United States of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 112th CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

Vol. 158 WASHINGTON, MONDAY, JULY 9, 2012 No. 101

House of Representatives

The House met at 2 p.m. and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. HARRIS).

DESIGNATION OF THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

WASHINGTON, DC,
July 9, 2012.

I hereby appoint the Honorable ANDY HARRIS to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

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

PRAYER

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

Loving and gracious God, we give You thanks for giving us another day.

As the Members of this assembly return from days away celebrating our Nation's birth, grant them safe and restful journey. May they return ready to assume a difficult work which must be done.

We pray for the needs of the Nation and world and all of creation. Bless those who seek to honor You and serve each other and all Americans in this House through their public service. May the words and deeds of this place reflect an earnest desire for justice, and may men and women in government build on the tradition of equity and truth that represents the noblest heritage of our people.

May Your blessing, O God, be with us this day and every day to come, and may all we do be done 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 gentlewoman from Minnesota (Ms. MCCOLLUM) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Ms. MCCOLLUM 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.

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, June 29, 2012.

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 June 29, 2012 at 5:01 p.m.:

That the Senate passed S. 3238.
That the Senate passed S. 2165.
That the Senate passed S. 2239.
That the Senate passed S. 3363.

With best wishes, I am
Sincerely,

KAREN L. HAAS.

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, June 29, 2012.

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 June 29, 2012 at 4:39 p.m.:

That the Senate passed without amendment H.R. 6064.

With best wishes, I am
Sincerely,

KAREN L. HAAS.

THE DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE IS ON THE WRONG SIDE OF JUSTICE

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

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, thousands of dead people and citizens of other countries are reportedly registered to vote in the battleground State of Florida.

Texas, however, has passed a law that would require citizens to display a photo ID when they vote. But the Justice Department isn't interested in fixing voter integrity, even though the Supreme Court has said voter ID laws are constitutional.

The DOJ, ignoring the Supreme Court decision it doesn't like, sued Texas anyway, claiming the law discriminates. The DOJ, with its battery of high-dollar lawyers, apparently has yet to find any evidence to back their claim, so it brought in a hired gun to try to find some support for its allegation—a biased liberal data group called Catalist, a self-defined agent for progressive organizations. So much for the DOJ being objective.

Instead of attacking Texas for constitutionally enforcing the law, the DOJ should focus its resources on protecting the sanctity of the ballot box.

Printed on recycled paper.

It seems the people who would be disenfranchised by voter ID laws would be unlawful voters or dead people.

The DOJ is on the wrong side of justice again.

And that's just the way it is.

STOP THE ENDLESS POLITICAL GAMES

(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, this ''do nothing'' Republican Tea Party Congress is killing jobs with its endless political games. This week's gimmick vote to repeal the Affordable Care Act is a meaningless vote to deny millions of Americans health care.

Meanwhile, the House's failure to pass an extension of the wind energy tax credit to producers of all American energy is killing jobs. Thirty-seven thousand American jobs in the wind energy sector are at risk.

Minnesota is a leader in wind energy production, but because of its refusal to act, this Congress is causing businesses to lay people off, killing jobs, and harming our clean energy future. The wind energy tax credit supports clean energy developers, manufacturers, and construction companies in America and in Minnesota.

This Republican Tea Party Congress needs to stop the gimmicks, stop killing jobs, and, instead, immediately pass the wind energy tax credit to save jobs and to create more American jobs.

THE AFFORDABLE CARE ACT CONTINUES TO HURT PATIENTS AND DOCTORS

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

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, today The Dallas Morning News and the Fort Worth Star-Telegram carried stories that only 31 percent of Texas doctors are accepting new patients who rely on Medicaid. In 2010, the last time the survey was taken, it was 42 percent. In the year 2000, it was 67 percent.

The Texas Medical Association conducted the survey and attributes the dropping numbers to a low reimbursement rate for physicians and increasing red tape. Doctors appear to be losing patience with government-funded health plans and government-run health care in general.

You know, shortly after the Supreme Court decision, all of the cable talk shows talked about it's free riders that are driving up the cost of health care in this country. No, it's not. The biggest freeloader is the Federal Government.

The Federal Government, with its Medicare and Medicaid programs being structured the way they are, is actually causing the cost of health care to skyrocket in this country, and that's something that needs to stop. They're freeloading on an underfunded program, and it's costing us money. And more importantly, it's inexcusably hurting patients.

The Affordable Care Act is a bad law. We all knew it was bad law when it passed. It was written by lobbyists in secret down at the White House. It was a rough draft passed by the Senate that got forced to the House.

This House is going to hold a repeal vote this week. I suspect it will pass. I urge the Senate to take up and pass this repeal vote so we can get on to the important business of reforming the system in this country.

SUGAR, RICE, AND SOYBEAN INDUSTRY SUPPORT

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

Mr. BOUSTANY. Mr. Speaker, as the House Agriculture Committee considers farm bill legislation, I rise in strong support of responsible policies for all of our agriculture producers, especially the sugar, rice, and soybean industries.

Our no-cost sugar program has kept sugar supplies stable in this country, while allowing for industry expansion under the 2008 farm bill.

Last week, the St. Mary Parish Chamber of Commerce passed a resolution highlighting the critical importance of the sugar industry to south Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, I will enter it into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD later.

The sugar industry contributes $3.5 billion annually to Louisiana's economy, while supplying more than 16,000 jobs.

I'm pleased to see the chairman's initial draft language also includes multiple risk management options benefiting south Louisiana rice and soybean farmers. The chairman recognizes that a one-size-fits-all policy for our Nation's diverse agricultural economy is not feasible. I applaud their effort to work with all commodity groups to come up with an excellent final product in this farm bill.

As the farm bill moves forward in the House, I urge my colleagues to support policies that will work for all agriculture producers—not just some, but all—including Louisiana farmers.

□ 1410

VETERANS' COMPENSATION COST-OF-LIVING ADJUSTMENT ACT OF 2012

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

Mr. GUINTA. I rise today to add my voice to those calling for the passage of H.R. 4114, which would give a cost-of-living adjustment to our disabled military veterans.

My State, New Hampshire, has one of the largest per capita veteran populations of any State in our Nation. Nearly 128,000 former servicemen and women call the Granite State home. As its name indicates, the Veterans' Compensation Cost-of-Living Adjustment Act would provide a much-needed benefit increase, starting this December 1, for qualifying disabled veterans. It provides an increase similar to what Social Security recipients receive.

Our disabled veterans made a special sacrifice during their time in uniform, and they now live with the result of that sacrifice each and every day. Increasing their monthly benefit checks is a small price for a grateful Nation to pay. Our military Armed Forces answered the call when our country needed them most, and I believe that we must now be there for them.

I urge my colleagues to join with me in passing this important cost-of-living increase for the disabled men and women who gave so much to our country.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess until approximately 4 p.m. today.

Accordingly (at 2 o'clock and 11 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1600

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. HARRIS) at 4 p.m.

RESIGNATION FROM THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following resignation from the House of Representatives:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
July 6, 2012.

JOHN A. BOEHNER,
Speaker, U.S. House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR SPEAKER BOEHNER: I herewith tender to you my resignation from the office of United States Representative for Michigan's 11th Congressional District effective midnight tonight, Friday, July 6, 2012.

Sincerely,

THADDEUS G. MCCOTTER.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
July 6, 2012.

Governor RICK SNYDER,
Lansing, MI.

DEAR GOVERNOR SNYDER: I herewith tender to you my resignation from the office of United States Representative for Michigan's 11th Congressional District effective midnight tonight, Friday, July 6, 2012.

Sincerely,

THADDEUS G. MCCOTTER.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under clause 5(d) of rule XX, the Chair announces to the House that, in light of

the resignation of the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. MCCOTTER), the whole number of the House is 432.

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.

VETERAN SKILLS TO JOBS ACT

Mr. CHAFFETZ. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 4155) to treat relevant military training as sufficient to satisfy training or certification requirements for Federal licenses, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 4155

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 ''Veteran Skills to Jobs Act''.

SEC. 2. CONSIDERATION OF RELEVANT MILITARY TRAINING FOR ISSUANCE OF A FEDERAL LICENSE.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The head of each Federal licensing authority shall consider and may accept, in the case of any individual applying for a license, any relevant training received by such individual while serving as a member of the armed forces, for the purpose of satisfying the requirements for such license.

(b) DEFINITIONS.—For purposes of this Act—

(1) the term ''license'' means a license, certification, or other grant of permission to engage in a particular activity;

(2) the term ''Federal licensing authority'' means a department, agency, or other entity of the Government having authority to issue a license;

(3) the term ''armed forces'' has the meaning given such term by section 2101(2) of title 5, United States Code; and

(4) the term ''Government'' means the Government of the United States.

SEC. 3. REGULATIONS.

The head of each Federal licensing authority shall—

(1) with respect to any license a licensing authority grants or is empowered to grant as of the date of enactment of this Act, prescribe any regulations necessary to carry out this Act not later than 180 days after such date; and

(2) with respect to any license of a licensing authority not constituted or not empowered to grant the license as of the date of enactment of this Act, prescribe any regulations necessary to carry out this Act not later than 180 days after the date on which the agency is so constituted or empowered, as the case may be.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Utah (Mr. CHAFFETZ) and the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. CONNOLLY) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Utah.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. CHAFFETZ. I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which 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. CHAFFETZ. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

We are here today to discuss H.R. 4155, the Veteran Skills to Jobs Act, introduced by Mr. DENHAM of California. I really appreciate the approach that this is taking with jobs and the economic environment as such. This is a commonsense, good measure. I think it is widely supported on both sides of the aisle, and I would urge my colleagues to pass it.

Essentially, H.R. 4155 ensures that applicants for Federal licenses receive credit for relevant training completed while serving as a member of the Armed Forces. While most licenses are issued by the States, the Federal Government does grant a number of licenses, most notably in the aerospace, communications, and maritime sectors.

After 40 months with the unemployment rate above 8 percent, we must do more to help create jobs; and with the unemployment rate for post-9/11 veterans at 12.7 percent, we must better support our veterans as they transition to the civilian workforce.

In April, the Defense Business Board issued a report recommending Federal agencies review military training as a qualification for their respective program requirements. H.R. 4155 is in line with this recommendation.

The bill provides some certainty to veterans during their transition from the military by ensuring their training is taken into account when applying for Federal licenses. The bill does not infringe on the jurisdiction of the licensing agency. Instead, it leaves the agency free to determine whether military training is sufficient to meet license requirements.

H.R. 4155 will reduce the licensing burden for qualified veterans, enabling them to more quickly re-enter the workforce and ease their transition to civilian life.

Again, I appreciate the work of Mr. DENHAM, Mr. WALZ, and others in a bipartisan way to introduce this bill, and I would urge my colleagues to support it.

With that, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CONNOLLY of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.R. 4155 and yield myself such time as I may consume.

I want to thank the sponsors of H.R. 4155, especially Mr. DENHAM and Mr. WALZ, for their dedicated service to our Nation while in uniform and for their commitment to supporting our veterans here in Congress.

I deeply value and appreciate the sacrifices made by the men and women in our Armed Forces, and I'm proud to represent thousands of them who reside in the 11th District of Virginia, a district that takes military service very seriously and holds it in high esteem.

I believe that we here in Congress have a sacred duty, Mr. Speaker, to provide for their well-being. For that reason, I strongly support efforts to expedite the transition of our Nation's warriors to civilian life. We need to do all we can to help these dedicated veterans find gainful employment. It's a shameful fact that the men and women who volunteer to safeguard our country are having so much trouble finding steady, good-paying jobs. A double-digit unemployment rate for post-9/11 veterans—almost double the national average—is simply unacceptable.

Transitioning to civilian life is difficult under any circumstance; however, this hardship is compounded when veterans cannot easily translate their military skills into careers in the Federal or private sector workforce through no fault of their own.

In addition, there's the task of educating employers to better understand that so much of military training is readily transferrable to civilian job requirements in the private sector.

We need to do better for our veterans, and I believe H.R. 4155 is a strong step in that direction. It would require each agency with Federal licensing authority to treat relevant military training as sufficient to satisfy training or certification requirements for Federal licenses. This will help our returning servicemembers get credit for their military training towards a license which they can use to get Federal or private sector jobs and reintegrate into civilian life.

The Federal Government, private sector employers, and our economy will benefit by being able to take full advantage of their talent, unique skills, and experience as veterans.

Mr. Speaker, the Senate has already passed an identical version of this noncontroversial, but important, bill by unanimous consent. I urge all Members to support this bill that will enable our Nation's veterans to get back to work.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CHAFFETZ. Mr. Speaker, I would like to yield as much time as he may consume to the distinguished gentleman from California, the sponsor of the bill, Mr. DENHAM.

Mr. DENHAM. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to support legislation I authored, H.R. 4155, the Veteran Skills to Jobs Act.

America is blessed with the strongest, most capable and professional military in the world. Unfortunately for many of our veterans, transitioning from service means a battle with joblessness. And as my friend from Utah explained, the unemployment rate is 12.7 percent; but for our young veterans, it's 29.1 percent for those that are under the age of 25.

The Federal Government has invested in our servicemen with some of the most unique, expensive, and valued training in the world. These brave young men and women have put their lives on the line and deserve to be able to use this training when they come back home.

With 200,000 servicemen and -women transitioning to the civilian workforce each year, we must ensure that they're able to find jobs when they come home. I have personally dealt with this issue when I left Active Duty as a crew chief. Though I had training on the most sophisticated aircraft in the world, to work on less-sophisticated aircraft on the civilian side it would have taken me 3 years of training after I left Active Duty.

In my conversations with Mr. WALZ from Minnesota, some of the challenges that his veterans have seen in Minnesota involve having to go through the same State licensing procedure.

It's time to say enough is enough. If you've had the best training in the world, you ought to be able to get the best jobs in the world; and this body ought to make sure that certification, that licensure is a seamless process. If you leave Active Duty today, you ought to have work tomorrow in the private sector utilizing that very same training.

This legislation not only mirrors similar efforts on the State level but follows the recommendation of the Defense Business Board and the Department of Defense that issued a report calling for exactly this same type of reform. The Veteran Skills to Jobs Act would help fix this problem, and I'm glad to see that both Chambers of Congress are working together in a bipartisan fashion to accomplish this very same goal.

Helping our returning veterans find jobs is not the concern of one party or one body of Congress. The Senate adopted this matter unanimously last week before we left for break, and it's time that this body do the same.

□ 1610

Again, I want to thank Mr. WALZ of Minnesota for his hard work on this effort, for the bipartisan effort. He and I have been in close communication this entire 112th Congress in making sure that this comes to reality, as well as Senator NELSON from Florida offering the companion bill in the Senate. It's time to make sure that we have a bipartisan and quick solution to this issue.

I also want to thank the American Legion, of which I'm a member. They have worked tirelessly in both bodies, as well as from a grass-roots perspective across the Nation working with many other service organizations, to actually make this a reality. Now it's time that this body does its job and pass this important measure.

Mr. CHAFFETZ. I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CONNOLLY of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to my good friend and colleague from Minnesota (Mr. WALZ), the cosponsor of this legislation.

Mr. WALZ of Minnesota. I thank the gentleman from Virginia for his support of this bill and other veterans issues.

First of all, I'd like to thank the gentleman from California. Mr. DENHAM's service in uniform to this Nation is to be commended, and his service to our veterans has been unwavering.

He's right, we've worked on this a long time. I had the opportunity on numerous occasions to travel downrange to visit our veterans, the last one with my good friend from California (Mr. DENHAM), and the care and concern that he showed listening to his veterans of what they need, listening to them talk about this. One of the things on the minds of our veterans, as they're fighting downrange defending our freedoms and doing what's asked of them is how are they going to be able to take care of their family when their service obligation ends.

So Mr. DENHAM came back, and working and reaching across the aisle, and working over in the Senate, crafted a piece of legislation that's not only morally the right thing to do, taking care of our veterans—you hear a lot about the 99 percent and the 1 percent. There's truth in that: 99 percent of us enjoy the benefits of security and national defense while 1 percent provide it. So the moral obligation of providing this is pretty much unquestioned, but the thing that I think Mr. DENHAM looked into on this is making sure the economic impact was felt also.

