protects their freedom and liberty and allows them to pursue their dreams. This bill obviously doesn't help do that. In fact, it hinders it. It hinders it by making it more difficult on consumers, but also will make it more difficult on up-and-coming new businesses that do business online. This bill represents taxation without representation, and the reason it does that is because the bill would require online businesses to determine, collect, and remit taxes to States with which they have no physical connection.

So if you have a business in Florida that does online sales and you sell to somebody in California, you're going to be responsible for determining California's sales tax, collecting it, and then sending it to California. The problem is if you have no physical connection to that State, you have no way to hold tax-happy politicians in States like California accountable for the decisions they make in terms of taxing, spending, and regulation.

I would say also, people say that there are local stores who have to pay sales tax. If you sell online to somebody out of State, you're not having to sell the tax. We don't require any stores on a local sale to figure out where the consumer came from and then send the tax over to that State. They simply collect the tax that's due in their State, so the compliance requirements are completely different. Indeed, there are over 9,600 taxing jurisdictions in the United States.

This bill specifically permits audits from the other States that have sales tax and from Indian reservations, and we have several hundred federally recognized Indian tribes, so this creates a huge compliance burden for our small businesses.

I just don't think it is good policy to saddle small businesses in Florida with red tape and additional compliance costs. I mean, why on Earth would any Floridian want an up-and-coming business to face a tax audit from a State like California or Illinois?

□ 1920

And I would say, as the gentleman from Kentucky pointed out, especially in light of what we're seeing with the malfeasance committed by the IRS out of Washington, D.C., you know, the IRS is at least somewhat accountable to the people, at least in theory, because we can always vote out the administration that oversees the IRS.

If you have an out-of-State tax audit, you don't have any political representation, so why would they care about your rights? They're not going to care about your rights. They're going to care about getting your revenue.

I just want to say a thing about fairness. People say, well, you know, you have brick-and-mortar, local stores versus these Internet businesses; but I would suggest that that distinction is illusory, and the reason why is many companies that do business online are brick-and-mortar companies.

I have a business in my district in Ormond Beach, Florida. It's called Coastal Moto, and this is a gentleman that put his entire life savings into this business. They now have grown to have five employees. They make custom wheels for Harley Davidson motorcycles, and they ship them worldwide. But they have employees showing up every day to work there, so they are both brick-and-mortar and online. So it's essentially brick-and-click.

And I would also just endorse what the gentleman from Kentucky said, that the tax would give large companies a competitive advantage, because anytime you saddle businesses with more compliance cost, that will create barriers to entry for smaller companies, and the big businesses are always able to comply more easily.

And look, I want companies of all sizes to do well. You know, big businesses, if they're doing well, God bless them. I just don't want to tilt the playing field in favor of them and make it more difficult for new businesses to start and grow.

The Internet is one of the most pro-growth, pro-opportunity inventions in all of human history. It literally gives anybody the chance to move a product. If you have an idea, you can go online, you can put that out, and you can be successful. It's much easier, with the Internet, to have a successful business than it was 100 years ago. You're able to get into the market more cheaply and more affordably. That's not something that we should try to undermine. That's something that we should want to continue to promote.

And finally, I would just say, is it fair to burden Florida businesses in order to fund excessive spending in States that suffer from severe fiscal

mismanagement? I mean, for example, in California, you have county administrators retiring with a \$400,000 pension for life. And so we're going to put burdens on our companies to be able to send money over there so that they can fund that extravagance? And I would also note that a lot of that money goes to funding union dues that end up helping fund political companies. So why would we want to do that?

So the bottom line is that the bill is bad for consumers; it represents taxation without representation; it will stymie small business growth; and it will create perverse economic incentives. Our political system right now is suffering from an accountability crisis. The last thing we need to do is expand government and add to this problem.

Mr. MASSIE. Thank you to the gentleman from Florida. He makes an excellent point on the sales tax audit burden on small businesses.

I'd like to give you two examples of companies in my district. These are, literally, mom-and-pop shops. One of them, the wife is the CFO and the husband runs the company; and in the other one, the father owns the company and the son works there every day. They were both subjected to sales tax audits in one State.

Let me tell you how the sales tax audit begins and how it ends. So the way it began was with a phone call. And that, for many small businesses, is the worst phone call of their life, of their business life, because they know what they're going to have to endure.

So let me give you the example of this farm store that underwent a sales tax audit. He was required to prove that every sales tax-exempt sale that he made in the previous years was, in fact, exempt from sales tax under Kentucky State law.

The sales tax auditors will pursue you to the end of the Earth if they think there's another dime to be found, so they pursued him with much vigor. He spent weeks looking for records trying to prove that these were, in fact, sales tax-exempt, because if they were not, he owed the sales tax on all of those sales.

How does this kind of audit end?

It ends with a white flag. There's no way to prove, there's no way to find every shred of paper for every transaction that you've ever had in the past years, so you finally settle with the sales tax auditors.

Can you imagine that? You'd be open to sales tax audits, which I've just described, in 45 different States. Now, maybe it only happens once every 10 years in your State; maybe that's the average. But, on average, you'll get 4½ sales tax audits a year, which brings me to the next small business in my district, where the wife is the CFO.

This business was subjected to a sales tax audit and an IRS audit in the same year, in fact, this year. This business owner came to me and said, Can you pass a bill that would keep me from having to go through two audits in the

same year? I mean, it's just not fair. I've got a State tax audit and a Federal audit in the same year. This is killing my business. My wife can't work on anything but these audits.

Can you imagine if that business is now subjected to 45 audits in 45 different States? I just can't let this individual down. And what we're talking about, sales tax audits, it's up to the States to decide what's sales tax exempt and what's not, and every State has a different rule.

And the only way to enforce these rules and to know if you've complied—is it for a farm? is it for education? is it for resale?—is for the retailer to submit all of those sales records, information, if you will, on the individual that purchased them to the State where the individual lives.

This is ripe for corruption, just as we saw with the IRS recently. Now they know what music you've downloaded, what movies you've downloaded. Maybe you bought some gun magazines. They're going to know about all of this, and it's just ripe for corruption and for exploitation.

I'd like to yield to my good friend and colleague from the State of Montana (Mr. DAINES).

Mr. DAINES. Thanks much to my good friend from Kentucky, Mr. THOMAS MASSIE, for coordinating this Special Order here tonight. I appreciate it greatly.

We're here tonight to share our strong opposition to the so-called Marketplace Fairness Act. This is a bill that mandates small businesses to collect sales tax on behalf of other cities and States when selling products over the Internet.

The problem is this bill would fundamentally change how online purchases are taxed and would impose yet another burden on small businesses across the country, but especially like my home State of Montana. You see, in Montana we don't have a statewide sales tax. In fact, we often say you know you're a native Montanan if you voted against a sales tax twice.

But I will have to say that in my home State we have a balanced budget requirement. And not only did our State balance its budget this year, we're running a surplus, and we've done that without a sales tax. And Washington should do the same. They should learn how to balance their budget, and they don't have to impose a sales tax that's imposed on businesses across this country.

But even though we don't have a sales tax, under this legislation, Montana small businesses would be forced to collect sales taxes for up to 9,600 cities and States, none of which would go back to the people of Montana.

Let me be clear. This isn't just a bill that hurts no sales tax States like Montana. It hurts small businesses in every State, burdening businesses that depend on Internet sales with added costs and more paperwork and more regulations.

Proponents of this bill say, well, it's about fairness. They say that this bill will help prevent the supposedly widespread practice of "showrooming," where customers visit a physical store but then buy the goods online where customers can get a better price or avoid paying sales tax. According to proponents of this bill, this showrooming is destroying our brick-and-mortar businesses.

Well, ladies and gentlemen, this is not only misleading; it's wrong. As the National Journal reported, a recent PricewaterhouseCoopers survey of 10,000 shoppers found this so-called widespread problem occurred less than 2 percent of the time. In fact, the survey found that 10 times as many consumers researched products online so they could go buy them at the local brick-and-mortar shop.

Think about that. And we've all had that happen to us. You may go online and shop, but you may not want to pay the shipping costs. You may not want to have the time it takes to receive the goods. You may want to be buying that bike for your child, so you go downtown and buy at the brick-and-mortar store.

Furthermore, the study states, and I quote, "We also can't emphasize enough that the physical store remains the centerpiece of the purchase journey for many categories. In 9 out of 11 categories, in fact, the majority of consumers use physical stores for both researching and purchasing the products they want to buy."

I know that many times I'd rather head downtown to my home of Bozeman, Montana, to talk to folks face-to-face and purchase a product I've researched online so I can avoid shipping fees and avoid the wait time.

□ 1930

I know a lot of Montanans feel the same way. But then I also have to ask, what is fair about forcing a small business that relies on Internet sales to learn the ins and outs of 9,600 different tax jurisdictions or be subjected to tax audits, as the gentleman from Kentucky just mentioned, not just from one State but from all 46 States that collect sales tax?