And on this, I think this is very important to keep in mind: We spend $140 billion a year training our military. That's an investment into those folks. When they finish their career, whether it be a stint of 4 years or whether it's a 20- or 30-year career, they come out with incredible skill training, with incredible professionalism, and they are a very mature workforce. Why would we not want to get our best and brightest back working in the economy? These are entrepreneurs. These are the folks that can get things done. This piece of legislation was crafted in such a way to do exactly that.

Implementation of concurrent credentialing has no undue burden on the military nor on its readiness. In fact, opportunities for credentialing will be a selling point for our military. You can come out and move directly into a job as an aviation mechanic or whatever it may be.

I'd like to mention just quickly here, in my State of Minnesota, an average Active Duty servicemember with an aviation mechanic or avionics occupation will have attended over 18 months of training and had a minimum of 4 years of practical experience. A certified aviation maintenance technician school costs $20,000 a year. So we've invested. We have a trained mechanic, but we're going to have them come back, have them be unemployed, have them try and use their GI Bill—which is Federal dollars—to get the very same credentialing that they had when they left at a time when we need to put them into the job. So in Minnesota, Thief River Falls is the only place you can get this. We're asking folks to line up and get positions that they don't have enough spots for. It makes no sense.

So I'd like to thank the gentleman for a commonsense piece of legislation, for a piece of legislation that addresses both our moral and economic need. And I'd also like to say, Mr. Speaker, as the Members in this House see, we can work together to solve problems. We can understand—and on this issue—the sacrifice that our servicemembers made so that we could have the honor and the privilege of self-government and stand here and debate the country's business. We owe it to them to conduct ourselves in a manner that's reflective of their sacrifice and service.

And I would like to congratulate the gentleman from California for bringing that type of comradery, that type of can-do spirit, and that type of willingness to compromise to get things done for the good of the soldiers.

With that, I urge my colleagues, support this legislation. Let's get it passed.

Mr. CONNOLLY of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, with that, let me just urge my colleagues, in the spirit of bipartisanship, to come together and support our veterans and to make opportunity more available. It is, as I said, a sacred duty, it seems to me, that those men and women who are willing to put on that uniform and serve their country ought to be treated with respect and dignity and a job when they come home, and this bill will go a long way to doing that.

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

Mr. CHAFFETZ. Mr. Speaker, this is a good, commonsense, bipartisan bill. I appreciate both these gentlemen who spoke here earlier for their work on this, Mr. DENHAM and Mr. WALZ.

The Veteran Skills to Jobs Act, H.R. 4155, it makes sense, it's good government, it's what our troops deserve; and I encourage all of my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to support this and send a strong message to the military and to the private sector to let them know that we support them, that the work they do, the skills that they learn are a value, and that they are needed within the workforce as a whole, and that the skills and the training they get—the best in the world—mean something. And we can bypass this licensing issue and get them back to work sooner rather than later.

With that, 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.

CHAFFETZ) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 4155, 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. CHAFFETZ. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

VETERANS' COMPENSATION COST-OF-LIVING ADJUSTMENT ACT OF 2012

Mr. MILLER of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 4114) to increase, effective as of December 1, 2012, the rates of compensation for veterans with service-connected disabilities and the rates of dependency and indemnity compensation for the survivors of certain disabled veterans, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 4114

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 ''Veterans' Compensation Cost-of-Living Adjustment Act of 2012''.

SEC. 2. INCREASE IN RATES OF DISABILITY COMPENSATION AND DEPENDENCY AND INDEMNITY COMPENSATION.

(a) RATE ADJUSTMENT.—Effective on December 1, 2012, the Secretary of Veterans Affairs shall increase, in accordance with subsection (c), the dollar amounts in effect on November 30, 2012, for the payment of disability compensation and dependency and indemnity compensation under the provisions specified in subsection (b).

(b) AMOUNTS TO BE INCREASED.—The dollar amounts to be increased pursuant to subsection (a) are the following:

(1) WARTIME DISABILITY COMPENSATION.—Each of the dollar amounts under section 1114 of title 38, United States Code.

(2) ADDITIONAL COMPENSATION FOR DEPENDENTS.—Each of the dollar amounts under section 1115(1) of such title.

(3) CLOTHING ALLOWANCE.—The dollar amount under section 1162 of such title.

(4) DEPENDENCY AND INDEMNITY COMPENSATION TO SURVIVING SPOUSE.—Each of the dollar amounts under subsections (a) through (d) of section 1311 of such title.

(5) DEPENDENCY AND INDEMNITY COMPENSATION TO CHILDREN.—Each of the dollar amounts under sections 1313(a) and 1314 of such title.

(c) DETERMINATION OF INCREASE.—

(1) PERCENTAGE.—Except as provided in paragraph (2), each dollar amount described in subsection (b) shall be increased by the same percentage as the percentage by which benefit amounts payable under title II of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 401 et seq.) are increased effective December 1, 2012, as a result of a determination under section 215(i) of such Act (42 U.S.C. 415(i)).

(2) ROUNDING.—Each dollar amount increased under paragraph (1), if not a whole dollar amount, shall be rounded to the next lower whole dollar amount.

(d) SPECIAL RULE.—The Secretary of Veterans Affairs may adjust administratively, consistent with the increases made under subsection (a), the rates of disability compensation payable to persons under section 10 of Public Law 85–857 (72 Stat. 1263) who have not received compensation under chapter 11 of title 38, United States Code.

SEC. 3. PUBLICATION OF ADJUSTED RATES.

The Secretary of Veterans Affairs shall publish in the Federal Register the amounts specified in section 2(b), as increased under that section, not later than the date on which the matters specified in section 215(i)(2)(D) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 415(i)(2)(D)) are required to be published by reason of a determination made under section 215(i) of such Act during fiscal year 2013.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MILLER) and the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. BROWN) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. MILLER of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

As chairman of the House Committee on Veterans' Affairs, I rise in support of H.R. 4114, the Veterans' Compensation Cost-of-Living Adjustment Act of 2012.

This critically important piece of legislation authorizes a cost-of-living increase for disabled veterans in receipt of disability compensation payments from VA, veterans clothing allowance payments, and other compensation for survivors of veterans who die as a result of their service to this country. The amount of the increase will be determined by the Consumer Price Index, which also controls the cost-of-living adjustment for Social Security beneficiaries.

I want to thank my colleague from New Jersey (Mr. RUNYAN), the chairman of the Subcommittee on Disability Assistance and Memorial Affairs, for introducing this important piece of legislation and for working with me and the ranking member to move it forward.

I want to urge all my colleagues to support H.R. 4114, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. BROWN of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I wholeheartedly support the Veterans' Cost-of-Living Adjustment Act of 2012, H.R. 4114. While this committee does not control the amount of the COLA, it is critical that we pass the bill so that it can be put in place when the Social Security COLA is enacted. It is so important that the payments that our veterans, their families, and survivors receive keep pace with inflation and better enable them to put food on the table and a roof over their heads.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased that last year's veterans COLA increase was 3.6 percent for 2012 and that we can likely expect an increase for 2013. The exact figure will be tied directly to the Social Security COLA, whose beneficiaries will also see the same increase in their payments.

As it has since 1976, Congress, through the passage of the Veterans' Cost-of-Living Adjustment Act, directs the Secretary of the Department of Veterans Affairs to increase the rates of basic compensation for disabled veterans and the rates of dependency and indemnity compensation to their survivors and dependents. This bill will benefit disabled veterans, their families, and their survivors from the World War I era through the current conflict in Iraq and Afghanistan.

Many of the over 3.5 million veterans who receive disability compensation benefits depend on these payments not only to provide for their basic needs, but for those of their spouses, children, and parents as well. Without an annual COLA increase, these veterans, their families, and survivors will likely see the value of their hard-earned benefits slowly eroding.

Mr. Speaker, I think we would be derelict in our duties if we fail to guarantee that those who sacrifice so much for this country are able to receive benefits and service that keep pace with their needs and inflation.

□ 1620

We fund the wars; let's fund the warriors. Let me repeat: we fund the wars; let's fund the warriors.

I urge my colleagues to support the Veterans' Compensation Cost-of-Living Adjustment Act of 2012, H.R. 4114, without delay.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MILLER of Florida. Mr. Speaker, at this time I yield as much time as he might consume to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. RUNYAN), the subcommittee chairman of the Subcommittee on Disability Assistance and Memorial Affairs, not only the author of this particular piece of legislation, but since coming to this Congress, he has become one of the most ardent supporters of our veterans.

Mr. RUNYAN. Chairman MILLER, thank you for those kind words, and thank you for your support in helping me move this piece of legislation forward.

I rise today in support of H.R. 4114, the Veterans' Compensation Cost-of-Living Adjustment Act of 2012.

H.R. 4114, which I introduced in February, puts veterans on equal footing with Social Security beneficiaries by increasing the amount provided to several kinds of compensation by the amount of the Social Security cost-of-living adjustment. These include disabled veterans compensation, veterans' clothing allowance, and the DIC for veterans' survivors.

This annual and noncontroversial bill, which has been scored by CBO as having no budgetary impact, is a critical part of ensuring that benefits for disabled veterans and their families are sufficient to meet their needs.

I am proud that the first bill I introduced in Congress last year was the veterans' COLA bill, which gave the first cost-of-living adjustment to our

veterans that they had received in several years. I am equally proud that we are doing right by our veterans by moving the COLA bill increase this year in the form of H.R. 4114.

I urge all Members to support this critical piece of legislation.

Mr. MILLER of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. BROWN of Florida. Mr. Speaker, last month we were honored with the presence of over 400 Montford Point Marines in the Capitol to receive the Congressional Gold Medal. From 1942 to 1949, almost 20,000 African American Marines experienced basic training at Camp Montford Point near the New River in Jacksonville, North Carolina.

These heroes fought on two fronts, at home against discrimination, and across the sea to defend our Nation. This highest civilian award in the United States was first presented during the Revolutionary War to George Washington. It is fitting that this latest award should go to those men who, years before Jackie Robinson and Rosa Parks, joined the Marines to defend their country.

During this week when we are going to be debating the Affordable Care Act, we need to discuss a project that affects veterans health in my State of Florida. On July 1, the VA paid an additional $500,000 to rent a portable operating room for a project that is 95 percent complete in the Miami VA Medical Center. When this renovation was first proposed, two minor projects, each costing $10 million, were sponsored to fulfill the requirements of the project.

I visited the medical center last month and heard directly from the administrators of the facility about the project. The planners on the ground soon realized that patients could have been put at risk due to contamination of the operating rooms by the construction on the other side of the room.

Veterans health care was being put at risk, and rather than let this happen, it was decided by those who know the veterans health the best—those at the health facilities—to combine the projects into one and rent the portable operating rooms.

We need a procedure to give the Secretary the ability to correct these kinds of projects and not waste taxpayers' money. I will soon be introducing legislation to give the Secretary the help he needs to save taxpayers money.

In the last Congress, our Democratic leadership in the House and the Senate, with President Barack Obama, we were able to pass the largest increase in the veterans budget in history. We also passed advanced appropriations for the VA health care so that veterans would not be subject to the deadline that Congress seems to miss every year to pass a proper budget. It allows the VA to plan for the following year's health care needs and reassure veterans that they will be able to get the care that they need.

We also passed the caregivers law to help those who are taking care of the members of the military, funded PTSD and TBI mental health programs, homeless programs and rural health care in the veterans homes. It is the least we can do for those who have given so much to protect our freedom. We did not just talk the talk but walked the walk.

And since we're discussing repeal of the health care law tomorrow, I would like to briefly discuss how, in fact, the Affordable Care Act benefits our Nation's veterans and all Americans. Although not a perfect bill—and no bill is since there are many compromises made—this is a perfect start, and attempting to obtain universal health care has been a primary goal of every single President and Congress since the days of Franklin Delano Roosevelt, who had fought for quality, accessible health care insurance reform for all Americans. And now, 75 years later, after the Supreme Court ruling just over a week ago, our Nation has finally attained that goal.

Millions of Americans have already come to rely on the wide-ranging and lifesaving benefits of the Affordable Care Act.

And let me just say, I keep hearing ObamaCare. Let me just be clear. Obama cares for the American health care.

Before Congress passed the Affordable Care Act, nearly one in five citizens in the wealthiest country in the world had little or no hope of affordable insurance and access to regular health care. When fully implemented, the Affordable Care Act will cover an additional 30 million Americans and 3.8 million African Americans who otherwise would remain uninsured.

Already under the Affordable Health Care Act, 17 million children with preexisting conditions can no longer be denied coverage; 105 million Americans no longer have a lifetime limit on their coverage; 32.5 million seniors received free preventive service in 2011; 54 million Americans in private plans have received free preventive services; 6.6 million young adults up to the age of 26 have obtained insurance through their parents' plan; and 5.2 million seniors and disabled people save an average of $704 each on their prescription drugs; 360,000 small businesses received tax credits to help them afford coverage for 2 million workers; 13 million families will receive insurance premium rebates averaging $151 in 2012.

However, instead of debating a health care repeal, we should be debating a construction reauthorization bill to deal with the waste of taxpayer dollars, like I indicated in Miami—$500,000 this month for a portable operating room.

In closing, let's get to work.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. MILLER of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I think it's rather interesting that my colleague would talk about the supposed great things that are in the ObamaCare bill and not talk about how it's going to be paid for—in fact, the largest tax increase on the American people that this Congress has ever placed on their backs.

They would make you believe that it was all free, but it's not. It's going to cost somebody, and that's going to be the American citizens.

□ 1630

I also want to talk about the Miami project very quickly. I had to go down and actually visit and then pressure the VA Secretary to make sure that the director of the Miami Medical Center left her job because she was not doing what she was supposed to do. In fact, this was, in a way, a skirting of the rules and of the laws by splitting a project into two, thus costing the taxpayers of the United States considerably more money, including the cost of the rental of the trailers that are being used as temporary operating rooms.

We continue to wait for the Department of Veterans Affairs to actually make an official request for us to come forward and take care of this problem that exists in Miami, specifically because of, I think, poor administrative oversight not only at the administrative level in Miami but with the VISN Director in VISN 8 as well.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. MILLER of Florida. Mr. Speaker, at this point, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and to include any extraneous materials that they may have on H.R. 4114.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. MILLER of Florida. Mr. Speaker, the Senate itself hasn't been able to pass a budget for almost 4 years, and they cannot pass an appropriations bill on time, so I do support the advanced appropriation that this House supported and that ultimately was signed into law. With that, I encourage all Members to support H.R. 4114.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MILLER) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 4114.

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.

ELECTRONIC FUND TRANSFER ACT AMENDMENT

Mr. LUETKEMEYER. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 4367) to amend the Electronic Fund Transfer Act to limit the fee disclosure requirement for an automatic teller machine to the screen of that machine.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 4367

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

SECTION 1. FEE DISCLOSURE REQUIREMENT.

Section 904(d)(3)(B) of the Consumer Credit Protection Act (15 U.S.C. 1693b(d)(3)(B)) (commonly known as the ''Electronic Fund Transfer Act'') is amended—

(1) by striking ''REQUIREMENTS.'' and all that follows through ''The notice required under clauses (i) and (ii)'' and inserting ''REQUIREMENT.—The notice required under clauses (i) and (ii)'' after ''NOTICE''; and

(2) by striking '', except that during the period beginning'' and all that follows and inserting a period.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. LUETKEMEYER) and the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. DAVID SCOTT) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Missouri.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. LUETKEMEYER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and to add extraneous material to this bill.

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

There was no objection.

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

Today, we are considering one of the most commonsense bills seen in some time. This bill provides a real solution to a real problem that is impacting banks, credit unions, and merchants nationwide.

Regulation E currently mandates that ATM fee disclosures appear both in physical placard or in sticker form on the machines as well as through an on-screen electronic notification. Unfortunately, some individuals have seen the potential to make a quick buck off a frivolous claim and have begun to remove stickers from ATMs across the country, thereby placing financial institutions and merchants out of compliance. This is exactly what has happened to some small financial institutions in my district and throughout Missouri. Someone was traveling through the State, removing stickers from ATM machines, and then was offering to settle with the banks for several thousands of dollars per machine or the banks would face lawsuits.