Imposing these unreasonable standards on online retail sales but not also on brick-and-mortar retail stores is not only unfair, it's unworkable. I've heard from Montana's small businessowners who are deeply concerned about what this bill means for them and how it will affect their ability to remain profitable. I'm concerned too.

I've spent nearly three decades in the private sector. In fact, prior to having served in Congress, the last elective office I held was student body president in high school. So I've come from the business world. I've been a job creator and somebody that's had to fight the regulations and pay taxes. I know that if you're a small business owner and you're forced to comply with more than 9,000 different tax codes, which,

by the way, most small businessowners readily admit it's next to impossible for any small business to do that. You are not going to be investing in your own business. You're not going to be hiring new employees, you're not going to be growing your product base or promoting innovation. You're now going to be spending more time and more capital dealing with regulations and mandates and more time with lawyers and accountants.

We also can't forget the threat that this holds for principles that are the foundation of our Nation's tax policy, and that is that States must not be allowed to extend their taxation and regulatory authorities beyond their borders. The Internet tax would do away with the physical presence standard which dictates that a State can only require a business to collect a sales tax if it's physically present within its boundaries.

Furthermore, the people don't want an online sales tax. A recent survey found that 84 percent of consumers were opposed to this bill and 75 percent of small online retailers are opposed. Those numbers send a clear message that the American people are strongly opposed to this proposal.

So I would ask my colleagues this—remember this is the people's House. We're here to represent our districts and our States and do what is best for them. The problem back in this town, in Washington, D.C., is that the big businesses, the big corporations, have lobbyists here to be the voice here on the Hill. We need to be the voice tonight for the small business people who don't have lobbyists here in Washington, D.C., because they can't afford them. Imposing a new tax burden in these precarious economic times is clearly not what our small businesses and consumers need.

I know one of the fastest ways to slow down growth and innovation is to tax it and to regulate it. This bill is a \$23 billion tax increase coming right out of the pockets of hardworking American families. So let me be clear. The so-called Marketplace Fairness Act is a job-killing tax hike that hurts America's small businesses, and it hurts America's consumers. I promise I will continue to fight this bad piece of legislation.

Mr. MASSIE. Mr. Speaker, I would like to remind my colleagues that Mr. DAINES represents the great State of Montana, which operates with a lean government and has, so far, got by without a sales tax. That's the great thing about these United States of America. We have 50 States competing with different models for how to run their governments. This tax, as I call it, the interstate commerce tax, is more about harmonizing tax laws across the United States and taking away the competition between States.

Now, my fair State of Kentucky has a sales tax of 6 percent. But I don't think it's fair that we impose a sales tax on the State of Montana when

they've worked very hard not to have one. Their businesses aren't subjected ever to a sales tax audit if they don't have to collect a sales tax. So I think he's too modest in not reminding us that he's coming from the State of Montana that has no sales tax.

This Marketplace Fairness Act could be called the "Offshore Online Retailers Act," because, while as Congressmen and Senators we can force the States to collect these taxes, we can't go into other countries and force them to collect taxes. So what will happen is a lot of our online retailers will move across the border where they enjoy the advantage of collecting those sales taxes, and there's no way to reach them and impose that tax upon them.

Now, some say this is not a new tax, don't call it a new tax, while others say that it's not a tax increase, don't call this a tax increase. Well, I say if it quacks like a duck and it walks like a duck, it's a duck. I'm new to Congress, but if at the end of a transaction, I have less money in my wallet and the government has the money in their coffers, I call it a tax.

Now, some will say, look, consumers already owe this tax. At the end of the year on April 15, they are supposed to pay the sales tax that wasn't collected in other States. But do you know what? That's just not true. They don't owe a sales tax because States long ago conceded that they don't have any authority to tax an event which occurs outside of their physical borders. They just can't do it without a physical presence. But States resented that they couldn't tax in other States, so they created something called a use tax. I say the use tax is actually a contrived tax. They know they can't tax an event outside of their borders, so they try to tax an event inside of their borders, which is the use of a product. But it's contrived in the sense that it's only owed if you didn't pay a tax on it somewhere else already.

So what kind of a tax is that? I'll tell you what it is: it's an uncollectible tax. And the States haven't exerted much effort in collecting that tax. We are not here to become tax collectors for the States. I just want to remind the States that.

Also, I want to talk a little bit more about my district. A large portion of my district is rural. We don't have stores to buy everything that we would like to be able to purchase. A lot of folks go online. A lot of folks are disabled and can't get to the store to go online. This is a regressive tax. This will punish those individuals who have the least mobility because they're online shopping. It also diminishes opportunities for businesses in rural areas by taxing those businesses that weren't taxed before that don't have a ready marketplace immediately in their vicinity.

Look, we've heard from Big Business, we've heard from lobbyists, and we've heard from State governments. But there's somebody absent from this de-

bate so far, and it's our constituents. I think we need to hear from them. And with that, and to address that issue, I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. DESANTIS. I thank the gentleman from Kentucky, and I would just add to your comments. You started by talking about federalism, the ability to kind of choose different tax laws, whatever laws, and this would actually facilitate higher taxes. It's a thumb on the scale in favor of higher taxes because it gives States the wherewithal to tax beyond their borders. So we should at least be trying to go in the other direction. I want Florida to be more like Montana, not more like some of the other high-tax States. And so that bears repeating.

Here are some of the folks who have written in via Twitter with their thoughts. Chris writes in:

Please tell the House that #InternetTax translates into higher costs for families and consumers. A weak economy cannot afford this.

Andrew writes in:

This will just be the 21st-century version of Smoot-Hawley. Will the lunacy from D.C. never cease?

Jay writes in and says:

The Internet tax is an inappropriate extension of the State's powers. It does not make commerce more fair.

Another fellow writes in and says:

It's a revenue grab, plain and simple. No taxation without representation. Is that vague?

Tiffany Lyle says:

If you tax the Internet, it's like taxing air. We work hard enough to earn what little we have.

And then Glenn writes in:

Remind them of how the Stamp Act went.

I have some more, but I will yield back to the gentleman from Kentucky because I know you probably have some more comments, as well.

Mr. MASSIE. Well, those comments bring up a very good point, and so do your comments. If this is a finger on the scale for higher taxes, States get to arbitrate and decide what gets taxed in their State. So right now we have exemptions for farm products and whatnot, but some States tax professional services in the transaction. And, of course, this bill opens up financial service transactions in one State to consumers in another State. But where does this end?

Senator BAUCUS stated in the other Chamber that not just the financial world would be open to taxes on their services, but also possibly attorneys, architects, engineers and accountants. One can only imagine, by not asking the States to do anything to simplify their system in return for the benefit of having out-of-state businesses collect taxes for them, we're giving carte blanche to the States to impose even more taxes on business.

Again, I think I'd like to hear a few more comments from our constituents.

Mr. DESANTIS. We do have some more.

Cory writes in:

I feel it may hinder an online business I've just started. It's already making business pay.

Mark says:

#InternetTax won't help local stores, but will protect online incumbents from new competition.

Taylor Neuhaus writes in and says:

I like the #InternetTax about as much as I like getting teeth pulled.

We have another fellow writes in and says:

It hurts small businesses, and it's basically Walmart vs. Amazon with consumers in the middle.

Finally, I think this is a great comment from Ian Stumpf:

An Internet tax will hurt one of the few remaining healthy sectors of the economy #disastrous.

□ 1940

Mr. MASSIE. I thank the gentleman from Florida for sharing that with us. I think all too often we don't listen as much to our constituents as we should; and on this issue, it's very important because those are in fact the people who are going to bear the burden of this new tax. And I will call it a new tax. It's unprecedented in our Constitution and in the history of this country.

I want to end this discussion tonight the way it began and the way I said it would end. No single individual who's a proponent of this tax has told me that it's going to help the economy. In fact, when I point out that it will increase taxes on consumers, when it will increase the burden on small businesses, and when it will apply pressure to offshore or online retailers, they all ultimately concede those points. This is not good for our country.

The resistance to this bill comes from our constituents, and it's also bipartisan as well. So hopefully by bringing light to this today, we will begin the conversation, begin the debate that all too often doesn't happen out in the open and shed some light on this issue.

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

#### THE IRS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2013, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. PERRY) for 30 minutes.

Mr. PERRY. Mr. Speaker, do we live in a banana republic? Are we living under a tin horn dictatorship? I mean, just this evening the IRS Acting Chief Steve Miller resigned. I suppose that's damage control, that's how we're going to fix this—you know, heads are going to roll.

Just recently, Mr. MILLER wrote to Members of Congress at least twice to explain the process of reviewing applications for tax exempt status without disclosing that Tea Party groups had been targeted. So it's nothing new. As a matter of fact, in July of last year he

testified before the House Ways and Means Oversight Subcommittee and didn't mention it, he didn't mention the additional scrutiny. I'm sure it must have slipped his mind. Oh, that's right, it couldn't have slipped his mind because he was asked about it specifically.

Now we're supposed to trust these answers that are forthcoming at this time and are continuing to be revised. But initially—and falsely—they claimed that the practice of flagging conservative groups for additional scrutiny was contained to low-level staffers at a Cincinnati office. First we heard it was a couple hundred, or 75, and then 200, and now it's like 500. I mean, how much do we trust someone that continues to change their story? And if it was low-level folks at the agency, how come the guy at the top just resigned? I mean, I understand that the buck stops there, but does the buck stop there—or should it stop there?

According to the report by the Inspector General, they knew about the problem by June 2011. I mean, they knew about it. They're testifying in front of Members of Congress and misleading Members of Congress. Forget Members of Congress, what about the American people? What about the people in these organizations, God-fearing, tax-paying Americans that were targeted, what about them?

According to the IG report, the IRS was not only targeting Tea Party organizations; it was going after groups focused on government spending, government debt, taxes, and education on ways to make America a better place to live. Really? I mean, maybe I'm being targeted because I'm looking through that list and I think those are things I stand for. I think those are things that most of my constituents stand for.

It also started targeting groups criticizing the government or educating Americans about the Constitution and the Bill of Rights. Since when is it a problem to criticize your government? I mean, isn't that one of the fundamental things that this Nation was founded on? And now we're going to have the IRS come after us. And is it bad that we educate Americans about the Constitution and the Bill of Rights? Is that a bad thing? Apparently—according to the IRS—it is.

The use of the IRS to target political opponents of an administration is one of the greatest dangers of the tremendous power of this Federal agency. I mean, I asked, are we living in a banana republic? Is this a tin horn dictatorship, because certainly this can't happen in America. These are things that happen in these other small rogue nations where there are political dissidents that come to America to escape persecution.

So what's next for us in America? If it starts here, does it end with then us going to jail as political dissenters against some ideals that the administration currently in power has?

I'm going to read an excerpt of the Federal law, 26 U.S. Code 7217. It prohibits any employee of the Executive Office of the President and Vice President, as well as Cabinet Secretaries, from requesting, directly or indirectly, that the IRS investigate any particular taxpayer with respect to the tax liability of such taxpayer.

It is important for the rule of law and the interest of justice that the Congress aggressively pursue its oversight function to get to the bottom of the scandal. We don't want to just get to the bottom of the scandal so we can make sure it never happens again. I mean, that's what we so often hear. We need to find out who instigated it and who authorized it, because it is very hard for us to believe that these were just some low-level employees that, you know, took it upon themselves.

And I must ask everybody, what is their impetus? What is their motivation to do that? What low-level employee would take it upon him or herself to say, well, we're going to start investigating Tea Party groups and groups with the name "patriot" in their organization. What's in it for them? And I suspect you're having a hard time coming up with the answer, just as I am.

How long has this been going on? Well, apparently it started in February of 2010, and it lasted for about 27 months. The last appeal that was approved was in Champaign, Illinois, in February of 2010. So if you think back to February, what was happening in February of 2010? Well, first of all, if you own an iPad right now, you couldn't get one in February of 2010 because there were none available; it wasn't on the market. If you remember back then, there was a volcano over Iceland that was stopping air travel to Europe. There was the Freshwater Horizon that blew up in the gulf, killing many workers and destroying the environment or contaminating the environment in the gulf. That's how long ago this has happened. That's how long this has been going on. And that's how long people in this administration knew about it and said nothing.

You know, I don't know what this means for Tea Party organizations and patriot groups and the like. I mean, if I quote Julian Bond, the former head of the NAACP, he calls the Tea Party the Taliban of American politics. I would suggest to you that they're exactly opposite that, and the actions of the administration are more keeping with Taliban-like tactics. I mean, these folks are continually ridiculed for being, oh, opposed to government intrusion in their lives, and worrying about conspiracies, and what kind of personal things about them the government is looking into and what they're doing with it. And it's all very conspiratorial, and they're seen as kind of kookie whack jobs. Apparently they're right. Who knew?

During this same period of time, interestingly, a director in the IRS fast-

tracked an application for the President's half-brother. That took 1 month. It took 1 month. Meanwhile, 27 months went by where organizations with the name "Tea Party" or "patriot" couldn't receive the same consideration.

Did front-line employees do this? Again, I've got to question that. It just doesn't add up. Again, day by day we hear more and more. I mean, the first thing that came out recently was that rogue employees did this—and at one point only one employee. Really? One employee out of 106,000 that work at the IRS, that's what we're supposed to believe?

Are we supposed to change our trust level and our belief level every day as new reports come out with new information that countervails the information of the day before? I mean, we've got to ask—the government asks its citizens all kinds of information, whether you're a farmer and the Agriculture Department forces you to do a survey, complete a survey under penalty of law.

And folks call up their Congressman. They call me up in the district office and they say: Why must I fill this out? Why do they need all this information? What is this relevant information? That's the Ag Department census. And maybe it's fair; maybe it's not. I take issue with it. But in this case, I really take issue with it because in this application and in their findings, the IRS findings, they looked at what books Members were reading. Are we going to have a book burning next?

□ 1950

They looked at Facebook posts, resumes of officers, minutes of meetings since the organizations' inception. And I ask you, what does any of that have to do with your tax status? Or does it have to do with something else? Does it have to do with your political status and who you may disagree with?

Thirty-one organizations' information was released to organizations like ProPublica—31 organizations. Maybe that's the beginning of that, and maybe we don't know the extent of how many other organizations were leaked this information. What did they do with it? Did they maybe use it to target candidates in political elections to make sure that they lost because they disagreed with their ideology?

We understand that we oftentimes disagree on ideology on policy, but we expect a fair and level playing field, and we certainly expect the government to provide that. That's the government's role. That's one of the government's core missions. In this case, obviously, the government was working for one team and decidedly against the other team. What does that mean to all Americans?

Some applications were under review at the IRS for 3 years, yet you could sue the IRS after 270 days for inaction. For 3 years these things went dormant. So who's responsible?

We have had a host of scandals in this town from time immemorial. This administration is really at some point no different than the next, but on one point I think it has been so far: nobody is ever responsible. People take responsibility, but there's no accountability, and no heads really roll. Nothing happens to anyone.

Finally, there is a firing here and we're not sure this guy had anything to do with it. But I would ask you this:

The President says that he finds out this information that you find out in the public on the same day you find it out. Mr. Speaker, that seems odd to me. He's the President. He's the leader of the country. We know that he can't know every little thing in every agency. He can't know that, and we don't expect him to know that. That is why he hires top people, smart people to run those organizations for him. But he is the leader of the country, and when this is going on for a couple of years and they know about it, shouldn't we be concerned that he doesn't know anything about it? I mean, is that a failure of leadership? I think that's a great question. And I think that it is bad that our President says that he doesn't know, and that he truly doesn't know. I don't see that as a good thing.

Mr. Speaker, the American public increasingly has a trust issue with this administration, which is now in damage control, and we understand that they have to be. But, Mr. Speaker, while they are in damage control, is the people's business, the legitimate people's business being conducted right now? Where is their focus? Where was their focus on these issues when they could have been stopped or averted, and where is it now and what is the cost of that?

And I would also say to you this: as a person who has lead organizations myself, at the top is where the culture starts. The person at the top, he or she determines the culture of that whole organization. The people within that organization survive or do not survive by going along and learning to fit in with that culture. If everything below that starts eroding, you can only, at some point, look towards the top.

I would submit to you under the current scenario of the last week's events that we might really be seeing the advent of the evidence of a culture of corruption that has been going on for more than just a few days. Let's just go through a couple of them. I know you know it is coming.

It started with Fast and Furious, and I can tell you that I don't feel like I've gotten the answers. I don't think the American people have gotten the answers that they have been looking for. I certainly don't think that justice has been served for those folks and, in particular, the one agent on the border who lost his life over that.

And, of course, there's Benghazi, which information continues to come out even as we speak, including emails today that show that the State Depart-

ment and the White House changed the intelligence talking points. Changed them why? Why change them? Why not tell the American people what happened, especially when apparently you know what happened? Is it because it shouldn't have happened and it didn't have to happen, but there was inaction when something could have changed? We heard that, well, we couldn't get folks there in time. We can do a lot of things in this town, but one thing I haven't seen anybody be able to do is to predict the future.

I don't know who in the White House or who in the Department of State predicted that the attack would only last so long. Years ago, when I was a little kid, I watched hostages in Iran being taken, and that lasted for well over a year, 470-some days or something like that.

How did we know, how did the Department of State, how did the White House know that this wasn't going to be the same scenario and these folks weren't going to be held captive for years and years and the United States held hostage? They just assumed whatever they assumed, I guess.

It is just interesting. We don't know the President's whereabouts during that period of time. I don't know if we will ever know. But it is interesting that there is no culpability, there is no accountability. Folks at the State Department, we were told, well, there were some low-level folks that were responsible for the security misfortune and missteps at the consulate and they have been reassigned. Four people are dead. Families don't know why their children died—their brothers, their sisters, their husbands, their fathers—they don't know to what end, and they still don't know. If we left it up to this administration, who keeps on stonewalling and just metering out the information only as fast as we can pull it out of them, they may never know.