The premise of this bill is simple: to eliminate an outdated and unnecessary regulatory burden facing merchants and financial institutions while continuing to ensure consumer protections for all ATM users through required on-screen fee disclosures.

It is important to recognize that the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau has also expressed interest in eliminating this duplicative fee disclosure requirement. In December of 2011, the CFPB asked the public to comment on the elimination of this requirement. However, during the public comment period, the CFPB admitted that it may not be able to remove the duplicative disclosure requirement and that it would be up to Congress to take action.

Today, Mr. Speaker, it is time for us to take action.

H.R. 4367 is supported by the National Association of Federal Credit Unions, the Credit Union National Association, the American Bankers Association, the Independent Community Bankers of America, the United States Chamber of Commerce, the Electronic Funds Transfer Association, the Consumer Bankers Association, The Clearing House, the Food Marketing Institute, the Financial Services Roundtable, the National Association of Convenience Stores, the American Gaming Association, and the ATM Industry Association as well.

This legislation has broad bipartisan support from its 145 cosponsors. Among them is the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. SCOTT), who has been a great partner on this initiative, and I thank him for his efforts.

Again, I want to remind my colleagues that this bill does not in any way alter the mandate for on-screen fee disclosures, meaning that customers will have a clear understanding of what they will be charged before they complete their ATM transactions.

It is time to put an end to these frivolous lawsuits. I thank my colleagues for the sponsorship of this legislation, and I ask all Members to support this bill today.

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

Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

First of all, let me say that this is very much bipartisan legislation in that it has been sponsored by both Democrats and Republicans. I am very, very pleased to have as an original cosponsor on this and to have worked very closely with Mr. LUETKEMEYER, who has done an admirable job in providing leadership on a much, much needed piece of legislation, which is H.R. 4367. As I said, I am proud to be an integral part of moving forward a very timely, reasonable, and vital piece of legislation.

Let me just say at the outset, Mr. Speaker, that our banking system, our retail system, our credit unions all sit at the center—at the epicenter—of this Nation's great economic system, which is facing tremendous challenges. As Mr. LUETKEMEYER said, we are faced with people who are basically scam artists, those who will go in and remove the labeling off the ATM machines, knowing that the penalty is upwards of one half a million dollars, and then will try to bring class action lawsuits against these financial institutions in very tough economic times. So this legislation has been developed to address this and to fix this so that our banking industry and our financial services industry will not have this threat over them.

What it would do is repeal the requirement for both a physical placard as well as an electronic notice disclosing the transaction fees on the ATM screens. Currently, as it works now, if an ATM machine does not display a physical placard, a financial institution—a bank, a credit union or our retailers—can be subject to a class action lawsuit, which would potentially amount to, as I said, one half a million dollars, or 1 percent of its net worth. This penalty has the potential of prompting bogus lawsuits against financial institutions simply due to a lack of the physical placard, even when the electronic notice is shown to a customer, perhaps because the placard was removed by a third party. So you can see that this is not fair for these institutions to be faced with up to a half million dollars in penalty fees, especially in these tough economic times. At the same time, many of these institutions continue to struggle to maintain standard operations while being faced with our current economic climate.

□ 1640

Mr. Speaker, let me just talk about that for a moment because there have been 31 bank failures in this country this year alone. About 3 weeks ago, three banks shut their doors, including the Security Exchange Bank in Marietta, Cobb County, Georgia, which is located in my district. As a matter of fact, in Georgia alone, 78 banks have closed their doors since our crisis began.

Georgia leads the Nation, unfortunately, in bank closures. That's why I am so particularly concerned about it and so pleased to have this measure pass, because this sensible legislation that we consider today would remove the threat of legal action against financial institutions—a bank or a credit union—simply for the lack of the physical placard at one of its ATM machines.

Passage of this bill, as Mr. LUETKEMEYER pointed out, will still provide the consumer with the protections that they need because a notice informing them of any fees will still be required upon the start of a transaction on the ATM screen. In addition, consumers will still be able to benefit from the convenience that the estimated 445,000 ATMs in operation in this country provide.

I'm very proud to have worked on this bill. It's very timely. It's very important for our economy that we move with this bill. The bill certainly deserves the strong bipartisan support that we have, and it's been a pleasure to work with Mr. LUETKEMEYER on it. I urge my colleagues to support this measure today.

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

Mr. LUETKEMEYER. Mr. Speaker, it is now my distinct honor to yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. BACHUS) to

speak on the bill, our distinguished chairman on the Financial Services Committee.

Mr. BACHUS. Mr. Speaker, I came here to compliment the two gentlemen who have spoken on this bill, who are the cosponsors of a bipartisan bill.

When I first heard about this legislation, I thought, like most legislation this year, it won't go anywhere. I thought it may pass the House, but it may not pass the Senate. I understand that with this particular legislation, that our Senate colleagues are waiting for it and they're ready to act upon it.

Mr. SCOTT brought up, I think, a salient point when he said that we're having many banks and credit unions who are struggling, because when people don't have jobs, they can't pay back their loans. Our banks and credit unions are trying to cope with the added expense of more regulation. Particularly at a time like that, but at any time, for people to take advantage of a statute that is intended to protect the American people is really audacity and greed in its purest sense.

I'm an attorney, and I can tell you that 999 out of 1,000 attorneys or former attorneys would absolutely be enraged to find that very few of their colleagues are taking advantage of Regulation E and the Electronic Fund Transfer Act to sue these institutions on lawsuits that are totally against the public interest, and particularly are against the interests of those living in low-income areas and high-crime areas. The people in those areas are coping with so much that to add to that, having an ATM machine removed from that location or from a low-income area, just adds another expense for people who have very little means of financing their life today. That's what's happening.

Either the vandals themselves are going and vandalizing the sticker that we've all seen—we've all used an ATM. We've all seen the sticker there. We probably didn't notice the sticker there because what really caught our attention is when we get on the screen and we see that same notice, but that notice actually on the screen requires us to affirmatively say ''yes,'' we will agree to it. So people today probably don't even notice that sticker. The few people who noticed that sticker and took advantage of it were people that were up to no good, people that were willing to bring what some of us would call a ''frivolous lawsuit.''

These lawsuits can ask for a half million dollars worth of damages. And because it is actually a statutory failure to have it, these lawsuits sometimes result in a $100,000 or $200,000 judgment. They're also resulting in these ATMs not being located in areas that are subject to vandalism. Of course, almost any area could be subject to it, but we've penalized those Americans who are least able to afford to travel a greater distance for the convenience of an AMT machine.

As Mr. LUETKEMEYER and Mr. SCOTT said, people come up; they scrape it off. Some of these appear to be well-organized efforts by the very people that bring the lawsuit to go out and do these in an organized manner among hundreds of machines. They then come in and file a class action.

Mr. LUETKEMEYER, at one time, was a banker in a small Missouri community. And in most cases, particularly a small credit union or a community bank or a local bank, they can't afford to battle these for $50,000 or $100,000—it actually may be a big law firm bringing these lawsuits—so they settle them for $50,000. This will put an end to that.

Let me tell you, no one on the Financial Services Committee expressed any doubt about this legislation. I don't think anyone would, other than those people who are complicit in vandalizing these machines and making money on what we sometimes called ''unintended consequences.'' I tell you, it certainly was unintended. If we had, in our imagination, sat down for days and said what is the worst thing that could happen by requiring us to put a sticker on as well as electronic notice, we would have never come up with this. We would have never come up with the ingenuity of some people to take advantage of the law. But that's what's happened here.

Today, I think, unanimously, hopefully, we're going to shut the door on this practice and send this bill over to the Senate, particularly for areas where there is high vandalism in our rural communities. We're going to set a wrong right.

Let me say that this is a model for how this Congress ought to operate, of coming together, having a consensus, coming up with good, commonsense legislation that benefits the public and reduces unnecessary costs and puts what I consider and I think is criminal behavior out of business. We're going to put some criminals out of business with this legislation.

Mr. LUETKEMEYER, Mr. SCOTT, and all Members who are cosponsoring this bill, I commend each and every one of you.

Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, in closing I certainly would just like to say how important this legislation is.

As the chairman of our Financial Services Committee, Chairman BACHUS, just stated, these are sophisticated individuals. These are people who know the system. That's why I refer to them as scam artists.

This is a racket, and it's a racket that we need to put out of business that's causing tremendous headaches, tremendous difficulties for the heart of our fine economic system, which is our banking system, our commercial system. This will go a long way in helping to take away a very superfluous but serious enough threat.

The other thing about this that's very fine is we hear a great cry among the American people for great bipartisanship. Here's a great example of Democrats and Republicans working together for the good of the United States of America.

Thank you very much for working with me on this, and I appreciate having an opportunity to work with you.

And since I have no other speakers, I yield back the balance of my time.

□ 1650

Mr. LUETKEMEYER. Mr. Speaker, again, I want to thank Mr. SCOTT from Georgia for helping this bill along. As he articulated, Georgia has had an inordinate number of banks this past year, 2 or 3 years, that have suffered and have gone out of business.

This is just another situation here where this bill may not be a very big bill in the light of things, but it certainly is going to relieve some stress on some of our institutions, also some exposure for some of our merchants. I think, as our distinguished chairman articulated, it's time to put some of these folks out of business as well.

I have had, unfortunately, some of these things go on in my district, and this is how it was brought to my attention. But I think we have come together as a group, and we had a great meeting the other day in Financial Services and had strong bipartisan support. We have the support in the Senate.

With that, I will close and ask for the support of the body.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. LUETKEMEYER) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 4367.

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. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

HYDROPOWER REGULATORY EFFICIENCY ACT OF 2012

Mrs. MCMORRIS RODGERS. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 5892) to improve hydropower, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 5892

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE; TABLE OF CONTENTS.

(a) SHORT TITLE.—This Act may be cited as the ''Hydropower Regulatory Efficiency Act of 2012''.

(b) TABLE OF CONTENTS.—The table of contents of this Act is as follows:

Sec. 1. Short title; table of contents.
Sec. 2. Findings.
Sec. 3. Promoting small hydroelectric power projects.
Sec. 4. Promoting conduit hydropower projects.

Sec. 5. FERC authority to extend preliminary permit periods.
Sec. 6. Promoting hydropower development at nonpowered dams and closed loop pumped storage projects.
Sec. 7. DOE study of pumped storage and potential hydropower from conduits.

SEC. 2. FINDINGS.

Congress finds that—

(1) the hydropower industry currently employs approximately 300,000 workers across the United States;

(2) hydropower is the largest source of clean, renewable electricity in the United States;

(3) as of the date of enactment of this Act, hydropower resources, including pumped storage facilities, provide—

(A) nearly 7 percent of the electricity generated in the United States; and

(B) approximately 100,000 megawatts of electric capacity in the United States;

(4) only 3 percent of the 80,000 dams in the United States generate electricity, so there is substantial potential for adding hydropower generation to nonpowered dams; and

(5) according to one study, by utilizing currently untapped resources, the United States could add approximately 60,000 megawatts of new hydropower capacity by 2025, which could create 700,000 new jobs over the next 13 years.

SEC. 3. PROMOTING SMALL HYDROELECTRIC POWER PROJECTS.

Subsection (d) of section 405 of the Public Utility Regulatory Policies Act of 1978 (16 U.S.C. 2705) is amended by striking ''5,000'' and inserting ''10,000''.

SEC. 4. PROMOTING CONDUIT HYDROPOWER PROJECTS.

(a) APPLICABILITY OF, AND EXEMPTION FROM, LICENSING REQUIREMENTS.—Section 30 of the Federal Power Act (16 U.S.C. 823a) is amended—

(1) by striking subsections (a) and (b) and inserting the following:

''(a)(1) A qualifying conduit hydropower facility shall not be required to be licensed under this part.

''(2)(A) Any person, State, or municipality proposing to construct a qualifying conduit hydropower facility shall file with the Commission a notice of intent to construct such facility. The notice shall include sufficient information to demonstrate that the facility meets the qualifying criteria.

''(B) Not later than 15 days after receipt of a notice of intent filed under subparagraph (A), the Commission shall—

''(i) make an initial determination as to whether the facility meets the qualifying criteria; and

''(ii) if the Commission makes an initial determination, pursuant to clause (i), that the facility meets the qualifying criteria, publish public notice of the notice of intent filed under subparagraph (A).

''(C) If, not later than 45 days after the date of publication of the public notice described in subparagraph (B)(ii)—

''(i) an entity contests whether the facility meets the qualifying criteria, the Commission shall promptly issue a written determination as to whether the facility meets such criteria; or

''(ii) no entity contests whether the facility meets the qualifying criteria, the facility shall be deemed to meet such criteria.

''(3) For purposes of this section:

''(A) The term 'conduit' means any tunnel, canal, pipeline, aqueduct, flume, ditch, or similar manmade water conveyance that is operated for the distribution of water for agricultural, municipal, or industrial consumption and not primarily for the generation of electricity.

''(B) The term 'qualifying conduit hydropower facility' means a facility (not including any dam or other impoundment) that is determined or deemed under paragraph (2)(C) to meet the qualifying criteria.

''(C) The term 'qualifying criteria' means, with respect to a facility—

''(i) the facility is constructed, operated, or maintained for the generation of electric power and uses for such generation only the hydroelectric potential of a non-federally owned conduit;

''(ii) the facility has an installed capacity that does not exceed 5 megawatts; and

''(iii) on or before the date of enactment of the Hydropower Regulatory Efficiency Act of 2012, the facility is not licensed under, or exempted from the license requirements contained in, this part.

''(b) Subject to subsection (c), the Commission may grant an exemption in whole or in part from the requirements of this part, including any license requirements contained in this part, to any facility (not including any dam or other impoundment) constructed, operated, or maintained for the generation of electric power which the Commission determines, by rule or order—

''(1) utilizes for such generation only the hydroelectric potential of a conduit; and

''(2) has an installed capacity that does not exceed 40 megawatts.''.

(2) in subsection (c), by striking ''subsection (a)'' and inserting ''subsection (b)''; and

(3) in subsection (d), by striking ''subsection (a)'' and inserting ''subsection (b)''.

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—Subsection (d) of section 405 of the Public Utility Regulatory Policies Act of 1978 (16 U.S.C. 2705), as amended, is further amended by striking ''subsection (a) of such section 30'' and inserting ''subsection (b) of such section 30''.

SEC. 5. FERC AUTHORITY TO EXTEND PRELIMINARY PERMIT PERIODS.

Section 5 of the Federal Power Act (16 U.S.C. 798) is amended—

(1) by designating the first, second, and third sentences as subsections (a), (c), and (d), respectively; and

(2) by inserting after subsection (a) (as so designated) the following:

''(b) The Commission may extend the period of a preliminary permit once for not more than 2 additional years beyond the 3 years permitted by subsection (a) if the Commission finds that the permittee has carried out activities under such permit in good faith and with reasonable diligence.''.

SEC. 6. PROMOTING HYDROPOWER DEVELOPMENT AT NONPOWERED DAMS AND CLOSED LOOP PUMPED STORAGE PROJECTS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—To improve the regulatory process and reduce delays and costs for hydropower development at nonpowered dams and closed loop pumped storage projects, the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission (referred to in this section as the ''Commission'') shall investigate the feasibility of the issuance of a license for hydropower development at nonpowered dams and closed loop pumped storage projects in a 2-year period (referred to in this section as a ''2-year process''). Such a 2-year process shall include any prefiling licensing process of the Commission.

(b) WORKSHOPS AND PILOTS.—The Commission shall—

(1) not later than 60 days after the date of enactment of this Act, hold an initial workshop to solicit public comment and recommendations on how to implement a 2-year process;

(2) develop criteria for identifying projects featuring hydropower development at nonpowered dams and closed loop pumped storage projects that may be appropriate for licensing within a 2-year process;

(3) not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act, develop and implement pilot projects to test a 2-year process, if practicable; and

(4) not later than 3 years after the date of implementation of the final pilot project testing a 2-year process, hold a final workshop to solicit public comment on the effectiveness of each tested 2-year process.

(c) MEMORANDUM OF UNDERSTANDING.—The Commission shall, to the extent practicable, enter into a memorandum of understanding with any applicable Federal or State agency to implement a pilot project described in subsection (b).

(d) REPORTS.—

(1) PILOT PROJECTS NOT IMPLEMENTED.—If the Commission determines that no pilot project described in subsection (b) is practicable because no 2-year process is practicable, not later than 240 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Commission shall submit to the Committee on Energy and Commerce of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources of the Senate a report that—

(A) describes the public comments received as part of the initial workshop held under subsection (b)(1); and

(B) identifies the process, legal, environmental, economic, and other issues that justify the determination of the Commission that no 2-year process is practicable, with recommendations on how Congress may address or remedy the identified issues.

(2) PILOT PROJECTS IMPLEMENTED.—If the Commission develops and implements pilot projects involving a 2-year process, not later than 60 days after the date of completion of the final workshop held under subsection (b)(4), the Commission shall submit to the Committee on Energy and Commerce of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources of the Senate a report that—

(A) describes the outcomes of the pilot projects;

(B) describes the public comments from the final workshop on the effectiveness of each tested 2-year process; and

(C)(i) outlines how the Commission will adopt policies under existing law (including regulations) that result in a 2-year process for appropriate projects;

(ii) outlines how the Commission will issue new regulations to adopt a 2-year process for appropriate projects; or

(iii) identifies the process, legal, environmental, economic, and other issues that justify a determination of the Commission that no 2-year process is practicable, with recommendations on how Congress may address or remedy the identified issues.

SEC. 7. DOE STUDY OF PUMPED STORAGE AND POTENTIAL HYDROPOWER FROM CONDUITS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of Energy shall conduct a study—

(1)(A) of the technical flexibility that existing pumped storage facilities can provide to support intermittent renewable electric energy generation, including the potential for such existing facilities to be upgraded or retrofitted with advanced commercially available technology; and

(B) of the technical potential of existing pumped storage facilities and new advanced pumped storage facilities, to provide grid reliability benefits; and

(2)(A) to identify the range of opportunities for hydropower that may be obtained from conduits (as defined by the Secretary) in the United States; and

(B) through case studies, to assess amounts of potential energy generation from such conduit hydropower projects.

(b) REPORT.—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Energy shall submit to the Committee on Energy and Commerce of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources of the Senate a report that describes the results of the study conducted under subsection (a), including any recommendations.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentlewoman from Washington (Mrs. MCMORRIS RODGERS) and the gentlewoman from Colorado (Ms. DEGETTE) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Washington.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mrs. MCMORRIS RODGERS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and to include extraneous material on H.R. 5892.

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

There was no objection.

Mrs. MCMORRIS RODGERS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of H.R. 5892, the Hydropower Regulatory Efficiency Act of 2012, which I introduced, along with my good friend from Colorado, Representative DIANA DEGETTE.

To see the potential and the benefits of hydropower, all we have to do is look at my home State of Washington, which gets over 75 percent of its power from clean, reliable hydropower and has some of the Nation's lowest electricity rates.

The Columbia and Snake River dams in eastern Washington, through irrigation, transformed a dry, barren desert with sagebrush to one of the most productive agriculture regions in the world. The low cost of hydropower brought high-tech companies like Google and Yahoo to relocate their servers there. Manufacturing facilities like BMW have now opened plants in Moses Lake, and the significant transportation benefits hydropower infrastructure provides to our Nation's barging are all as a result of hydropower.

Yet, notwithstanding all of these benefits, the regulatory approval process for hydropower development, especially for smaller projects, can be unnecessarily slow, costly, and cumbersome. That's why I authored, and I urge my colleagues to support, H.R. 5892, which reforms and streamlines the hydropower permitting and regulatory process for small hydropower and conduit projects, reducing the burdens impeding development and getting low-cost electricity to communities faster.

Mr. Speaker, few would disagree that we as a Nation need to become more energy independent. Along with Members on both sides of the aisle, I support an all-of-the-above energy strategy. The Department of Energy has also a goal of doubling the amount of hydropower produced in the United States, which a recent National Hydropower Association study revealed could be accomplished without building a single new dam by simply investing in new technologies and turbines. Mr. Speaker, the benefits and the overwhelming potential is why I urge the President to include hydropower in his all-of-the-above energy strategy.

As part of an all-of-the-above strategy, we need to domestically produce more oil, coal, natural gas, and renewable energies like hydropower. According to the Energy Information Administration, currently 75 percent of all renewable energy produced in the United States is hydropower. However, that only accounts for 7 percent of the total electricity nationwide, and we've hardly scratched the surface of hydropower's potential. By utilizing currently untapped resources, the United States could add approximately 60,000 megawatts of new hydropower by 2025.

Furthermore, with job growth still at a sluggish pace and far too many Americans out of work, we should be looking at every opportunity to put Americans back to work. Increased hydropower development will do just that, with the potential to create up to 700,000 jobs over the next decade. Unleashing American ingenuity to increase hydropower production will lower energy costs and help create thousands of jobs.

Mr. Speaker, I urge all my colleagues to support American energy and support H.R. 5892.

I reserve the balance of my time.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
May 29, 2012.

Hon. BARACK OBAMA,
The White House,
Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: As we continue to advance policies that will reduce America's dependency on foreign energy under the ''all-of-the-above'' mantra, I respectfully urge you to consider our nation's largest, cleanest, and most inexpensive renewable energy source—hydroelectric power.

According to your Department of Energy, approximately only seven percent of our nation's total electricity and nearly seventy-five percent of all renewable energy comes from hydropower. Hydropower's undeveloped potential is nearly exponential. Currently, only three percent of the 84,000 dams in the United States produce hydropower and hydropower production could double without building a single new dam. Not to mention the commonsense regulatory reforms that can be made to reduce the regulatory burden constraining hydropower production. The first and foremost beneficiary of increasing the development of this clean renewable energy source will be consumers with lower utility bills.

While I applaud your decision to embrace an ''all-of-the-above'' energy approach, I am disappointed your ''all-of-the-above'' approach does not include hydropower. According to your campaign website, the United States' leading renewable energy source does not play a role in our nation's energy future. With the potential and benefits of hydropower in mind, I respectfully urge you to re-evaluate and include hydropower in your ''all-of-the-above'' approach to energy independence.

Sincerely,

CATHY MCMORRIS RODGERS.

NATIONAL HYDROPOWER ASSOCIATION,
Washington, DC, July 9, 2012.

Hon. CATHY MCMORRIS RODGERS,
Washington, DC.
Hon. DIANA DEGETTE,
Washington, DC.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE MCMORRIS RODGERS AND REPRESENTATIVE DEGETTER: On behalf of the National Hydropower Association (NHA) I want to extend our appreciation for your leadership on hydropower issues and recognize your tremendous work on H.R. 5892, the Hydropower Regulatory Efficiency Act of 2012.

NHA fully supports the legislation, which provides common-sense improvements to the development process for small hydropower and conduit projects while also seeking solutions to unlock new generation at existing non-powered dam infrastructure and closed-loop pumped storage facilities.

Hydropower is an integral part of America's energy portfolio. The adoption of smart, targeted policies, such as H.R. 5892, allows our nation to tap new hydropower resources to meet future energy needs.

Once again, we commend your work to increase affordable, reliable, and renewable hydropower deployment and for crafting a bill that has garnered broad bipartisan support as well as the endorsement of both the industry and the environmental community.

Sincerely,

LINDA CHURCH CIOCCI,
Executive Director.

HYDROVOLTS,
June 19, 2012.

Hon. CATHY MCMORRIS ROGERS,
House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE MCMORRIS RODGERS: We are writing to express our support for H.R. 5892, the ''Hydropower Regulatory Efficiency Act of 2012.''

Hydrovolts, headquartered in Seattle, Washington, is a manufacturer of portable hydropower turbines that harvest hydrokinetic energy from water channels. Primarily working with irrigation districts, water treatment plants and other water system operators who can purchase multiple turbines, we are working to help revolutionize renewable in-stream hydropower generation and make it cost-effective for the USA and for an untapped global export market. Deployed in the huge water supply canals that now cross the continents, these turbines have no environmental impact and can be mass-produced like cars, creating good manufacturing jobs. Hydrovolts' ingenious design and business plan have won awards from cleantech venture contests and investments from individuals and corporations. Please see the online video about Hydrovolts at www.youtube.com/watch?v=gbh6K5LVrj0.

By taking advantage of the regulatory scheme created in H.R. 5892 that allows for the rapid deployment of small hydropower technology, Hydrovolts will be able to affordably harness the hydrokinetic energy flowing through thousands of miles of canals. Hydrovolts has already built and installed turbines that are scalable, portable, low cost and easy to install. They will create clean energy that is accessible and affordable in potentially millions of sites.

H.R. 5892 will directly and dramatically help our company grow and succeed, by removing regulatory barriers that are unreasonably imposed on this untapped hydropower resource. We will get many more customers and hire more people because of this legislation. It will help launch an entirely new clean energy source for America—canal power—as well as removing a major regulatory barrier to many existing proposed hydropower projects. This is an example of pursing an ''all of the above'' energy security objective from a new perspective of distributed hydropower that supports manufacturing and agriculture. Above all, Hydrovolts supports this legislation because it is an important step towards the goal of expanding hydropower production.

Founded in April of 2007, Hydrovolts has proven that it is a strong small business with large potential. To date, our most notable achievements are:

Performance design and function validated at University of Washington, USGS lab, US Navy

Successful demonstration project in Washington's Roza Irrigation District

Signed first-ever licensing agreement for demonstration in Federal canals with USBR

Winner of three national contests for cleantech business plans

Raised $3 million from private investors and grown to 14 employees, without receiving any government subsidies or grants.

On June 19th, we met with Shaughnessy Murphy on your staff to discuss this important legislation and we look forward to continue working with you on this important legislation. The leadership you have demonstrated on the issue of renewable energy is appreciated. If there are opportunities for entrepreneurs to testify to Congress in support of H.R. 5892, we will be happy to come to Washington DC to speak up. Please don't hesitate to reach out for this.

Should you have any additional questions or wish to reach me, please feel free to contact me at 206.658–4380 or burt@hydrovolts.com.

Sincerely,

BURT HAMNER,
CEO, Hydrovolts, Inc.

PUBLIC UTILITY DISTRICT NO. 1
OF CHELAN COUNTY,
Wenatchee, WA, July 5, 2012.

Hon. CATHY MCMORRIS RODGERS,
Washington, DC.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE MCMORRIS RODGERS: On behalf of Chelan County PUD, I would like to thank you for sponsoring H.R. 5892, the Hydropower Regulatory Efficiency Act of 2012. Your leadership in recognizing the importance of hydropower's renewable character and economic contributions is very much appreciated. As a large hydropower generator in north central Washington State, Chelan PUD and our customers benefit significantly from this clean source of electric generation. We believe hydropower is a critical and under-appreciated resource in our nation's electric generation mix.

We are encouraged that H.R. 5892 will help facilitate hydropower development by addressing regulatory barriers for small hydropower and conduit hydropower, projects at non-powered dams, and closed loop pumped storage. These efforts are an important step in increasing generation from renewable hydropower and better-utilizing existing infrastructure. We also agree that studying the potential for pumped storage to support integration of intermittent renewable generation will be helpful as the Northwest and other regions work to integrate increasing amounts of wind into the electric grid.

Overall, we are hopeful that your legislative efforts will bring needed recognition and appreciation for the contributions of hydropower to our nation's electric generation mix. We thank you for your hard work and dedication to this issue.

Sincerely,

JOHN JANNEY,
General Manager.

GRANT COUNTY, Public Utility District, Excellence in Service and Leadership,
Ephrata, Washington, July 5, 2012.

Hon. CATHY MCMORRIS RODGERS,
House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR CONGRESSWOMAN MCMORRIS RODGERS: Grant County Public Utility District (Grant PUD) applauds your extraordinary leadership in Congress to increase our nation's renewable hydropower capacity and expand American jobs and economic opportunities throughout the United States.

Grant PUD strongly supports your bi-partisan legislation—H.R. 5892, the Hydropower Regulatory Efficiency Act of 2012. We are pleased that this bi-partisan bill, introduced by yourself and Rep. Diana DeGette (D–CO), is scheduled for passage by the U.S. House of Representatives on July 9, 2012. Grant PUD believes it will foster significant growth of sustainable hydropower development that will strengthen our domestic economy, environment and renewable energy supplies.

We also commend the many additional co-sponsors of this legislation, which include:

Rep. John Dingell (D–MI)
Rep. Cory Gardner (R–CO)
Rep. Robert Latta (R–OH)
Rep. Ben Luján (D–NM)
Rep. Ed Markey (D–MA)
Rep. Jim Matheson (D–UT)
Rep. Todd Platts (R–PA)
Rep. Lamar Smith (R–TX)
Rep. Lee Terry (R–NE)
Rep. Greg Walden (R–OR)

Hydropower is a reliable, available, affordable and renewable energy resource. H.R. 5892 reminds us that hydropower has much more to offer and must play a key role in any ''all-of-the-above'' energy strategy. Think about this one statistic: Of the 80,000 dams across the United States, just three percent (3%) are utilized to generate hydroelectricity. Just three percent! This legislation puts America on a path to tap this available infrastructure, support our environment and employ hundreds of thousands of American workers.

According to the Department of Energy, 12,000 megawatts (MW) of new hydropower capacity could be developed at existing dams that currently do not generate electricity. This would increase U.S. hydropower capacity by 15 percent without building any new dams. That is enough energy to serve 4.5 million residential customers.

Grant PUD strongly supports the Hydropower Regulatory Efficiency Act of 2012, which also enjoys broad public support from American Rivers to the National Hydropower Association.

We appreciate your leadership on national energy issues and stand ready to assist you and the bill's numerous co-sponsors in promoting hydropower as a reliable, available, affordable and sustainable source of renewable electricity that will protect our environment and expand American job opportunities.

Sincerely,

ANDREW D. MUNRO,
Grant PUD—Director, Customer Service Division, and Past President, National Hydropower Association.

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

I'm proud to stand here today with my Western colleague, Mrs. MCMORRIS RODGERS, to speak in support of the Hydropower Regulatory Efficiency Act, H.R. 5892. Both of us realize how important hydropower is towards our country and towards energy independence. It's the largest source of renewable energy in America today, but, as Mrs. MCMORRIS RODGERS said, it's only 3 percent of our Nation's dams that are producing this power.

The Hydropower Regulatory Efficiency Act will enable increased electricity production from clean domestic energy sources by removing roadblocks to new hydropower projects. This legislation will create smarter and more efficient permitting processes for hydropower projects across the Nation by easing the licensing requirements for small hydroelectric projects.

In particular, the bill will allow the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission to extend preliminary permits for those projects that had been conducted responsibly and to expand the number of hydropower projects that are exempt from FERC licensing requirements. The bill also directs FERC and the Secretary of Energy to perform studies that will reveal new potential for hydropower production and to increase grid reliability. This legislation will promote growth in our hydropower industry and it will create new jobs.

Since my colleague, Mrs. MCMORRIS RODGERS, and I began crafting this bill in December of last year, it has advanced with strong bipartisan support every step of the way. This is a testament both to the substance of the bill and to the spirit of everybody who contributed to the process. Members, staff, and stakeholders negotiated constructively and openly to produce this legislation. It's important for us to realize that even in these politically charged times, such collaboration is possible and necessary for us to fulfill our commitment to the American public.

I want to thank my colleague across the aisle for her hard work on this bill, and I also want to acknowledge Ranking Member WAXMAN and Chairman UPTON on the Energy and Commerce Committee for their support throughout the process.

H.R. 5892 will expand our potential to advance clean energy production and create jobs. I urge all Members to vote for this bill.

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

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentlewoman from Washington (Mrs. MCMORRIS RODGERS) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 5892.

The question was taken.

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess until approximately 6:30 p.m. today.

Accordingly (at 5 p.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1830

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN of California) at 6 o'clock and 30 minutes p.m.

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. 4155; H.R. 4367; and H.R. 5892, in each case 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.