Is it embarrassing? Americans are forgiving. If a mistake was made in good faith, a mistake was made. We are all human. But was a mistake made in good faith or was a mistake made—scratch that. Was it a precalculated decision for political purposes? And, if it was, that is, indeed, reprehensible. I'm sure that is, indeed, embarrassing and there will be a cost to that. So maybe that is the motivation we don't know.

And then there is the Justice Department wiretaps at the AP. The Attorney General recused himself. He recused himself. He recused himself of what? I'm not sure the timeline there. Does that mean he knew that the Justice Department was going to tap the AP, one of the largest wire services in the world? Did he know and say, well, there is an investigation going on so I'm going to stay out of it and he left it to his deputy?

We don't know what to trust, but I can tell you this. According to the Department of Justice, their media subpoena requirement is:

The approval of the Attorney General is required before a government attorney can

issue a subpoena to a member of the news media.

That is not my words. That comes right from 28 CFR 50.10.

Fifty-two major media organizations have spoken out against this. This is not a liberal/conservative thing. This is a freedom of the press. This is an issue that crosses all lines.

The press Shield Act has been introduced in the Senate. It was introduced a couple of years ago when Democrats held the House, the Senate, and the Presidency. Now it is being reintroduced and retouted. Oh, really? If it was so important—if it is so important now, why didn't you pass it then? Why did you wait until now to reintroduce it and make a big deal of it?

I would suggest to you that that is more damage control. It is more political gamesmanship and trying to just smooth over a bad situation.

The Justice Department wiretaps at the AP led right to this House gallery. And I wonder about jurisdictional issues. Doesn't the Executive Office have a separation of powers duty? Can the Executive Office wiretap the House of Representatives?

And what about the Senate? Isn't it curious that the House of Representatives is controlled by the majority party, which is Republicans, so the wiretaps come here, but they don't go to the Senate, where arguably most of the reporters hang out because that is where things are really happening most of the day, but no wiretaps there? I guess it is just a coincidence, Mr. Speaker.

Let's move on. Health and Human Services Secretary Sebelius out soliciting funds to pay for ObamaCare. Is that appropriate or is that not a little scandalous? Is she shaking them down? Are we just now waiting for the next shoe to drop on that and to get some information about that?

There's another one waiting in the wings as we speak, the EPA. Fees for FOIA requests. Freedom of Information Act requests are normally waived for philanthropic and public policy-oriented organizations. And, of course, they were waived for 92 percent of green groups friendly with the EPA. Interestingly, during the same period of time, the fees were universally applied to conservative groups.

□ 2000

Mr. Speaker, we have a trust issue. We've had a trust issue in the House of Representatives with the administration for some time, and the American people are starting to realize that they, too, have a trust issue. It is unfortunate. It is unfortunate because, at a time when Congress is, generally speaking, still pretty close to an all-time low in approval rating, what we need is uplifting things from the most transparent organization in history to make sure that the American people know that they can trust their government even though they don't always agree. Sometimes they disagree with

policy, but if it's out front—if you give somebody your rationale, if you tell him this is why I think we should do what we should do—a citizen says, I don't agree, but you're our leader, so go ahead.

We don't lie to the American people. We don't hide things from the American people. We don't watch Americans die and do nothing about it and then lie about it after the fact. We don't mislead Congress.

Mr. Speaker, it's the most critical time during these times for the administration to fully come clean on everything. Be up front on everything. Don't parse the information, because all that will serve to do is to erode the trust of the American people further day by day, not only in the administration, but in the halls of all of government institutions from the top to the bottom.

We as Americans are right to be cynical of our government. We are right to, and we have a right to be cynical. It's not a bad thing. We have the right to question, and we should question—that's how answers come—but we shouldn't have to question the trust. Questioning motives, questioning policies, those are apt things, but not wondering why the government is collecting information to give to the IRS.

Why would you give it to the IRS? Why did the IRS need that information? Was it to get more taxes? Why do they need to know what books you're reading? The IRS can put people in jail, folks. Are we looking towards a time when we put people in jail for reading the wrong books? for thinking the wrong things? for opposing the ruling powers? That is something for another world. That is something from another world, another country.

This is America. These things do not happen here. These things should not happen here. Yet these things, apparently and sadly, have happened here.

It is time for the administration to lay everything on the table so that we know where we stand, so that we can get past this and get back to the business of governance. We have slow economic growth. People are struggling. People have lost their jobs. People will continue to lose their jobs. Bills are going up, and paychecks are going down. That's what we need to be focusing on.

We are held hostage by foreign governments who own our debt. We are held hostage by foreign governments who hold energy supplies while we're standing right on top of them in America. Those are the policies we need to be discussing, not whether our government misled us about Benghazi; whether they misled us about wiretaps; whether they misled us about Fast and Furious; whether they misled us about Health and Human Services and what they're doing with shaking down companies for money for ObamaCare; whether they're going to mislead us about the EPA and fees charged to certain organizations only; and certainly, the IRS' targeting of certain individ-

uals for what they think and what they say.

There is no place for that in America. We need to get back to the people's business, and we need to do it right fast.

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

#### LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

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

#### 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 was thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H.R. 360. An act to award posthumously a Congressional Gold Medal to Addie Mae Collins, Denise McNair, Carole Robertson, and Cynthia Wesley to commemorate the lives they lost 50 years ago in the bombing of the Sixteenth Street Baptist Church, where there 4 little Black girls' ultimate sacrifice served as a catalyst for the Civil Rights Movement.

#### BILL PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Karen L. Haas, Clerk of the House, reported that on May 15, 2013, she presented to the President of the United States, for his approval, the following bill:

H.R. 360. To award posthumously a Congressional Gold Medal to Addie Mae Collins, Denise McNair, Carole Robertson, and Cynthia Wesley to commemorate the lives they lost 50 years ago in the bombing of the Sixteenth Street Baptist Church, where these 4 little Black girls' ultimate sacrifice served as a catalyst for the Civil Rights Movement.

#### ADJOURNMENT

Mr. PERRY. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 8 o'clock and 4 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, May 16, 2013, at 10 a.m. for morning-hour debate.

#### OATH OF OFFICE MEMBERS, RESIDENT COMMISSIONER, AND DELEGATES

The oath of office required by the sixth article of the Constitution of the United States, and as provided by section 2 of the act of May 13, 1884 (23 Stat. 22), to be administered to Members, Resident Commissioner, and Delegates of the House of Representatives, the text of which is carried in 5 U.S.C. 3331:

“I, AB, do solemnly swear (or affirm) that I will support and defend the Constitution of the United

States against all enemies, foreign and domestic; that I will bear true faith and allegiance to the same; that I take this obligation freely, without any mental reservation or purpose of evasion; and that I will well and faithfully discharge the duties of the office on which I am about to enter. So help me God.”

has been subscribed to in person and filed in duplicate with the Clerk of the House of Representatives by the following Member of the 113th Congress, pursuant to the provisions of 2 U.S.C. 25:

MARK SANFORD, First District of South Carolina.

#### EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1487. A letter from the Under Secretary, Department of Defense, transmitting the Department's report on National Guard Counterdrug Schools Activities, pursuant to Public Law 109-469, section 901(f); to the Committee on Armed Services.

1488. A letter from the Assistant General Counsel, Division of Regulatory Services, Department of Education, transmitting the Department's final rule — Program Integrity Issues [Docket ID: ED-2010-OPE-0004] (RIN: 1840-AD02) received April 29, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

1489. A letter from the Deputy Assistant Secretary for Higher Education Programs, Department of Education, transmitting the Department's final rule — Final Priorities; Gaining Early Awareness and Readiness for Undergraduate Programs (GEAR UP) College Savings Account Research Demonstration Project [CFDA Number: 84.334D.] received April 29, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

1490. A letter from the Assistant Legal Adviser for Treaty Affairs, Department of State, transmitting report prepared by the Department of State concerning international agreements other than treaties entered into by the United States to be transmitted to the Congress within the sixty-day period specified in the Case-Zablock Act; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1491. A letter from the Chief Justice, Supreme Court of the United States, transmitting amendments to the Federal Rules of Criminal Procedure that have been adopted by the Supreme Court, pursuant to 28 U.S.C. 2072; (H. Doc. No. 113—25); to the Committee on the Judiciary and ordered to be printed.

1492. A letter from the Chief Justice, Supreme Court of the United States, transmitting amendments to the Federal Rules of Evidence that have been adopted by the Supreme Court, pursuant to 28 U.S.C. 2072; (H. Doc. No. 113—26); to the Committee on the Judiciary and ordered to be printed.