VETERAN SKILLS TO JOBS ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 4155) to direct the head of each Federal department and agency to treat relevant military training as sufficient to satisfy training or certification requirements for Federal licenses, 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. CHAFFETZ) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, as amended.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 369, nays 0, not voting 62, as follows:

[Roll No. 452]

YEAS—369

Ackerman
Adams
Aderholt
Alexander
Altmire
Amash
Amodei
Andrews
Baca
Bachmann
Bachus
Baldwin
Barber
Barletta
Barrow
Bartlett
Barton (TX)
Bass (CA)
Bass (NH)
Becerra
Berg
Berkley
Berman
Biggert
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Bono Mack
Boren
Boswell
Boustany
Brady (PA)
Brady (TX)
Braley (IA)
Broun (GA)
Brown (FL)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Buerkle
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Calvert
Camp
Canseco
Cantor
Capito
Capps
Capuano
Carnahan
Carney
Carson (IN)
Castor (FL)
Chabot
Chaffetz
Chu
Cicilline
Clarke (MI)
Clay
Clyburn
Coffman (CO)
Cohen
Cole
Conaway
Connolly (VA)
Cooper
Costa
Costello
Courtney
Cravaack
Crawford
Crenshaw
Critz
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
Davis (KY)
DeFazio
DeGette
DeLauro
Denham
Dent
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Dold
Donnelly (IN)
Doyle
Dreier
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Edwards
Ellmers
Emerson
Engel
Eshoo
Farr
Fattah
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Fudge
Gallegly
Garamendi
Gardner
Garrett
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gibson
Gohmert
Gonzalez
Goodlatte
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Green, Gene
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Grijalva
Grimm
Guinta
Guthrie
Hahn
Hall
Hanabusa
Hanna
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Hayworth
Heck
Heinrich
Hensarling
Herger
Herrera Beutler
Higgins
Himes
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hochul
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hoyer
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt
Israel
Issa
Jenkins
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Jordan
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly
Kildee
Kind
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kinzinger (IL)
Kissell
Kline
Kucinich
Labrador
Lamborn
Lance
Langevin
Lankford
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latham
LaTourette
Latta
Levin
Lewis (GA)
LoBiondo
Loebsack
Lofgren, Zoe
Long
Lowey
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Luján
Lummis
Lungren, Daniel E.
Mack
Maloney
Marchant
Marino
Markey
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (CA)
McCarthy (NY)
McCaul
McClintock
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McHenry
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
McNerney
Meehan
Mica
Michaud
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller (NC)
Miller, Gary
Moore
Moran
Mulvaney
Murphy (PA)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neugebauer
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Nunnelee
Olver
Owens
Palazzo
Pallone
Pastor (AZ)
Paulsen
Pearce
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peterson
Petri
Pingree (ME)
Pitts
Platts
Poe (TX)
Polis
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Price (NC)
Quayle
Quigley
Rahall
Rangel
Reed
Rehberg
Reichert
Renacci
Reyes
Ribble
Richardson
Richmond
Rigell
Rivera
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rokita
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross (AR)
Ross (FL)
Rothman (NJ)
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Runyan
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Scalise
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schilling
Schrader
Schwartz
Schweikert
Scott (SC)
Scott, Austin
Scott, David
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sessions
Sewell
Sherman
Shimkus
Shuster
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Southerland
Speier
Stark
Stearns
Stivers
Sullivan
Sutton
Terry
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tierney
Tipton
Tonko
Towns
Tsongas
Turner (NY)
Turner (OH)
Upton
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walberg
Walden
Walsh (IL)
Walz (MN)
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watt
Waxman
Webster
Welch
West
Westmoreland
Wilson (FL)
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Woodall
Woolsey
Yarmuth
Yoder
Young (FL)
Young (IN)

NOT VOTING—62

Akin
Austria
Benishek
Bonner
Brooks
Butterfield
Campbell
Cardoza
Carter
Cassidy
Chandler
Clarke (NY)
Cleaver
Coble
Conyers
Culberson
DesJarlais
Deutch
Diaz-Balart
Ellison
Farenthold
Filner
Flake
Fleischmann
Frank (MA)
Gingrey (GA)
Gosar
Green, Al
Gutierrez
Hirono
Jackson (IL)
Jackson Lee (TX)
Johnson (IL)
Landry
Lee (CA)
Lewis (CA)
Lipinski
Lynch
Manzullo
Meeks
Miller, George
Murphy (CT)
Myrick
Neal
Olson
Pascrell
Paul
Pence
Peters
Rohrabacher
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (WI)
Schmidt
Schock
Scott (VA)
Shuler
Simpson
Stutzman
Whitfield
Wilson (SC)
Young (AK)

□ 1855

Mr. MCDERMOTT, Ms. WOOLSEY, and Mr. ALTMIRE changed their vote from "nay" to "yea."

So (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated for:

Mr. LYNCH. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall vote 452, the vote for H.R. 4155, the Veteran Skills to Job Act, had I been able to vote, I would have voted "aye."

Mr. FILNER. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall 452, I was away from the Capitol due to prior commitments to my constituents. Had I been present, I would have voted "aye."

Mr. CASSIDY. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 452 I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted "aye."

ELECTRONIC FUND TRANSFER ACT AMENDMENT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 4367) to amend the Electronic Fund Transfer Act to limit the fee disclosure requirement for an automatic teller machine to the screen of that machine, 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 Missouri (Mr. LUETKEMEYER) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill.

This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 371, nays 0, not voting 60, as follows:

[Roll No. 453]

YEAS—371

Ackerman
Adams
Aderholt
Alexander
Altmire
Amash
Amodei
Andrews
Baca

Bachmann
Bachus
Baldwin
Barber
Barletta
Barrow
Bartlett
Barton (TX)
Bass (CA)
Bass (NH)
Becerra
Berg
Berkley
Berman
Biggert
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop (NY)
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Bono Mack
Boren
Boswell
Boustany
Brady (PA)
Brady (TX)
Braley (IA)
Broun (GA)
Brown (FL)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Buerkle
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Calvert
Camp
Canseco
Cantor
Capito
Capps
Capuano
Carnahan
Carney
Carson (IN)
Cassidy
Castor (FL)
Chabot
Chaffetz
Chu
Cicilline
Clarke (MI)
Clay
Clyburn
Coffman (CO)
Cohen
Cole
Conaway
Connolly (VA)
Cooper
Costa
Costello
Courtney
Cravaack
Crawford
Crenshaw
Critz
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
Davis (KY)
DeFazio
DeGette
DeLauro
Denham
Dent
Diaz-Balart
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Dold
Donnelly (IN)
Doyle
Dreier
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellmers
Emerson
Engel
Eshoo
Farr
Fattah
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Fudge
Gallegly
Garamendi
Gardner
Garrett
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gibson
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Gonzalez
Goodlatte
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Green, Gene
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Grijalva
Grimm
Guinta
Guthrie
Hahn
Hall
Hanabusa
Hanna
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Hayworth
Heck
Heinrich
Hensarling
Herger
Herrera Beutler
Higgins
Himes
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hochul
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hoyer
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt
Israel
Issa
Jenkins
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Jordan
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly
Kildee
Kind
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kinzinger (IL)
Kissell
Kline
Kucinich
Labrador
Lamborn
Lance
Langevin
Lankford
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latham
LaTourette
Latta
Levin
Lewis (GA)
LoBiondo
Loebsack
Lofgren, Zoe
Long
Lowey
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Luján
Lummis
Lungren, Daniel E.
Mack
Maloney
Marchant
Marino
Markey
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (CA)
McCarthy (NY)
McCaul
McClintock
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McHenry
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
McNerney
Meehan
Mica
Michaud
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller (NC)
Miller, Gary
Moore
Moran
Mulvaney
Murphy (PA)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neugebauer
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Nunnelee
Olver
Owens
Palazzo
Pallone
Pastor (AZ)
Paulsen
Pearce
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peterson
Petri
Pingree (ME)
Pitts
Platts
Poe (TX)
Polis
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Price (NC)
Quayle
Quigley
Rahall
Rangel
Reed
Rehberg
Reichert
Renacci
Reyes
Ribble
Richardson
Richmond
Rigell
Rivera
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rokita
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross (AR)
Ross (FL)
Rothman (NJ)
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Runyan
Ryan (OH)
Ryan (WI)
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Scalise
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schilling
Schrader
Schwartz
Schweikert
Scott (SC)
Scott, Austin
Scott, David
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sessions
Sewell
Sherman
Shimkus
Shuster
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Southerland
Speier
Stark
Stearns
Stivers
Sullivan
Sutton
Terry
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tierney
Tipton
Tonko
Towns
Tsongas
Turner (NY)
Turner (OH)
Upton
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walberg
Walden
Walsh (IL)
Walz (MN)
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watt
Waxman
Webster
Welch
West
Westmoreland
Wilson (FL)
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Woodall
Woolsey
Yarmuth
Yoder
Young (FL)
Young (IN)

NOT VOTING—60

Akin
Austria
Benishek
Bishop (GA)
Bonner
Brooks
Butterfield
Campbell
Cardoza
Carter
Chandler
Clarke (NY)
Cleaver
Coble
Conyers
Culberson
DesJarlais
Deutch
Edwards
Ellison
Farenthold
Filner
Flake
Fleischmann
Frank (MA)
Gosar
Green, Al
Gutierrez
Hirono
Jackson (IL)
Jackson Lee (TX)
Johnson (IL)
Landry
Lee (CA)
Lewis (CA)
Lipinski
Lynch
Manzullo
Meeks
Miller, George
Murphy (CT)
Myrick
Neal
Olson
Pascrell
Paul
Pence
Peters
Rohrabacher
Ruppersberger
Rush
Sánchez, Linda T.
Schmidt
Schock
Scott (VA)
Shuler
Simpson
Stutzman
Whitfield
Young (AK)

□ 1902

So (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated for:

Mr. FILNER. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall 453, I was away from the Capitol due to prior commitments to my constituents. Had I been present, I would have voted "aye."

HYDROPOWER REGULATORY EFFICIENCY ACT OF 2012

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 5892) to improve hydropower, and for other purposes, 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 gentlewoman from Washington (Mrs. MCMORRIS RODGERS) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill.

This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 372, nays 0, not voting 59, as follows:

[Roll No. 454]

YEAS—372

Ackerman
Adams
Aderholt
Alexander
Altmire
Amash
Amodei
Andrews
Baca
Bachmann
Bachus
Baldwin
Barber
Barletta
Barrow
Bartlett
Barton (TX)
Bass (CA)
Bass (NH)
Becerra
Berg
Berkley
Berman
Biggert
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Bono Mack
Boren
Boswell
Boustany
Brady (PA)
Brady (TX)
Braley (IA)
Broun (GA)
Brown (FL)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Buerkle
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Calvert
Camp
Canseco
Cantor
Capito
Capps
Capuano
Carnahan
Carney
Carson (IN)
Cassidy
Castor (FL)
Chabot
Chaffetz
Chu
Cicilline
Clarke (MI)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Clyburn
Coffman (CO)
Cohen
Cole
Conaway
Connolly (VA)
Cooper
Costa
Costello
Courtney
Crawford
Crenshaw
Critz
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
Davis (KY)
DeFazio
DeGette
DeLauro
Denham
Dent
Diaz-Balart
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Dold
Donnelly (IN)
Doyle
Dreier
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Edwards
Ellmers
Emerson
Engel
Eshoo
Farr
Fattah
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Fudge
Gallegly
Garamendi
Gardner
Garrett
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gibson
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Gonzalez
Goodlatte
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Green, Gene
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Grijalva
Grimm
Guinta
Guthrie
Hahn
Hall
Hanabusa
Hanna
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Hayworth
Heck
Heinrich
Hensarling
Herger
Herrera Beutler
Higgins
Himes
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hochul
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hoyer
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hurt
Israel
Issa
Jenkins
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Jordan
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly
Kildee
Kind
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kinzinger (IL)
Kissell
Kline
Kucinich
Labrador
Lamborn
Lance
Langevin
Lankford
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latham
LaTourette
Latta
Levin
Lewis (GA)
LoBiondo
Loebsack
Lofgren, Zoe
Long
Lowey
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Luján
Lummis
Lungren, Daniel E.
Mack
Maloney
Marchant
Marino
Markey
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (CA)
McCarthy (NY)
McClintock
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McHenry
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
McNerney
Meehan
Mica
Michaud
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller (NC)
Miller, Gary
Moore
Moran
Mulvaney
Murphy (PA)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neugebauer
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Nunnelee
Olver
Owens
Palazzo
Pallone
Pastor (AZ)
Paulsen
Pearce
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peterson
Petri
Pingree (ME)
Pitts
Platts
Poe (TX)
Polis
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Price (NC)
Quayle
Quigley
Rahall
Rangel
Reed
Rehberg
Reichert
Renacci
Reyes
Ribble
Richardson
Richmond
Rigell
Rivera
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rokita
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross (AR)
Ross (FL)
Rothman (NJ)
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Runyan
Ryan (OH)
Ryan (WI)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Scalise
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schilling
Schrader
Schwartz
Schweikert

Scott (SC)
Scott, Austin
Scott, David
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sessions
Sewell
Sherman
Shimkus
Shuster
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Southerland
Speier
Stark
Stearns
Stivers
Sullivan
Sutton
Terry
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tierney
Tipton
Tonko
Towns
Tsongas
Turner (NY)
Turner (OH)
Upton
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walberg
Walden
Walsh (IL)
Walz (MN)
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watt
Waxman
Webster
Welch
West
Westmoreland
Wilson (FL)
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Woodall
Woolsey
Yarmuth
Yoder
Young (FL)
Young (IN)

NOT VOTING—59

Akin
Austria
Benishek
Bonner
Brooks
Butterfield
Campbell
Cardoza
Carter
Chandler
Cleaver
Coble
Conyers
Cravaack
Culberson
DesJarlais
Deutch
Ellison
Farenthold
Filner
Flake
Fleischmann
Frank (MA)
Gosar
Green, Al
Gutierrez
Hirono
Hunter
Jackson (IL)
Jackson Lee (TX)
Johnson (IL)
Landry
Lee (CA)
Lewis (CA)
Lipinski
Lynch
Manzullo
McCaul
Meeks
Miller, George
Murphy (CT)
Myrick
Neal
Olson
Pascrell
Paul
Pence
Peters
Rohrabacher
Ruppersberger
Rush
Schmidt
Schock
Scott (VA)
Shuler
Simpson
Stutzman
Whitfield
Young (AK)

□ 1909

So (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated for:

Mr. FILNER. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall 454, I was away from the Capitol due to prior commitments to my constituents. Had I been present, I would have voted "aye."

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. JOHNSON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, on Monday, July 9, 2012 I had a meeting regarding environmental matters in Champaign, Illinois. Had I been in Washington, I would have voted "aye" on H.R. 4155 the Veteran Skills to Jobs Act, H.R. 4367 to amend the Electronic Fund Transfer Act to limit the fee disclosure requirement for an automatic teller machine to the screen of that machine, and H.R. 5892 the Hydropower Regulatory Efficiency Act of 2012.

Again, had I been present, I would have voted "aye" on the above stated resolutions.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. PASCRELL. Mr. Speaker, on July 9, 2012, I missed the following rollcall votes of the day.

Had I been present I would have voted

1. Yes rollcall vote No. 452 H.R. 4155—Veteran Skills to Jobs Act

2. Yes rollcall vote No. 453. H.R. 4367—To amend the Electronic Fund Transfer Act to limit the fee disclosure requirement for an automatic teller machine to the screen of that machine

3. Yes rollcall vote No. 454 H.R. 5892—Hydropower Regulatory Efficiency Act of 2012

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, this evening, I was called away on personal business. I regret that I was not present to vote on H.R. 4155, H.R. 4367, and H.R. 5892. Had I been present, I would have voted "yea" on these bills.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. DESJARLAIS. Mr. Speaker, due to airplane maintenance issues affecting flight schedules, my arrival into Washington was delayed this evening. I was unable to cast a vote on rollcall votes No. 1452 (H.R. 4155), No. (H.R. 4367), and No. 454 (H.R. 5892). Had I been present, I would have voted aye on each of those votes.

REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBER AS COSPONSOR OF H.R. 3798

Mr. WEST. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to remove myself as a cosponsor of H.R. 3798, the Egg Products Inspection Act.

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

There was no objection.

FORMER CHARLESTON NAVAL BASE LAND EXCHANGE ACT OF 2012

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (S. 2061) to provide for an exchange of land between the Department of Homeland Security and the South Carolina State Ports Authority.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

S. 2061

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 "Former Charleston Naval Base Land Exchange Act of 2012".

SEC. 2. DEFINITIONS.

In this Act:

(1) FEDERAL LAND.—The term "Federal land" means the parcels consisting of approximately 10.499 acres of land (including improvements) that are owned by the United States, located on the former U.S. Naval Base Complex in North Charleston, South Carolina, and included within the Charleston County Tax Assessor's Office Tax Map Number 400–00–00–004, and shown as New Parcel B in that certain plat of Forsberg Engineering and Surveying Inc., dated May 25, 2007, entitled in part "Plat Showing the Subdivision of TMS 400–00–00–004 into Parcel B and Remaining Residual (Parcel A).

(2) NON-FEDERAL LAND.—The term "non-Federal land" means the 3 parcels of land (including improvements) authorized to be conveyed to the United States under this Act.

(3) SECRETARY.—The term "Secretary" means the Secretary of Homeland Security.

(4) STATE PORTS AUTHORITY.—The term "State Ports Authority" means the South Carolina State Ports Authority, an agency of the State of South Carolina.

SEC. 3. LAND EXCHANGE.

(a) LAND EXCHANGE.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—In exchange for the conveyance to the Secretary, by quitclaim deed, of all right, title, and interest of the State Ports Authority to the non-Federal land owned by the State Ports Authority, the Secretary is authorized to convey to the State Ports Authority, by quitclaim deed, all right, title, and interest of the United States in and to the Federal land.

(2) EXCHANGE.—If the State Ports Authority offers to convey to the Secretary all right, title, and interest of the State Ports Authority in and to the non-Federal parcels identified in subsection (b), the Secretary—

(A) is authorized to accept the offer; and

(B) on acceptance of the offer, shall simultaneously convey to the State Ports Authority all right, title, and interest of the United States in and to approximately 10.499 acres of Federal land.

(b) NON-FEDERAL LAND DESCRIBED.—The non-Federal land (including improvements) to be conveyed under this section consists of—

(1) the approximately 18.736 acres of land that is owned by the State Ports Authority, located on S. Hobson Avenue, and currently depicted in the Charleston County Tax Assessor's Office as Tax Map Number 400–00–00–158, and as New I–48.55 Parcel B, containing 18.736 acres, on the plat recorded in the Charleston County RMC Office in Plat Book EL, at page 280;

(2) the approximately 4.069 acres of land that is owned by the State Ports Authority, located on Thompson Avenue and the Cooper River, and currently depicted in the Charleston County Tax Assessor's Office as Tax Map Number 400–00–00–156, and as New II–121.44 Parcel C, containing 4.069 acres, on the plat recorded in the Charleston County RMC Office in Plat Book L09, at pages 0391–393; and

(3) the approximately 2.568 acres of land that is owned by the State Ports Authority, located on Partridge Avenue, and currently depicted in the Charleston County Tax Assessor's Office as Tax Map Number 400–00–00–157, and as New II–121.44 Parcel B, containing 2.568 acres, on the plat recorded in the Charleston County RMC Office in Plat Book L09, at pages 0391–0393.

(c) LAND TITLE.—Title to the non-Federal land conveyed to the Secretary under this section shall—

(1) be acceptable to the Secretary; and

(2) conform to the title approval standards of the Attorney General of the United States applicable to land acquisitions by the Federal Government.

SEC. 4. EXCHANGE TERMS AND CONDITIONS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The conveyance of Federal land under section 3 shall be subject to—

(1) any valid existing rights; and

(2) any additional terms and conditions that the Secretary determines to be appropriate to protect the interests of the United States.

(b) COSTS.—The costs of carrying out the exchange of land under section 3 shall be shared equally by the Secretary and the State Ports Authority.

(c) EQUAL VALUE EXCHANGE.—Notwithstanding the appraised value of the land exchanged under section 3, the values of the Federal and non-Federal land in the land exchange under section 3 shall be considered to be equal.

SEC. 5. BOUNDARY ADJUSTMENT.

On acceptance of title to the non-Federal land by the Secretary—

(1) the non-Federal land shall be added to and administered as part of the Federal Law Enforcement Training Center; and

(2) the boundaries of the Federal Law Enforcement Training Center shall be adjusted to exclude the exchanged Federal land.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. DOLD). Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. SMITH) and the gentlewoman from California (Ms. CHU) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and to include extraneous materials on S. 2061 currently under consideration.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, this legislation authorizes the Secretary of the Department of Homeland Security to transfer property located in South Carolina and owned by the United States in exchange for property owned by the South Carolina State Ports Authority.

The Department will acquire land that is important to the continued operation and development of the Federal Law Enforcement Training Center's maritime academy. The State of South Carolina will acquire land that will allow the South Carolina State Ports Authority to develop an access road to Interstate 26.

This exchange would have already occurred, but the Department of Homeland Security Secretary lacked the authority to engage in the transfer of real property. This bill gives the Secretary the necessary authority to facilitate this transaction. This is a commonsense solution that will benefit both the State of South Carolina and the United States.

This bill and the underlying land exchange is supported by the Governor of South Carolina, the South Carolina State Ports Authority, and the Secretary of the U.S. Department of Homeland Security. The Senate passed this bill by unanimous consent last month.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support this bipartisan legislation, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. CHU. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of Senate 2061, the Former Charleston Naval Base Land Exchange Act of 2012. This bill authorizes the Secretary of Department of Homeland Security to convey a parcel of Federal land in North Charleston, South Carolina, to the South Carolina State Ports Authority in exchange for specified lands owned by the Ports Authority.

The land to be transferred by the Department of Homeland Security formerly comprised a portion of the Charleston Naval Base but is now vacant. DHS currently leases the land it plans to acquire in this transfer and uses it to house some of the operations of the Federal Law Enforcement Training Center also known as FLETC.

The Charleston Harbor area includes the fourth busiest international container shipping port in the United States, with one passenger and four container port terminals, as well as numerous privately held terminals. The waterways in this area contain shipping channels, rivers, bays, creeks, streams, the Intracoastal Waterway, and the Atlantic Ocean. These waterways provide a realistic training environment for FLETC's Maritime Law Enforcement and Port Security students.

Specifically, the FLETC Charleston facility is one of Charleston's three residential training centers and includes a variety of specialized capabilities for maritime law enforcement and port security training. The facilities include four deepwater piers for large commercial or military vessels and three sets of floating docks for smaller vessels.

Students at the FLETC Charleston facility engage in programs such as commercial vessel, boarding, training, maritime tactical operations training, and seaport security antiterrorism training. All of these programs are critical to protecting our Nation from the potential of a variety of criminal and terrorist threats.

By allowing a mutually beneficial transfer of the lands between the Port Authority and DHS, we are advancing the important mission of the FLETC.

I urge my colleagues to support Senate 2061, which the Senate has already adopted, so that it may become law.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. SMITH) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, S. 2061.

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.

□ 1920

THE LATEST IN A SERIES OF ATTACKS ON WOMEN'S REPRODUCTIVE HEALTH

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

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, the House just won't let up on American women. Tomorrow features a committee markup to deprive women of their constitutional right to an abortion. The bill picks on D.C. women because Republicans don't have the nerve to introduce this frontal attack on Roe v. Wade as a nationwide bill. But they make no secret of their purpose. They have already gotten several conservative States to pass similar laws and they seek a Federal precedent. But they can't get a legitimate one.

Women will easily see a House-only bill based on bogus science and limited to D.C. for what it is: The latest in a series of attacks on women's reproductive health this term.

CONGRESSIONAL BLACK CAUCUS HOUR

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 5, 2011, the gentlewoman from the Virgin Islands (Mrs. CHRISTENSEN) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mrs. CHRISTENSEN. I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks in accordance with the subject of the Special Order this evening.

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

There was no objection.

Mrs. CHRISTENSEN. I want to, again, begin by thanking the Democratic leader for giving the Congressional Black Caucus this time to focus on health care reform specifically, especially as the House is preparing to continue their attempts to repeal what we know is a good bill and a needed bill in this country.

Before I begin to yield time, I just want to recognize the 103rd anniversary of the NAACP. They have long been premier champions of health care and fought for health care as a right. They are committed to eliminating the racial and ethnic disparities in our health care system that plague people of color in the United States. Their 880 Campaign is based on the fact that over the past decade, because we have not eliminated health disparities, over 880,000 African Americans and other people of color have died premature deaths from preventable causes. That does not need to happen. So we continue that fight in health care reform. We have made great strides in it. And we look forward to implementing that law, despite the attempts to repeal today.

I want to congratulate the NAACP on their 103rd anniversary this evening, and I would like to yield such time as she may consume to the gentlelady from Texas, Congresswoman EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON.

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Thank you very much.

Two weeks ago, the United States Supreme Court justly and commendably upheld the Affordable Care Act, ensuring that millions of Americans will continue to have access to quality, affordable health care. Despite this monumental victory for our country, for the 31st time since its enactment, Republicans are attempting to repeal the health care law, treating it as if this is just some kind of political game played between the two parties.

While the Affordable Care Act will expand coverage for millions of Americans, many Texans will be denied access by their Governor. And I'm a Texan. Just today, Texas Governor Rick Perry announced his decision not to expand Medicaid or implement a State health exchange under the Affordable Care Act—nothing more than

politics. However, during his announcement, Governor Perry failed to provide an alternative plan to address the growing numbers of uninsured Texans. Texas has the highest percentage of adults without health care insurance, and rejecting Federal Medicaid funds would only worsen this predicament for Texans. Without the Affordable Care Act, millions of uninsured Americans will continue to seek primary care in our Nation's overcrowded emergency rooms, leaving taxpayers to pay the tab, if they own property. As a nonpracticing registered nurse, I am all too familiar with this scenario, which has placed a huge burden on our Nation's hospital systems.

Mr. Speaker, this week's GOP messaging vote to repeal is nothing more than political warfare in an election year. Instead of bringing job-creating bills to the floor, Republican leadership insists on wasting taxpayer dollars by debating a law which has been firmly upheld by the Nation's highest court. While the Republicans have introduced numerous measures to undermine and repeal the Affordable Care Act, they have repeatedly failed to introduce one piece of legislation which could serve as a viable alternative to the health care law.

I urge my colleagues to reject this effort to take away patient protections for Americans. Instead, for once, let partisan politics come in second and let the American people win this one.

Mrs. CHRISTENSEN. Thank you, Congressman JOHNSON. Thank you for beginning to lay out the issue before us this evening, as we know that we've done landmark legislation in passing the Affordable Care Act. It is now settled law and the Supreme Court has ruled and we have a lot of other work that the American people need us to do.

At this time I would like to yield such time as she may consume to the gentlelady from Florida, Congresswoman CORRINE BROWN.

Ms. BROWN of Florida. Thank you very much for leading this discussion on health care.

You can fool some of the people some of the time, but you can't fool all of the people all of the time. And as we begin to discuss repealing the health care law tomorrow, I would like to discuss just how exactly the Affordable Care Act benefits all Americans. Although not a perfect bill—and I've been elected in Congress for 20 years and I've never seen a perfect bill, but a perfect beginning. And the reason why it's not perfect is because you make compromises throughout the process. This is a perfect start. Attempting to obtain universal health care has been a primary goal of every single President and Congress since the days of President Franklin Delano Roosevelt, who fought for quality access to health care and health care insurance reform for all Americans. And now, 75 years later after the Supreme Court ruling just over a week ago, our Nation has finally attained that goal. After 75 years, every single President has tried to implement some form of universal health care.

□ 1930

In fact, millions of Americans have already come to rely on the wide-ranging and lifesaving benefits of the Affordable Care Act. And let me say that as far as Obama health care is concerned, let me clear something up. It's President Barack Obama. And let me be clear, he does care. Let me say again, President Barack Obama does care. He cares deeply about the health and well-being of every American.

Before Congress passed the Affordable Care Act, nearly one in five citizens in the wealthiest country on Earth had little or no hope of affordable insurance or getting access to regular health care. And when fully implemented, the Affordable Care Act will cover an additional 30 million Americans and 3.8 million African Americans who otherwise would remain uninsured.

Already under the Affordable Care Act, 17 million children with preexisting conditions can no longer be denied coverage, 105 million Americans no longer have a lifetime limit on their coverage, 32 million seniors received free preventive care in 2011, 54 million Americans in private plans have received free preventive services, 6.6 million young adults up to the age of 26 have attained insurance through their parents' plan, 5.2 million seniors and disabled people saved an average of $704 each on prescription drugs, 360,000 small businesses received tax credits to help them afford coverage for 2 million workers, and 13 million families received insurance premium rebates averaging $151 in 2012.

In my congressional district of Florida, 6,900 young adults in the district will receive health care insurance, 6,200 seniors received prescription drug discounts worth $3.6 million, and the average savings is $600 per senior. And 20,000 children and 80,000 adults now have health care insurance that covers preventive services without co-pay, coinsurance, or deductibles.

Every American who has benefited from this needs to let their local Representatives, their Senator and their Governor know. We all have a dog in this fight.

The Republican Party is constantly complaining about a tax and how this law will raise taxes. But I'd like to reply to them the American taxpayers are already paying a hidden tax right now. Every single time one of the millions of our citizens who lacks health care insurance receives emergency care, that cost is passed on to paying customers through higher fees and premiums.

So the question is, how can we begin to bring our country's health care costs down? And this law is the first step in achieving this.

In closing, as I always say, you can fool some of the people some of the time, but you can't fool all of the people all of the time.

Mrs. CHRISTENSEN. I thank you, and I thank you for pointing out some of the benefits and the numbers of Americans who are enjoying those benefits already over these last 2 years. And those benefits, as you said, extend to all Americans, whether they live in Democratic districts or Republican districts. We want to make sure that people continue to be able to insure their children with preexisting disease, their young people up to age 26, to have our seniors and disabled and anyone who is insured be able to get that important preventive care without a co-pay, and begin to continue to strengthen the Medicare program as we have in the Affordable Care Act.

Ms. BROWN of Florida. I have one question before I leave. The question of tax penalty is a very debatable question. But my concern is anyone that has insurance is not affected, veterans are not affected.

Mrs. CHRISTENSEN. Absolutely.

Ms. BROWN of Florida. And you will not pay that penalty unless you do not—if you can afford it and you don't have it, then you're going to pay some minimum amount?

Mrs. CHRISTENSEN. Exactly.

Ms. BROWN of Florida. Can you explain that to people who are watching? Because, basically, it is just for those small, less than 1 percent, who do not try to get coverage.

Mrs. CHRISTENSEN. That's correct. And as you said, there is a hardship provision so that if people just cannot afford it and fall in the cracks between the Medicaid expansion and the exchange, they will not have to pay. And it will be a very small percentage, one or two percent, that CBO has said would actually end up paying the penalty, and it's a very small penalty. Yes, for administrative purposes, it's collected through the IRS; but it's a penalty. And very few people would have to pay it.

As you said also in your statement, we pay anyway. And we pay more on the other end for not having everyone insured.

Ms. BROWN of Florida. The question is if you go to the hospital—and I was on the plane with one of the business persons and he was talking about it, and I said, you know, you are already paying. If someone on this plane passes out, they're going to the hospital, they're going to service them, and it is called, what, cost shifting? So you are already paying the cost of the most expensive way to provide health care. And many people do it. They wait until Friday, 5 o'clock and they go to the emergency room, which is the most expensive way to provide it.

Mrs. CHRISTENSEN. People who are not insured, or even people who are underinsured or who have a high copay, they have not gone for preventive care. Now they can get it without a copay. And without that preventive care, they end up in the emergency rooms in

the hospital when the illness has worsened and the cost is more. We can prevent that by having everyone insured and having everyone have preventive care.

I know people are saying that we are not reducing costs. You can't reduce costs in the first couple of years. But if you look out that 10-year period and even in the 10 years past that, you will see in many ways that the cost will be reduced.