1493. A letter from the Chief Justice, Supreme Court of the United States, transmitting amendments to the Federal Rules of Appellate Procedure that have been adopted by the Supreme Court, pursuant to 28 U.S.C. 2072; (H. Doc. No. 113—27); to the Committee on the Judiciary and ordered to be printed.

1494. A letter from the Chief Justice, Supreme Court of the United States, transmitting amendment to the Federal Rules of Bankruptcy Procedure that have been adopted by the Supreme Court, pursuant to 28

U.S.C. 2075; (H. Doc. No. 113—28); to the Committee on the Judiciary and ordered to be printed.

1495. A letter from the Chief Justice, Supreme Court of the United States, transmitting amendments to the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure that have been adopted by the Supreme Court, pursuant to 28 U.S.C. 2072; (H. Doc. No. 113—29); to the Committee on the Judiciary and ordered to be printed.

1496. A letter from the Deputy Assistant Administrator, Department of Justice, transmitting the Department's final rule — Schedules of Controlled Substances: Placement of Lorcaferin Into Schedule IV [Docket No.: DEA-369] received May 8, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1497. A letter from the Chair and CEO, Farm Credit Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule—Rules of Practice and Procedure; Adjusting Civil Money Penalties for Inflation (RIN: 3052-AC87) received May 6, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1498. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Special Local Regulation; Hebda Cup Rowing Regatta, Trenton Channel; Detroit River, Wyandotte, MI [Docket Number: USCG-2013-0211] (RIN: 1625-AA08) received May 1, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1499. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Standard Instrument Approach Procedures, and Takeoff Minimums and Obstacle Departure Procedures; Miscellaneous Amendments [Docket No.: 30896; Amdt. No. 3531] received May 6, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1500. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Standard Instrument Approach Procedures, and Takeoff Minimums and Obstacle Departure Procedures; Miscellaneous Amendments [Docket No.: 30897; Amdt. No. 3532] received May 6, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1501. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — amendment of Restricted Areas R-670A, B, C, D; and Establishment of Restricted Areas R-6703E, F, G, H, I, and J; WA [Docket No.: FAA-2012-0371; Airspace Docket No. 12-ANM-14] (RIN: 2120-AA66) received May 6, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1502. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Modification of VOR Federal Airway V-595, OR [Docket No.: FAA-2012-1004; Airspace Docket No. 12-ANM-21] (RIN: 2120-AA66) received May 6, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1503. A letter from the Director of Regulation Policy and Management, Office of the General Counsel, Department of Veterans Affairs, transmitting the Department's final rule — Payment for Home Health Services and Hospice Care to Non-VA Providers (RIN: 2900-AN98) received May 6, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

1504. A letter from the Acting United States Trade Representative, United States Trade Representative, transmitting the in-

attention to include Japan in the ongoing negotiations of the Trans-Pacific Partnership; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

#### REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. HENSARLING: Committee on Financial Services. H.R. 701. A bill to amend a provision of the Securities Act of 1933 directing the Securities and Exchange Commission to add a particular class of securities to those exempted under such Act to provide a deadline for such action (Rept. 113—58). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. BURGESS: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 215. Resolution providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 45) to repeal the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act and health care-related provisions in the Health Care and Education Reconciliation Act of 2010 (Rept. 113—59). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. SESSIONS: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 216. Resolution providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 1062) to improve the consideration by the Securities and Exchange Commission of the costs and benefits of its regulations and orders (Rept. 113—60). 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. GEORGE MILLER of California (for himself, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. HOLT, Mr. GRIJALVA, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Ms. CASTOR of Florida, Mr. YARMUTH, Mr. POLIS, Ms. KAPTUR, Ms. TSONGAS, Ms. LEE of California, Mr. LEWIS, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York, and Ms. WILSON of Florida):

H.R. 1981. A bill to require certain standards and enforcement provisions to prevent child abuse and neglect in residential programs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. REICHERT (for himself and Mr. THOMPSON of California):

H.R. 1982. A bill to amend section 1862 of the Social Security Act with respect to the application of Medicare secondary payer rules to workers' compensation settlement agreements and Medicare set-asides under such agreements; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. ROYCE (for himself and Ms. BASS):

H.R. 1983. A bill to amend the Food for Peace Act to reform the food assistance programs under that Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and in addition to the Committees on Agriculture, Transportation and Infrastructure, and 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. LANCE (for himself and Mrs. CHRISTENSEN):

H.R. 1984. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to raise awareness of, and to educate breast cancer patients anticipating surgery, especially patients who are members of racial and ethnic minority groups, regarding the availability and coverage of breast reconstruction, prostheses, and other options; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. LANCE (for himself, Mr. DENT, Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina, Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN, Mr. GRIMM, Mr. HANNA, Mr. HARRIS, Mr. JONES, Mr. RUNYAN, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. WELCH, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, and Mr. KING of New York):

H.R. 1985. A bill to amend the National Oilheat Research Alliance Act of 2000 to reauthorize and improve that Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. LIPINSKI (for himself, Mr. FORTENBERRY, Mrs. HARTZLER, and Ms. SPEIER):

H.R. 1986. A bill to provide for the assignment of Sexual Assault Nurse Examiners-Adult/Adolescent to brigades and equivalent units of the Armed Forces; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Ms. SINEMA:

H.R. 1987. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to increase the amount of benefits payable for the burial and funeral expenses of certain veterans; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. ALEXANDER (for himself and Mr. CONNOLLY):

H.R. 1988. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to provide authority for certain members of the Armed Forces to transfer entitlement to Post-9/11 Educational Assistance to their dependents; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. ALEXANDER:

H.R. 1989. A bill to require the Forest Service to accommodate, to the extent consistent with the management objectives and limitations applicable to the National Forest System lands at issue, individuals with mobility disabilities who need to use a power-driven mobility device for reasonable access to such lands; to the Committee on Agriculture, and in addition to the Committee on Natural Resources, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. PRICE of Georgia:

H.R. 1990. A bill to prohibit the Secretary of the Treasury from enforcing the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act and the Health Care and Education Reconciliation Act of 2010; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ANDREWS:

H.R. 1991. A bill to require the Secretary of Education to verify that individuals have made a commitment to serve in the Armed Forces or in public service, or otherwise as a borrower on an eligible loan which has been submitted to a guaranty agency for default aversion or is already in default, before such individuals obtain a consolidation loan for purposes specified under section 455(o) of the Higher Education Act of 1965; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. COLLINS of Georgia (for himself, Mr. SCHNEIDER, Mr. ROYCE, and Ms. GABBARD):

H.R. 1992. A bill to amend the requirements relating to assessment of Israel's qualitative military edge over military threats, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. FORBES:

H.R. 1993. A bill to prohibit the Internal Revenue Service from hiring new employees

to enforce the Federal Government's invasion into the health care lives of American citizens; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HARPER:

H.R. 1994. A bill to terminate the Election Assistance Commission; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. KIND (for himself, Mr. PETRI, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Ms. DELAURO, Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. SENSENBRENNER, Mr. MCGOVERN, and Mr. COOPER):

H.R. 1995. A bill to reform the Federal Crop Insurance Act and reduce Federal spending on crop insurance; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. KING of New York (for himself, Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York, Mr. RUNYAN, Mr. PETRI, Mr. YOUNG of Florida, and Mr. DEFazio):

H.R. 1996. A bill to provide for free mailing privileges for personal correspondence and parcels sent to members of the Armed Forces serving on active duty in Iraq or Afghanistan; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. MCKEON (for himself and Mr. PETERS of California):

H.R. 1997. A bill to allow investor participation in the loan rehabilitation program authorized under section 203(k) of the National Housing Act; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. MCKEON (for himself and Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California):

H.R. 1998. A bill to amend the Lacey Act Amendments of 1981 to clarify provisions enacted by the Captive Wildlife Safety Act, to further the conservation of certain wildlife species, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. MURPHY of Florida (for himself, Mr. JOYCE, Mr. PETERS of California, Mr. RICE of South Carolina, and Ms. SINEMA):

H.R. 1999. A bill to reduce waste and implement cost savings and revenue enhancement for the Federal Government; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, and in addition to the Committees on Appropriations, Agriculture, Energy and Commerce, and Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. PIERLUISI (for himself, Mr. HOYER, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. KING of New York, Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. WAXMAN, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. FALCOMA, Ms. NORTON, Ms. BROWN of Florida, Mr. MICA, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Mr. FATTAH, Mr. KIND, Mr. CROWLEY, Mr. DIAZ-BALART, Mr. GRIJALVA, Ms. BORDALLO, Mr. ELLISON, Ms. CASTOR of Florida, Ms. FUDGE, Mr. SCHOCK, Mr. SABLAN, Mr. DEUTCH, Mr. POLIS, Mr. GRAYSON, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Mr. GARCIA, and Ms. SHEA-PORTER):