Ms. BROWN of Florida. Last question. These Governors, Texas you mentioned, Florida, these Governors are saying, we are not going to take advantage of the expansion. As a private citizen, what can I do? Because the President, just like the Governors, they can only propose. But the legislators are the ones that dispose. The President brought his proposal to Congress, but we had the ultimate decision as to what the final bill would look like. And that is as true in the State houses also.

Mrs. CHRISTENSEN. That is correct. And we will be working with our State legislatures to make sure that they understand what is at stake. And I'm sure that the voters in their districts who are already enjoying those benefits and who are looking forward to finally having insurance that they can afford for the first time will be talking to them about what they feel is important.

Ms. BROWN of Florida. Where are the health care providers and the people that provide the additional services? How should they weigh in?

Mrs. CHRISTENSEN. I'm going to read some statements from some of the primary care physicians at the end of this Special Order, but they're beginning to weigh in. And based on what I was reading today, they are weighing in pretty favorably. And they will benefit as well. It is change, and change is difficult no matter what. But they will benefit as well, and they are beginning to speak up.

Ms. BROWN of Florida. I want to thank you again for your leadership on this matter. You've worked throughout the process in keeping us informed. I think you're the only physician——

Mrs. CHRISTENSEN. I'm the first female physician. I'm the only physician in the CBC, but there are other physicians in Congress.

Ms. BROWN of Florida. I understand. But you are the only female physician in Congress.

Mrs. CHRISTENSEN. I was the first. We have one other elected in this Congress.

Ms. BROWN of Florida. Well, you are certainly mine, and I thank you for your leadership.

Mrs. CHRISTENSEN. Physicians and other providers, the thing that we don't talk about a lot is the jobs that will be created through this Affordable Care Act. We did finally pass a transportation bill, and thank God that will begin to create some jobs and save some jobs, but the health care reform bill is also a job-creating bill. It's projected it will create about 4 million jobs of all kinds over the 10-year period. So we've been creating jobs as well in the Affordable Care Act.

I would like to yield such time as she might consume to the gentlelady from Ohio, Congresswoman FUDGE.

Ms. FUDGE. Thank you so much. I thank you for yielding, and I thank the gentlelady for all of her work on the Affordable Care Act.

People seem to believe that this was something done in haste. They don't understand that for almost a year or more, people like you, people like members of the CBC worked very, very hard to make sure that we could come up with legislation that would be not only a good piece of legislation for the people of this country, but that would be something that would befit this Congress.

□ 1940

So I thank you for your work. You know that you have been our leader, especially with the CBC, but as well as in this House. You have been our leader on this, and I thank you for that.

Mr. Speaker, I join my colleagues to express my strong support of affordable health care for all Americans. The Supreme Court has spoken, upholding landmark legislation that ensures all Americans have access to affordable, quality health care.

Millions of Americans across the country are already realizing the benefits of the Affordable Care Act, and the numbers are impressive:

Eighty-six million Americans have received free preventive screenings, free physical exams, mammograms, and other cancer screenings;

Seventeen million children with preexisting conditions can no longer be denied coverage, and 6.6 million young adults now remain under their parents' insurance plan until the age of 26;

Seventy thousand previously uninsured Americans with preexisting conditions now have the security of coverage through the Pre-Existing Condition Insurance program.

The act pays for actual care—this is something that people don't understand. The act pays for actual care, not the overinflated salaries of CEOs and executives. As a result, 12.8 million Americans will receive more than $1.1 billion in rebates because their insurance companies spent too much of their premium dollars on administrative costs or CEO bonuses.

Let me repeat that in another way.

They are required to spend the bulk of your money—at least 80 percent—on actual care. If they don't spend it on actual care, then you are reimbursed, and that is what is happening. So now we are going to be rebated more than $1 billion.

Further, the law makes enormous headway toward closing the gap on health disparities—of which my colleague knows so much. It includes increased funding for community health centers, which are so often a critical part of the health safety net in underserved communities.

We should be focusing on creating jobs rather than voting to repeal a law that is estimated to provide health care coverage to up to 32 million Americans. The highest court in the land has ruled, and the American people won. Let's stop this foolishness and focus on jobs.

Mrs. CHRISTENSEN. Thank you.

Congresswoman FUDGE, you're right. This is not a win for Democrats. It's not a win for the President. This is a win for the American people.

Thank you for bringing up the rebates, the $1.1 billion in rebates. In addition to the rebates—because some insurance companies have spent over their 80 percent that has to be provided in service—the Secretary has been able, in at least 12 States already, to keep the increases in premiums at 10 percent or less. That's another function of the Affordable Care Act. And you know our constituents have been crying out over the increases in premiums that they've been experiencing every year, and now the Affordable Care Act gives the Secretary the authority to keep those premiums within not more than a 10 percent increase.

Ms. FUDGE. Thank you, and I thank you again for your service.

Mrs. CHRISTENSEN. Thank you.

So as my colleagues have all said, the Supreme Court has upheld the law. It is settled law. It's time for us to move on.

This is landmark legislation, landmark legislation like Social Security, Medicare, Medicaid, and SCHIP. We have a lot more work that the American people need us to do:

We need to continue the middle-income tax cuts.

We need to pass the American Jobs Act.

We need to continue to address the issue of the mortgages that are causing people to lose their homes. I was reading today in one of the papers that African Americans are expected to bear the burden of the mortgage fallout for many years to come, longer than everyone else.

And then we also have to implement the Affordable Care Act. We have the exchanges. I know there is a lot of talk about the exchanges and whether we'll be able to provide the subsidies, but what we ought to be doing is working together to make sure that that very important part of this law can be fully implemented.

We're talking about the working poor, people who are doing the right thing, being responsible, working and trying to take care of their families. It would be so unfair to them, now that they see within their reach affordable health care, to take that away. We're going to pay for it either now or we're going to pay for it later, as Congresswoman BROWN was saying. It's less to pay on this side and ensure that everyone has access to the services that they need to keep them healthy and to keep them from developing those catastrophic illnesses.

I want to talk a little bit about what the Congressional Black Caucus, the Congressional Hispanic Caucus, and the Congressional Asian American Caucus have done in crafting this health care bill.

Congresswoman FUDGE is right. We didn't start just before the bill was passed. We actually started before the debate began in the Congress. We developed benchmarks.

We call ourselves the Tri-Caucus.

We decided very early that insurance would never be enough for our communities that have been left out of the health care mainstream for so long and that health equity had to be a goal of any bill that we passed, so the Tri-Caucus worked together. We worked very hard. We met with House and Senate leadership. We met with the White House several times to ensure that the benchmarks that we set for our communities were going to be met, so that, really, this bill would provide access to quality health care for all Americans—not just a few, but for all Americans.

We hear a lot about the consumer protections:

The fact that children cannot be denied insurance if they have a preexisting disease, which is important to us;

The fact that our young people can stay on our insurance until 26 years old;

The fact that there are no lifetime and annual limits, and all of those important provisions that we hear about all of the time.

But I want to talk a little bit about some of the health equity provisions, because this bill prevents discrimination. It defines what a health disparity is and a health disparity population, and it makes sure that all of the research in the bill, all of the task forces, all of the institutes, the comparative effectiveness research, all of those include monitoring and having a goal of eliminating health disparities in their mandate. There are incentive payments to providers if they can demonstrate that they have eliminated health disparities.

Health disparities actually cost this Nation. In a study done by the Joint Center for Political and Economic Studies, they've shown where, just over a 3-year period, $1.24 trillion was lost in direct and indirect costs just because of health disparities.

We expanded, of course, the coverage in the consumer protections—Medicaid expansion, which we really urge all of the States to provide for their citizens who are at 133 percent or under the Federal poverty level.

The territories, despite the vote to repeal our funding, that funding still stands. My territory is enjoying a great increase in funding. We have not lifted the cap. We are not getting State-like treatment, but for the very first time, many of the territories may be able to cover at least up to 100 percent of the Federal poverty level with the substantial increases that the Affordable Care Act provided.

We also have limited funding to set up exchanges, and the consumer protections and capacity building grants applied to the territories, which really need them.

We included the Indian Health Improvement Act.

We expanded community health centers and school-based health centers within the bill.

We provide for community health worker grants. In communities that have not had the benefit of robust health care services, it's important that people that they trust in the community can help them understand this law and help to make that connection to the health services that will be provided. That's what the community health worker grants would do.

They have community transformation grants.

We tried to include a program that we've been working on called Health Empowerment Zones. We didn't quite get that, but we have funding for communities where those health services have not been available, to be able to prepare that community and to begin to build some infrastructure so that every community can have the benefits of this bill.

□ 1950

We mandated that not-for-profit hospitals create a community health needs assessment every 3 years, and we created a Community Preventive Services Task Force.

Having community-focused, community-developed, community-driven, community-implemented programs is where we're going to see the biggest improvement in health care, especially in communities of color and communities that are poor and our rural communities in our territory.

The bill ensures that Federal health care programs collect and report data on race, ethnicity, sex, primary language, and disability status. We address health care disparities in Medicaid and SCHIP by standardizing data collection requirements.

Again, in comparative effectiveness, we were able to make sure that that research will include racial and ethnic subgroups, women and people with comorbidities. We establish a National Health Care Workforce Commission that requires reporting. For the very first time in this country, we have a national strategy at prevention, and we have a national strategy to eliminate health disparities, for the very first time, all from the Affordable Care Act.

We increase the National Health Service Corps and loan repayment programs, expanded Centers of Excellence, and we made sure to invest in Historically Black Colleges and Universities and Minority-Serving Institutions.

We're going to have to greatly expand our health care workforce on all levels to take care of the 30-plus million new people who will be coming into the system, and we want to make sure that that workforce reflects the diversity of our country, and that the now underrepresented minorities have a chance to get some of those jobs and be able to provide some of those services for the communities that they come from.

We provide support for cultural competence training for health care professionals, grants to the health care workforce, to provide culturally and linguistically appropriate services. We require the dissemination of information adapted to a variety of cultural, linguistic, and educational backgrounds so that everyone can understand what it is we're trying to do and be able to access the services.

Mental health and substance abuse parity was included. We included dental services in the basic package for children. We would have wished that it could be in the basic package for all people, but we were able to get it in children.

We establish a prevention and public health fund, and I know the Republican leadership has been trying to repeal that fund, to deplete that fund, but this is an attempt to change the paradigm of how we deal with health care in this country, not to just be dealing with the acute, expensive, long-term care, but to focus on prevention. An ounce of prevention is still worth a pound of cure.

We strengthened and expanded the Office of Women's Health. We elevated the Office of Minority Health to the Office of the Secretary. We've created new Offices of Minority Health in the Food and Drug Administration, Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Service, SAMHSA, and other agencies where it's really critical that we have that input that really zeros in on the health care of the minorities who are the people who are really underserved and create some of the costs that we're trying to reduce. If we can take care of all of the people in this country, the costs will go down.

We elevated the Center on Minority and Health Disparities to a national institute at NIH, and they're doing great work with all of our universities across the country.

What we've come to understand is that when you're dealing with health, especially when you're looking from a community level, you can't just focus on disease. You have to look at the environment that people live in. And for the very first time we have a National Prevention, Health Promotion, and Public Health Council headed by our Surgeon General.

That council brings about 17 agencies of government together to plan and to look at the impact of their programs, policies, initiatives that help, and to really plan how we can create an environment in our communities and in our country that supports wellness and supports prevention and supports good health, so that people can walk in their neighborhoods, so that they could have fresh fruit and vegetables in their

neighborhoods and other things like that so we can deal with the obesity problem, so we can deal with smoking cessation, and all the things that contribute to poor health and really increase the costs. When we look at communities and focus on community prevention, that's where we're going to reduce the cost of health care.

So, I wanted to just say a word about Medicare because I am so tired of hearing about $500 billion taken out of—cut from Medicare. Now, that's a misinterpretation of what really happened. That $500 billion comes from cutting waste, fraud, and abuse in part.

I was reading in an article in the paper just today that Medicare could probably save $70 billion just in 1 year, in 2010, by really zeroing in on waste, fraud, and abuse and implementing some of the recommendations of the General Accountability Office—they could save $70 billion in 1 year. Multiply that by ten, I think it comes up to $700 billion, which is more than the $500 billion that the Republicans keep saying we took out of Medicare.

We didn't. We made payments fairer, remember, by making the payments more equitable across the board. So we may have lowered some of the reimbursement rates for Medicare Advantage, but we were able to still keep some of the better, more effective Medicare Advantage programs in place.

We began to close the doughnut hole. We took some of that money to close the doughnut hole so that over the 10-year period there will be no time that a senior or a person with disability will have to pay the full cost of their medication.

We are providing preventive care with no copayments and an annual physical exam with no copayment. And in addition to all of that, with that $500 billion, we extended the life of Medicare by 8 years.

So I just want to clear that up. We did not take $500 billion out of Medicare. We used it to reinvest into Medicare, to make it stronger, to provide more services and more benefits for the beneficiaries.

Of course, health care reform will take an investment, but it will reduce costs over time. We'll reduce disparities, we'll have better end-of-life care with planning by individuals and their families, we'll have that community-based prevention, obesity prevention, smoking cessation and health policy and every policy that I talked about. And all of that will reduce the cost of health care.

I just want to close by just reading a few statements from some physicians. I'm a primary care physician, a family physician myself. And Medscape today published an article from a primary care round table. And I know the doctors who spoke here said many, many things. I just want to quote a sentence or two from several of them.

Charles P. Vega, M.D. At the end of his statement he says:

> The Supreme Court decision breathes life into the health care reform movement at a critical time, and we need to take advantage of this fortune, not only to implement the most important parts of the Affordable Care Act, but also to start building towards the next logical steps in health care reform, beginning with an efficient public option that emphasizes smart, quality care.

And Dr. Robert W. Morrow says:

> And now we're in a regulatory space where the health of the public could take precedence over the profits of the commercial health plans. And why not?

Dr. Roy M. Poses, M.D., says of the Supreme Court ruling:

> The news is not bad. We're probably, on balance, somewhat better off with some health care insurance reform than none. However, we're still a long way from meaningfully addressing concentration and abuse of power in health care. There will be no rest for the weary bloggers of the Health Care Renewal.

Another doctor, Dr. Li, says:

> My take is that the plan is not as good as what's being touted by the left, but it's far better than what's being said by the right.

And Dr. Robert M. Centor says:

> Clearly, upholding the individual mandate allows the U.S. to approach universal health care. Universal health care is such a worthy goal that we must applaud this victory.

Dr. Mark Williams says:

> For me the Supreme Court ruling on the ACA implies at least a period of relative clarity and less uncertainty, despite much political rhetoric. In short, we now have some time for planning and innovation.

And he also says:

> Healthcare is too precious to be considered a business or a marketplace commodity. Whatever system we choose must commit itself to the needs of the population and the global community, not simply to our own personal needs. It must be based on needs and not simply on service expansion.

And lastly, from my own American Academy of Family Practice, they say:

> Having the mandate upheld is consistent with what has been AAFP policy for over 20 years. We have advocated for health care coverage for everyone and access to at least basic health services, including good primary care with prevention and chronic illness care. You can argue whether the mandate is the only means to get there, but at least in the analyses that I've seen, it was one of the best identified ways to get everyone covered.

And so, the American people, when you ask them about the different provisions of the law, an overwhelming majority really supports the provisions that we've been able to provide for them in health care reform.

□ 2000

Many physicians are touting the Supreme Court decision and the law. I think, if we can all forget about the political rhetoric of repeal and just work together to make sure that it's implemented in the best way possible, we will really be doing what the American people have sent us here to do.

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

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 6079, REPEAL OF OBAMACARE ACT

Mr. SESSIONS, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 112–587) on the resolution (H. Res. 724) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 6079) 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.

INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS AND BROKEN PROMISES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 5, 2011, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GOHMERT) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. GOHMERT. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

These can be the best of times and the worst of times. There is still so much potential. This country has so much in the way of assets. It is interesting to hear my friends across the aisle talk about the wonders of ObamaCare, but I know this President has said before: if you make more than $250,000, you won't ever have your taxes raised. I won't ever raise your taxes.