H.R. 2000. A bill to set forth the process for Puerto Rico to be admitted as a State of the Union; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. RANGEL (for himself, Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania, Mr. MCGOVERN, Ms. LEE of California, Mr. RAHALL, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. MCCAUL, Mr. WESTMORELAND, Mr. PERRY, Mr. JONES, Mrs. CAPPS, Ms. CHU, Ms. NORTON, Mr. MEEKS, Mr. WALZ, Mr. COOPER, Mr. NUNNELEE, Mr. BROUN of Georgia, Mr. CLEAVER, Mr. GARY G. MILLER of California, Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania, Mr. POCAN, and Mr. ROE of Tennessee):

H.R. 2001. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to improve the ability of health care professionals to treat veterans via telemedicine; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. RYAN of Ohio (for himself, Ms. GRANGER, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Ms. KUSTER, Mrs. LOWEY, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. COLE, and Mr. CRENSHAW):

H.R. 2002. A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to enhance assistance for victims of sexual assault committed by members of the Armed Forces, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. RYAN of Ohio (for himself and Mrs. LOWEY):

H.R. 2003. A bill to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act to require the label of drugs intended for human use to contain a parenthetical statement identifying the source of any ingredient constituting or derived from a grain or starch-containing ingredient; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. SIMPSON (for himself and Mr. DEFazio):

H.R. 2004. A bill to expand geothermal production, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. TIERNEY (for himself, Mr. CAPUANO, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. FARR, Ms. HAHN, Mr. KEATING, Ms. LOFGREN, Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. MORAN, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Ms. SPEIER, and Ms. TSONGAS):

H.R. 2005. A bill to provide for the development and use of technology for personalized handguns, to require that, within 3 years, all handguns manufactured or sold in, or imported into, the United States incorporate such technology, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary, and in addition to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. WALBERG (for himself and Mr. KILDEE):

H.R. 2006. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to expand access to Coverdell education savings accounts; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WELCH:

H.R. 2007. A bill to eliminate the limitation on the period for which borrowers are eligible for guaranteed assistance under the Consolidated Farm and Rural Development Act; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. WELCH:

H.R. 2008. A bill to prohibit United States assistance for Afghanistan unless the United States and Afghanistan enter into a bilateral agreement which provides that work performed in Afghanistan by United States contractors is exempt from taxation by the Government of Afghanistan; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. WEBER of Texas (for himself, Mr. SMITH of Texas, Mr. HALL, Mr. NEUGEBAUER, Mr. SENSENBRENNER, Mr. STOCKMAN, Mr. CRAMER, Mr. SCHWEIKERT, and Mr. STEWART):

H. Res. 214. A resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives that extensive scientific and technical studies and analyses by the Department of State and other Federal agencies have affirmed that the proposed Keystone XL pipeline is an environmentally sound project; to the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology.

By Mr. BENTIVOLIO:

H. Res. 217. A resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives that the Federal, State, and local police officers who have fallen while fulfilling their duty both in Michigan and the United States

should be honored for their sacrifice and commitment to preserving law and order; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

## MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XII,

25. The SPEAKER presented a memorial of the Senate of the State of Georgia, relative to Senate Resolution No. 423 urging the Congress and the President to resolve the national debt crisis; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

## 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. GEORGE MILLER of California:

H.R. 1981.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1, 3 and 18 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. REICHERT:

H.R. 1982.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

"The constitutional authority of Congress to enact this legislation is provided by Article 1, section 8 of the United States Constitution, specifically clause 1 (relating to providing for the general welfare of the United States) and clause 18 (relating to the power to make all laws necessary and proper for carrying out the powers vested in Congress), and Article IV, section 3, clause 2 (relating to the power of Congress to dispose of and make all needful rules and regulations respecting the territory or other property belonging to the United States)."

By Mr. ROYCE:

H.R. 1983.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, section 8 of the Constitution of the United States

By Mr. LANCE:

H.R. 1984.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I of the Constitution of the United States.

By Mr. LANCE:

H.R. 1985.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Congress has the power "to regulate commerce with foreign nations, and among the several states."

By Mr. LIPINSKI:

H.R. 1986.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution.

By Ms. SINEMA:

H.R. 1987.

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 lay and collect duties, imposts and excises, to pay the debts and provide for the general welfare of the United States; as enumerated in Article I, Section 8.

By Mr. ALEXANDER:

H.R. 1988.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clause 1 of section 8 of article I of the Constitution granting that “[t]he Congress shall have power to . . . provide for the common defence and general welfare of the United States;” as well as clause 18 of section 8 of article I of the Constitution provides that “[t]he Congress shall have power . . . To make all laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.

By Mr. ALEXANDER:

H.R. 1989.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 18, which states Congress may “. . . make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers . . .”

By Mr. PRICE of Georgia:

H.R. 1990.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Consistent with the original understanding of the commerce clause, the authority to enact this legislation is found in Clause 3 of Section 8, Article I of the Constitution. The bill stops the IRS implementation of the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act, which exceeds the authority vested in Congress by the Constitution. Finally, the bill removes government intrusion into the doctor-patient relationship, which is protected by the Ninth and Tenth Amendments to the Constitution.

By Mr. ANDREWS:

H.R. 1991.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Congress’ Spending Power as contained in Article I, Section 8, Clause 1 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. COLLINS of Georgia:

H.R. 1992.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Congress has authority under Article I, Section 8, cl. 3, the Interstate Commerce Clause, to regulate interstate and foreign commerce.

Congress has authority under Article I, Section 8, cl. 18, the Necessary and Proper Clause, to effectuate its powers enumerated elsewhere.

By Mr. FORBES:

H.R. 1993.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clauses 1 and 18

By Mr. HARPER:

H.R. 1994.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 4 of the U.S. Constitution granting Congress the authority to make laws governing the time, place, and manner of holding Federal elections.

By Mr. KIND:

H.R. 1995.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3: To regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes.

By Mr. KING of New York:

H.R. 1996.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 6

The Congress shall have Power . . . To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by

this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.

By Mr. MCKEON:

H.R. 1997.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 of the Constitution—the Commerce Clause—and Article I, Section 8, Clause 18 of the Constitution—the Necessary and Proper Clause.

By Mr. MCKEON:

H.R. 1998.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

(Article I, Section 8, Clause 3). The commerce clause states that the United States Congress shall have power “To regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes.” Courts and commentators

By Mr. MURPHY of Florida:

H.R. 1999.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1 Section 8 Clause 18 of the United States Constitution:

The Congress shall have Power—To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.

By Mr. PIERLUISI:

H.R. 2000.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The constitutional authority on which this bill rests is the power of the Congress to admit new States into the Union and to make all needful rules and regulations respecting the territories of the United States, as enumerated in Section 3 of Article IV of the Constitution.

By Mr. RANGEL:

H.R. 2001.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Congress is given the power under the Constitution “To raise and support Armies,” “To provide and maintain a Navy,” and “To make Rules for the Government and Regulation of the land and naval Forces.” Art. I, §8, cls. 12–14. See also: ROSTKER V. GOLDBERG, 453 U.S. 57 (1981)

By Mr. RYAN of Ohio:

H.R. 2002.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Section 8, Clauses 14 and 18:

To make Rules for the Government and Regulation of the land and naval Forces; and

To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States or in any Department or Officer thereof

By Mr. RYAN of Ohio:

H.R. 2003.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.

By Mr. SIMPSON:

H.R. 2004.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clause 2 of section 3 of article IV of the Constitution (“The Congress shall have the Power of Congress to dispose of and make all needful Rules and Regulations respecting the Territory or other Property belonging to the United States . . .”).

By Mr. TIERNEY:

H.R. 2005.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8.

By Mr. WALEBERG: 1

H.R. 2006.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8.

Clause 1: The Congress shall have Power To lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts and Excises, to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defence and general Welfare of the United States; but all Duties, Imposts and Excises shall be uniform throughout the United States;

Clause 18: To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in Any Department of Officer thereof.

By Mr. WELCH:

H.R. 2007.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 18: The Congress shall have Power To . . . make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.

By Mr. WELCH:

H.R. 2008.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 18: The Congress shall have Power To . . . make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.

#### ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 3: Mr. ROTHFUS, Mr. DENHAM, and Mr. KINGSTON.

H.R. 7: Mr. WEBSTER of Florida, Mr. MCCAUL, Mr. MULLIN, Mr. NUNNELEE, Mr. TIBERI, Mr. BISHOP of Utah, Mr. GRIFFIN of Arkansas, Mr. WEBER of Texas, Mr. PALAZZO, Mr. LATTA, and Mr. KING of New York.

H.R. 22: Mr. OLSON.

H.R. 23: Mr. KINGSTON.

H.R. 45: Mr. STUZMAN, Mr. LUCAS, and Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia.

H.R. 104: Mr. NUGENT.

H.R. 164: Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. HOLDING, Ms. PINGREE of Maine, Mr. JORDAN, and Mr. PETERS of California.

H.R. 184: Mr. GRAVES of Missouri, Mr. LOBIONDO, Mr. TURNER, and Mr. BROUN of Georgia.

H.R. 207: Mrs. NOEM.

H.R. 241: Mr. COLE.

H.R. 262: Mr. MCDERMOTT.

H.R. 303: Mr. MCCAUL.

H.R. 335: Mr. LARSON of Connecticut.

H.R. 346: Mr. HARRIS, Mr. BISHOP of Utah, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. GRIFFIN of Arkansas, Mr. ROKITA, and Mr. MESSER.

H.R. 357: Mr. MESSER.

H.R. 367: Mr. DAINES.

H.R. 384: Mr. CARSON of Indiana and Mr. GRJALVA.

H.R. 386: Mr. CARSON of Indiana.

H.R. 398: Mr. MAFFEI.

H.R. 451: Mr. WEBSTER of Florida, Mr. NUGENT, Mr. GRAYSON, Mr. MICA, and Mr. HASTINGS of Florida.

- H.R. 521: Mr. HUFFMAN.  
H.R. 556: Mr. KLINE and Mr. ROTHFUS.  
H.R. 578: Mr. PEARCE.  
H.R. 627: Mr. SHERMAN.  
H.R. 637: Mr. STOCKMAN and Mr. PEARCE.  
H.R. 664: Ms. SPEIER, Mrs. KIRKPATRICK, and Mr. RICHMOND.  
H.R. 688: Mr. ISRAEL, Mrs. BEATTY, Mr. CULBERSON, Ms. BROWNLEY of California, and Mrs. BUSTOS.  
H.R. 690: Ms. DELBENE.  
H.R. 721: Mr. COLE, MCINTYRE, Mr. TERRY, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, and Mr. SMITH of New Jersey.  
H.R. 736: Mr. PALLONE.  
H.R. 752: Mr. LARSEN of Washington.  
H.R. 755: Ms. LEE of California.  
H.R. 761: Mr. RADEL.  
H.R. 763: Mr. KING of New York, Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania, Mr. WEBSTER of Florida, Mr. LABRADOR, Mr. SHUSTER, Mr. RICE of South Carolina, and Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky.  
H.R. 769: Mr. SARBANES.  
H.R. 781: Mr. GERLACH.  
H.R. 792: Mr. CARTER and Mr. MULLIN.  
H.R. 793: Ms. CLARKE.  
H.R. 794: Ms. SCHWARTZ.  
H.R. 828: Mr. STUTZMAN, Mr. HUIZENGA of Michigan, Mr. BROWN of Georgia, and Mr. STOCKMAN.  
H.R. 850: Mr. LANKFORD.  
H.R. 874: Mr. LOWENTHAL and Mr. HASTINGS of Florida.  
H.R. 901: Mr. ROSKAM, Mr. SCHRADER, Mr. KIND, and Mr. RUSH.  
H.R. 903: Mr. AMODEI and Mr. CARTER.  
H.R. 911: Mr. MICHAUD, Mr. JONES, and Mr. DOGGETT.  
H.R. 929: Mr. GARAMENDI.  
H.R. 940: Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania and Mr. LATHAM.  
H.R. 957: Mr. VALADAO.  
H.R. 961: Mr. COURTNEY and Ms. ESHOO.  
H.R. 963: Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. SIRES, and Mr. SMITH of New Jersey.  
H.R. 1005: Mr. PITTENGER, Mr. BAR, Mr. FLEMING, Mr. CULBERSON, Mr. BRIDENSTINE, Mr. BARTON, Mr. MULVANEY, Mr. MASSIE, Mr. HUIZENGA of Michigan, Mrs. BACHMANN, Mr. HARRIS, Mr. STOCKMAN, and Mr. YODER.  
H.R. 1008: Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, Mr. COURTNEY, Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. CLAY, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, and Mr. POLIS.  
H.R. 1009: Mr. TONKO and Mr. KIND.  
H.R. 1020: Mr. ROSKAM and Ms. HERRERA BEUTLER.  
H.R. 1038: Mrs. ELLMERS and Ms. CHU.  
H.R. 1076: Mr. OLSON.  
H.R. 1130: Mr. LEVIN.  
H.R. 1149: Mr. ALEXANDER.  
H.R. 1151: Mr. YODER and Mr. GINGREY of Georgia.  
H.R. 1154: Mr. PETERS of California.  
H.R. 1155: Mr. COURTNEY.  
H.R. 1179: Mr. PETERSON and Mr. MICHAUD.  
H.R. 1182: Mr. KLINE.  
H.R. 1186: Mr. VARGAS and Mr. KENNEDY.  
H.R. 1243: Mr. CROWLEY.  
H.R. 1250: Mr. WELCH, Ms. BROWNLEY of California and Mr. LABRADOR.  
H.R. 1276: Mr. ADERHOLT, Mr. SCHRADER, Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky, Mr. SCOTT PAYNE, Mr. SIRES, Mr. PASCRELL, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mr. MEADOWS, Mr. BARLETTA, Ms. ESTY, Mr. FORBES, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. RAHALL, and Mr. PRICE of North Carolina.  
H.R. 1304: Mr. CAMP.  
H.R. 1318: Mr. SCHIFF.  
H.R. 1321: Ms. BROWNLEY of California.  
H.R. 1340: Mr. DOGGETT.  
H.R. 1355: Mr. LABRADOR.  
H.R. 1362: Mr. PASCRELL.  
H.R. 1385: Mr. LEWIS and Ms. DEGETTE.  
H.R. 1402: Mr. LANGEVIN.  
H.R. 1403: Ms. LEE of California, Ms. NOR-  
TON, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Ms. FUDGE, Ms. BROWN of Florida, Ms. WILSON of Florida, and Mr. RANGEL.  
H.R. 1412: Mr. TAKANO.  
H.R. 1431: Mr. MORAN, Mr. PIERLUISI, Mr. CICILLINE, Ms. LEE of California, and Ms. WILSON of Florida.  
H.R. 1438: Mr. BISHOP of New York.  
H.R. 1464: Mr. PETERS of California.  
H.R. 1498: Mr. MEEKS.  
H.R. 1502: Mr. ROTHFUS.  
H.R. 1518: Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Mr. CONNOLLY, Ms. KUSTER, Mr. PETERS of Michigan, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. TIPTON, Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, Mr. WALBERG, and Mrs. DAVIS of California.  
H.R. 1527: Mr. MCNERNEY, Mr. SWALWELL of California, and Mr. HINOJOSA.  
H.R. 1566: Mr. RADEL and Mr. RENACCI.  
H.R. 1595: Mr. HUFFMAN.  
H.R. 1613: Mr. MULLIN.  
H.R. 1620: Mr. BISHOP of New York and Mr. LATHAM.  
H.R. 1623: Ms. LEE of California, and Mr. JOYCE.  
H.R. 1628: Mr. BUCSHON and Mr. LABRADOR.  
H.R. 1629: Mr. POLIS.  
H.R. 1630: Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. THOMPSON of California, Mr. KENNEDY, Ms. BROWN of Florida, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Ms. LOFGREN, Mrs. LOWEY, Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Ms. LEE of California, and Mr. MCDERMOTT.  
H.R. 1661: Ms. LEE of California.  
H.R. 1692: Mr. VISCOLSKY.  
H.R. 1696: Ms. MCCOLLUM.  
H.R. 1697: Mr. YODER.  
H.R. 1701: Mr. BONNER and Mr. LANKFORD.  
H.R. 1716: Mr. KIND and Mr. VARGAS.  
H.R. 1717: Mr. MAFFEI, Mr. BOUSTANY, Mr. RAHALL, Mr. TIPTON, Mr. HANNA, Mr. ROGERS of Alabama, Mr. MEADOWS, Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mr. LANGEVIN, Mr. COLLINS of New York, Mr. TURNER, Mr. STIVERS, Mr. KLINE, Mr. ROTHFUS, Mr. COLE, Mr. FLEISCHMANN, Mr. SENSENBRENNER, Mr. ENYART, Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania, Mr. BENTIVOLIO, and Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York.  
H.R. 1726: Mr. GRAYSON, Mr. PRICE of Georgia, Mr. HARRIS, Mr. SOUTHERLAND, Mr. STOCKMAN, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. GARRETT, and Mr. PEARCE.  
H.R. 1733: Mr. LABRADOR.  
H.R. 1740: Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. CRAMER, Mr. LONG, Mr. HUIZENGA of Michigan, Mr. BRIDENSTINE, Mr. LANKFORD, and Mr. MILLER of Florida.  
H.R. 1748: Mr. GRAYSON.  
H.R. 1750: Mr. JONES, Mr. GRAVES of Georgia, Mr. BUCSHON, Mr. GRAVES of Missouri, and Mr. TIBERI.  
H.R. 1764: Mr. GRAVES of Missouri, Mr. BROUN of Georgia, and Mr. MCKEON.  
H.R. 1771: Mr. SCHNEIDER.  
H.R. 1795: Mr. TAKANO, Mr. LANGEVIN, Mr. WHITFIELD, Mr. MEEHAN, Mr. KEATING, Mr. HUNTER, Ms. ESHOO, Mr. FARR, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Mr. LONG, Mr. HONDA, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Mr. LIPINSKI, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Ms. DELAURO, and Mr. ROYCE.  
H.R. 1796: Mrs. NOEM, Mr. HECK of Washington, Mr. PETERS of Michigan, Mr. KILMER, Mr. LANGEVIN, Mr. NUGENT, Mr. CÁRDENAS, Mr. DEFazio, Mr. COFFMAN, Mr. VELA, Ms. BORDALLO, Mr. POCAN, Mr. POSEY, Ms. SEWELL of Alabama, Mr. TIERNEY, Ms. HERRERA BEUTLER, and Mr. SWALWELL of California.  
H.R. 1797: Mr. LABRADOR.  
H.R. 1798: Mr. SOUTHERLAND, Mr. BRALEY of Iowa, Mr. RUPPERSBERGER, and Mr. CONNOLLY.  
H.R. 1801: Mr. POLLS, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Mr. PASTOR of Arizona, and Ms. SCHWARTZ.  
H.R. 1809: Ms. FRANKEL of Florida, Ms. LEE of California, and Mr. PEARCE.  
H.R. 1811: Mr. MORAN.  
H.R. 1812: Mr. DEUTCH.  
H.R. 1814: Mr. MCKEON, Mr. CARTWRIGHT, Mr. LABRADOR, Mr. WESTMORELAND, and Ms. ESHOO.  
H.R. 1824: Ms. LEE of California and Mr. CARSON of Indiana.  
H.R. 1825: Mr. WALBERG.  
H.R. 1826: Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina.  
H.R. 1845: Mr. BEN RAY LUJÁN of New Mexico and Ms. WILSON of Florida.  
H.R. 1851: Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York, Mrs. LOWEY, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. NEAL, and Ms. MATSUL.  
H.R. 1857: Ms. BORDALLO, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, and Ms. WILSON of Florida.  
H.R. 1861: Mr. ROKITA, Mr. RIBBLE, Mr. WALBERG, and Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois.  
H.R. 1864: Mr. KLINE, Mrs. MCMORRIS RODGERS, Mr. STUTZMAN, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Mr. TURNER, Mrs. BACHMANN, Mr. LATTI, Ms. TSONGAS, and Mr. CARSON of Indiana.  
H.R. 1871: Mrs. BLACK.  
H.R. 1873: Mrs. BLACK.  
H.R. 1874: Mr. KLINE, Mr. TIBERI, Mr. PEARCE, and Mr. KINGSTON.  
H.R. 1882: Mr. BENTIVOLIO and Mr. BROUN of Georgia.  
H.R. 1896: Mrs. BLACK and Mr. TIBERI.  
H.R. 1907: Mr. KEATING, Mr. MCGOVERN, and Ms. SPEIER.  
H.R. 1915: Mr. HASTINGS of Florida and Mr. ROE of Tennessee.  
H.R. 1918: Mr. KLINE and Mr. COFFMAN.  
H.R. 1943: Mr. VAN HOLLEN.  
H.R. 1950: Mrs. NOEM, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, Mr. HECK of Nevada, Mr. SCHOCK, Mr. WENSTRUP, Mr. REICHERT, Mr. LUETKEMEYER, Mr. CARTER, Mr. LONG, Mr. GINGREY of Georgia, Mr. ROKITA, Mr. NUNNELEE, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. BENTIVOLIO, Mr. MESSER, Mr. NUGENT, Mr. DESANTIS, Mr. PITTS, Mrs. BACHMANN, Mr. HUIZENGA of Michigan, Mr. PRICE of Georgia, Mr. POSEY, Mr. HARRIS, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. STOCKMAN, Mr. GARDNER, Mr. GRAVES of Georgia, Mr. SOUTHERLAND, Mr. STUTZMAN, Mr. PEARCE, Mr. CULBERSON, Mr. HUELSKAMP, Mr. PAULSEN, Mr. KLINE, Mrs. MILLER of Michigan, Mr. SIMPSON, Mr. OLSON, Mr. DENT, and Mr. DIAZ-BALART.  
H.R. 1952: Mr. MULVANEY and Mr. PERLMUTTER.  
H.R. 1962: Mr. RADEL and Mr. CONYERS.  
H.R. 1971: Mr. WALZ and Mrs. BACHMANN.  
H.R. 1975: Mr. LOWENTHAL, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mr. PETERS of California, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, and Mr. GALLEGO.  
H. Con. Res. 34: Mr. SARBANES, Ms. BASS, Mr. RAHALL, and Mr. RANGEL.  
H. Res. 36: Mr. KINZINGER of Illinois, Mr. PITTS, Mr. KING of New York, Mr. TIPTON, Mr. REICHERT, and Mr. MCCAUL.  
H. Res. 89: Mr. PAYNE, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Mr. COLLINS of Georgia, Mr. LANCE, Mr. ENYART, Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California, Mr. GUTHRIE, Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. LONG, Mrs. DAVIS of California, Ms. BROWN of Florida, Mr. POMPEO, Mr. MCINTYRE, Mr. CRAMER, Ms. JENKINS, Mr. SCHNEIDER, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey and Mrs. BLACKBURN.  
H. Res. 109: Mr. MICHAUD, Mr. LANKFORD, Mr. CONNOLLY, and Mr. MARKEY.  
H. Res. 123: Ms. BASS, Ms. BROWN of Florida, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, Ms. CLARKE, Mr. CLYBURN, Ms. FUDGE, Mr. JEFFRIES, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Ms. LEE of California, Ms. MOORE, Mr. WATT, Mr. RICHMOND, Ms. SEWELL of Alabama, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Mr. VEASEY, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Ms. MENG, Mr. CARTWRIGHT, Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. STIVERS, Mr. POCAN, Mr. POSEY, and Mr. TIBERI.  
H. Res. 131: Mr. WEBER of Texas.  
H. Res. 160: Mrs. LUMMIS.  
H. Res. 167: Mr. MEEHAN.

H. Res. 174: Ms. TITUS.  
 H. Res. 190: Mr. GRIJALVA.  
 H. Res. 195: Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi.  
 H. Res. 197: Ms. WILSON of Florida.  
 H. Res. 200: Mr. BENTIVOLIO and Mr. KLINE.  
 H. Res. 212: Mr. LONG, Ms. JENKINS, and Mr. BENISHEK.  
 H. Res. 213: Mr. NOLAN, Ms. PINGREE of Maine, Mr. SMITH of Washington, Ms. MATSUI, Ms. KUSTER, and Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD.

**CONGRESSIONAL EARMARKS, LIMITED TAX BENEFITS, OR LIMITED TARIFF BENEFITS**

Under clause 9 of rule XXI, lists or statements on congressional earmarks, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits were submitted as follows:

**OFFERED BY MR. RYAN OF WISCONSIN**

The provisions that warranted a referral to the Committee on the Budget in H.R. 45 do not contain any congressional earmarks, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits as defined in clause 9 of rule XXI.

**OFFERED BY MR. ROGERS OF KENTUCKY**

The provisions that warranted a referral to the Committee on Appropriations in H.R. 45 do not contain any congressional earmarks, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits as defined in clause 9 of rule XXI.

**OFFERED BY MR. UPTON**

The provision that warranted a referral to the Committee on Energy and Commerce in H.R. 45 do not contain any congressional earmarks, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits as defined in clause 9 of rule XXI.

**OFFERED BY MR. KLINE**

The provision that warranted a referral to the Committee on Education and the Workforce in H.R. 45 do not contain any congressional earmarks, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits as defined in clause 9 of rule XXI.

**OFFERED BY MR. CAMP**

The provisions that warranted a referral to the Committee on Ways and Means in H.R. 45, to repeal the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act and health care-related provisions in the Health Care and Education Reconciliation act of 2010, do not contain any congressional earmarks, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits as defined in clause 9 of rule XXI of the Rules of the U.S. House of Representatives.

**OFFERED BY MR. GOODLATTE**

The provisions that warranted a referral to the Committee on the Judiciary in H.R. 45 do not contain any congressional earmarks, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits as defined in clause 9 of rule XXI.

**OFFERED BY MR. HASTINGS OF WASHINGTON**

The provisions that warranted a referral to the Committee on Natural Resources in H.R. 45 do not contain any congressional earmarks, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits as defined in clause 9 of rule XXI.

**OFFERED BY MR. SESSIONS**

The provisions that warranted a referral to the Committee on Rules in H.R. 45 do not contain any congressional earmarks, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits as defined in clause 9 of rule XXI.

**OFFERED BY MRS. MILLER OF MICHIGAN**

The provisions that warranted a referral to the Committee on House Administration in H.R. 45 do not contain any congressional earmarks, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits as defined in clause 9 of rule XXI.

**PETITIONS, ETC.**

Under clause 3 of rule XII,

16. The SPEAKER presented a petition of the City of Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania, relative to Resolution No. 225 urging the Congress to enact comprehensive immigration reform; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.