He has said it a lot of different ways. Yet, when I read his version of the American Jobs Act, which he, himself, pushed for, promulgated, demanded be passed, it actually raised taxes on everybody who made more than $125,000. So he broke the promise there.

In ObamaCare, it's very clear that, if you make just above the poverty line and if you can't afford the kind of Cadillac insurance that is demanded that you purchase, you're going to get hammered with a tax, and it will ultimately be 2½ percent in extra income tax. He basically has pushed through a bill that makes war with those who can least afford to buy health insurance—adding a 2½ percent tax to the people who are the most vulnerable and hardworking folks. They're just trying to get by, and they're going to have to pay an extra 2½ percent in income tax?

Now, the enlightened Chief Justice explains through pages 11 through 15 of his opinion that it's actually not a tax, that it's clearly a penalty because, if you don't buy the insurance at the high level the government will dictate, then it will be necessary for you to pay an extra hunk of income tax—those who are the hardworking, least able to afford it. I don't see how anybody can say, It's great, and a happy day for you.

If you go through the rest of his opinion, of course he says the Commerce Clause doesn't make the ObamaCare bill constitutional; but then he gets around to saying, Well, regardless of what Congress called it—you know,

they called it a penalty—we'll just say it's a penalty for the purposes of jurisdiction so that it allows us to take up the case; but for purposes of whether or not it's constitutional, we'll call it what it is—a tax. It's one of the worst decisions this Chief Justice has ever made, and it's one of the worst I've ever read—poorly written by a man who should have known better.

But this administration has broken so many promises. It had negotiations with Egyptian leader Mubarak. We are certainly ready to throw him under the bus just as they have our allies, the Northern Alliance, that successfully fought and defeated the Taliban within a matter of months with our assistance but with less than 500 U.S. military in country. Now, after the President added troops and we had over 100,000 troops, this administration is ready to turn the country over to President Karzai and the Taliban. The Taliban has been on national television, saying, Hey, obviously, by virtue of the Obama administration's begging us to come to the table, promising they'll release some of our murdering thugs from confinement and that they'll buy us first-class offices in Qatar, well, gee, it's obvious to the world, they've said, that the United States has lost the war in Afghanistan.

Congratulations, President Barack Obama, for making it clear to the Taliban that you have lost the war for us.

Now we are advised the President has invited Egypt's Islamist leader to the United States. Past administrations have recognized the Muslim Brotherhood's end goal of a giant, worldwide caliphate where we all fall prey under sharia law and where we all have freedom, but that freedom is to only worship Allah and where we have justice but that justice is only under sharia; and this administration is embracing them wholeheartedly.

In this article of July 8, Sunday, from Business and Financial News, it headlines: ''Obama Invites Egypt's Islamist Leader to U.S.'' It talks about how President Barack Obama has invited Egypt's newly elected Islamist President, Mohamed Morsi, to visit the United States in September.

It reads:

> Washington, long weary of Islamists and an ally of ousted President Hosni Mubarak, shifted policy last year to open formal contacts with the Muslim Brotherhood, the group behind Morsi's win.

It reads:

> Morsi formally resigned from the group after his victory, but nowhere is there an indication that Egypt's new President has disavowed the effort to make the United States, which they've called the Great Satan, subservient to sharia law.

In fact, as to the Egyptian Muslim Brotherhood's leader as posted yesterday in The Blaze:

> Egypt's Muslim Brotherhood chairman, Muhammad Badi, also known as the group's ''Supreme Guide''—this would be the Supreme Guide over the newly elected Egyptian leader—said last week that waging jihad against Israel is an imperative for every Muslim. Middle East watcher Raymond Ibrahim, who scours the Arabic press and translates it to English for Western eyes, posted this revelation on his blog.

Then it sets out this quote:

> According to last Thursday's edition of Al Wafd, during his weekly sermon, ''Muhammad Badi, the Muslim Brotherhood's Supreme Guide, confirmed the necessity for every Muslim to strive to save al-Quds—and that's Jerusalem—from the hands of the rapists—Israelis—and to cleanse Palestine from the clutches of the occupation, deeming this an individual duty for all Muslims.''

More specifically, he ''called on all Muslims to wage jihad with their money and their selves to free al-Quds''—or Jerusalem—the same, exact language one finds in al Qaeda's tracts.

□ 2010

The article goes on that earlier this year the Middle East Research Institute translated a sermon of bodies in which he called for ''gradually establishing a global Islamic caliphate leading to 'mastership of the world.' ''

''Mastership of the world'' is what's in quotes.

It is interesting, because it hasn't been that long ago. This was posted by my friend Patrick Poole, July 5, 2012. It says, ''Rewind—2010: Egypt's prez Morsi called for expulsion of U.S. ambassadors across Middle East.'' Patrick Poole says:

> While doing a bit of filing in the office yesterday, I came across a September 2010 Reuters article of more recent interest.
>
> You might recall that was the time when Terry Jones, in Florida, was threatening to burn a Koran on the 9/11 anniversary and had the whole Muslim world in an uproar—before he had even committed the act (which happened several months later).
>
> In the mere contemplation of such an action by Terry Jones, the Muslim Brotherhood was calling on all Muslim countries to expel all U.S. Ambassadors. And who was making this call?
>
> According to Reuters:
>
> Mohammad Mursi, spokesman for Egypt's influential Muslim Brotherhood, said the organization was calling for pressure on all Muslim governments to expel U.S. Ambassadors.

Yes, this is what we want to encourage, this type of leader. We want to tell the world by this President's open arms at the White House—not with the ill treatment previously of Prime Minister Netanyahu—but with open arms, a member of the Muslim Brotherhood who never disclaimed the desire to make us subservient to shari'a law, bringing him to the White House.

As some of us travel around and speak to different people around the world, those who are truly fighting for freedom—and not the freedom the Muslim Brotherhood talks about, where it is freedom only to worship Allah; freedom truly to make choices about who one worships or whether one worships at all. They say when the United States invites someone and shows hospitality to people in the world, the rest of the world gets the message that the conduct of those individuals they are inviting and embracing and having smiling pictures with, that their conduct is a good thing.

When this country's leaders embrace leaders of other countries, it tells the world this is what we think in America is the way to act, the way to be, the thing to do. That it is very deflating. Having talked to Iranian refuges in northern Iraq, they just get devastated when they see an American leader being so chummy with people they know embrace terrorism, that have no problem with terrorist activities to promote Islam spreading around the world.

This President should be far more careful about who he encourages and who he discourages, because the true friends of liberty around the world, who stood up to Syria's leader, they were not embraced by this President. There was no statement from this President of: Let's do for the protesters and the rebels in Syria what I demanded we did in Libya. There was nothing like that.

We've sent Secretary of State Clinton over to the Middle East. There have been statements that we don't like what you're doing, but nothing like what this White House did when they cut the legs out from Mubarak who at least tried to keep the peace with Israel to some extent and what he did in actually providing bombs and air cover to take out Qadhafi in Libya.

We knew at the time the Muslim Brotherhood will probably take over Egypt, that they have called us the great Satan. We knew in Libya that there were even al Qaeda who want to bring about this Nation's end violently, and yet this President embraced those al Qaeda rebels, along with the other rebels in Libya, dropped bombs, and provided air cover.

None of that has been done for Syria. It's a little bit strange because much of the world considers Syria's leader to be a mere puppet of the Iranian terrorist leaders. Certainly Russia, who has shown great hostility to some of the things we deem to be appropriate liberty, they embrace the actions of the Syrian leader.

Where was this President when there were true freedom seekers stepping up and being killed? Was he giving a pretty speech?

Another article that was in The Blaze, July 8, says:

> The Jerusalem Post explains:
>
> Washington, long wary of Islamists and a former ally of ousted President Hosni Mubarak, shifted policy last year to open formal contacts with the Muslim Brotherhood, the group behind Mursi's win.
>
> Mursi's success at the polls mirrors the rising influence of Islamists in countries across the Middle East and North Africa in the wake of revolts and protests against autocratic rulers who have led the region for decades.

But the Obama administration has invited Egypt's new Islamist leader, Mohammed Mursi, to visit the United States in September, according to an

Egyptian official, clearly reflecting Washington's changing view of Islamists and the Muslim Brotherhood.

Here is another article, posted April 26 of this year, from The Blaze. It is entitled, ''Want to Know Just How Close the Muslim Brotherhood is to the Obama Administration?'' It says:

On Wednesday evening, GBTV unveiled a powerful documentary, ''Rumors of War III,'' exposing how radical Islamists, including the Muslim Brotherhood, are infiltrating American Government at its highest levels. Above is a video clip from the program outlining some of the key players involved.

It goes on:

Arif Alikahn, Former Department of Homeland Security Assistant Secretary for Policy Development: Now a Distinguished Visiting Professor of DHS and Counterterrorism at the National Defense University, Alikahn also served as Deputy Mayor for Public Safety for the City of Los Angeles, where he reportedly derailed the LAPD's efforts to monitor the city's Muslim community—particularly its radical mosques and madrassas where certain 9/11 hijackers were said to have received support. He is affiliated with MPAC, which has called the terrorist group Hezbollah a ''liberation movement.''

It goes on to establish some of the ties of this administration with members of the Muslim Brotherhood.

It was intriguing to me, when I asked our own Secretary of Homeland Security, Janet Napolitano, how many members of the Muslim Brotherhood were on her countering violent terrorism—violent extremism—sorry. She can't use the word ''terrorism.'' She couldn't tell me whether 10 were Muslim Brotherhood or not. She didn't know.

Some of these things for some of us bring back memories of occurrences back from the late seventies when our own President Jimmy Carter, who has to be encouraged by this President's administration—because many people have said they thought he had the worst Presidency in history and did so much damage to international affairs—when you look at what this administration has done.

□ 2020

I mean, to the extent that an African from West Africa, elderly gentleman, but full of wisdom, wanted to meet me and visit when I was there a couple of years ago.

He said, we were very excited that you elected a black man as your President, but we have seen America appear to grow weaker and weaker in the eyes of most people. He asked that I come back and convey—and I have on more than one occasion—that you must not allow the United States to grow weak. Those of us who are Christian in foreign countries rely on the United States' strength to keep us somewhat safe.

If you let the world think that the United States is weak, or become weak, then many of us have no hope of being safe in this life. This country has to stand strong, and we have seen it grow weaker and weaker in the eyes of the world.

There's an article that's reprinted July 9, today, in Human Events, which was originally by Robert Spencer back February 14 of this year. He said:

Last week the Egyptian government announced that it intends to put 19 Americans on trial for fomenting antigovernment protests, a charge they deny. Protests from the Obama administration have so far been futile, met with sneers of contempt.

If you're of a certain age, this should sound familiar. On November 4, 1979, Iranian thugs stormed the U.S. Embassy in Tehran and took 52 Americans hostage. Jimmy Carter's government wrung its hands in futility for the next 14 months, until finally the Islamist Republic released the hostages January 20, 1981, the day Ronald Reagan took office as President of the United States.

The bitter irony in all that was that Carter had betrayed the Shah of Iran, a longtime U.S. ally, and thereby paved the way for the ascent to power of the Ayatollah Khomeini and the Iranian mullahcracy that has ruled Iran ever since. Rather than feel gratitude toward Carter, however, Khomeini viewed his abandonment of the Shah as a sign of weakness and pressed forward with his jihad against the Great Satan.

Iran has been hostile towards the United States since then, including gleeful predictions of our Nation's imminent demise. Just days ago, Iran's Supreme Leader, the Ayatollah Khamenei, declared to an enthusiastic Tehran crowd, that ''in light of the realization of the divine promise by almighty God, the Zionists and the Great Satan (America) will soon be defeated. Allah's promises will be delivered, and Islam will be victorious.''

The original Ayatollah Khomeini, not Khamenei, was said by Jimmy Carter to be a man, a fellow man of faith. Well, he has a different kind of faith, and we have soldiers still dying today because the United States of America allowed some Iranian thugs, terrorists, to commit an act of war by attacking an American embassy, taking Americans hostage, and did nothing to defend our territory.

I was at Fort Benning at the time. We were put on alert. Nobody wanted to go to Iran, but everybody expected, surely we will do something to show these Islamist jihadists, these thugs, that you cannot commit an act of war against the United States and not pay a price. Because as the United States Government, we have a duty to provide for the common defense. We have a duty to protect American property.

When American property is attacked, and under everybody's interpretation of international, an embassy is that country's own property, we let it go without anything but weak-kneed responses, and we are paying the price today. But we see this President who thinks a wonderful speech—and he's good at them, he reads them so well and throwing in constant apologies to people who want to destroy us and see us wiped off the map—will somehow engender love and devotion from people who want to destroy us.

It doesn't work that way internationally. We have a duty to protect this Constitution, and we are not doing so in embracing enemies of this country who still have not disclaimed the pledge, the effort to see this country overthrown.

There was a time when Presidents would view people who have made such claims and pledges or been part of terrorist organizations, we would not embrace such individuals, because we know the harm it does to our allies.

One article from a guy named Michael D. Evans says:

Carter viewed Khomeini as a religious holy man in a grassroots revolution, rather than a founding father of modern terrorism who introduced the Islamofascist ideology we are fighting today in the world war on terrorism.

As Henry Kissinger said, ''Carter has managed the extraordinary feat of having, at one and the same time, the worst relations with our allies, the worst relations with our adversaries, and the most serious upheavals in the developing world since the end of the Second World War.''

That was then, and now we have another President doing the very same thing.

There was an article from The New York Times back in June of 2001:

Prime Minister Ariel Sharon of Israel will meet with President Bush at the White House next week, the second time the two have held face-to-face discussions since Mr. Sharon's election.

In contrast, Yasir Arafat, the Palestinian leader, has not been invited to Washington by the Bush administration, and officials made clear today that they had no plans to do so in the near future. So far the administration has kept Mr. Arafat at arm's length, a stark difference from President Clinton, who brought the Palestinian leader to the White House more than any other foreign leader.

Those messages are not missed by allies and enemies alike around the world.

There is another article, this is from The New York Times, posted today:

In his first major speech last month, Mohamed Morsi, the new Egyptian president, pledged to seek the release of a notorious Egyptian terrorist from a North Carolina prison. Not long before that, a member of a designated terrorist organization, Gamaa al-Islamiyya—who also happens to be a recently elected member of the Egyptian Parliament—was welcomed to Washington as part of an official delegation sponsored by the State Department.

''Obama administration officials made no public comment on Mr. Morsi's promise and struggled to explain why the Egyptian Parliament member, Hani Nour Eldin, got a visa''—since after all he was a member of a designated terrorist organization. But he got not only a visa, he got entrance into our most secure administration dwellings.

The article says that the administration cited privacy rules, ''declining to say whether he had been granted a waiver from the ban on such visitors or whether his affiliation simply escaped notice.''

Pressed by reporters after the visa quickly became a congressional controversy, a State Department spokeswoman, Victoria J. Nuland, said Mr. Eldin had been judged to pose no threat to the United States.

□ 2030

''It's a new day in Egypt,'' she added.

''It's a new day in a lot of countries across the Middle East and North Africa.''

And I might add, it was a new day in Iran when the Ayatollah Khomeini took over and President Carter welcomed him as a fellow man of faith.

This article from the Times goes on:

For the Obama administration, as it navigates the tumultuous effects of the Arab spring, it's a complicated day as well. Long-held assumptions about who is a friend of the United States and who is not have been upset, leaving Americans confused.

Well, it's leaving not only Americans confused; it's leaving our allies confused. We have people around the world who have fought with us, they have fought for us, and this administration has turned its back on them. You can go to the country of Afghanistan and some terrible killings have once again occurred. We know that Pakistan, according to the people I've talked to traveling around Afghanistan, Pakistan is basically the biggest source of supplies, reinforcement, or help to the Taliban. And what do we do? We have our Secretary of State apologize to the country who kept our country's biggest enemy, the mastermind behind the killing of more Americans than any other attack in our history on our soil, and they protected him. And they kept him protected. And we are supposed to apologize to Pakistan? Well, this administration did.

And when our soldiers, our military suffered attacks from a certain area there adjoining Pakistan, and apparently in Pakistan, they finally responded to protect themselves, and we have to apologize for people dying who were in the area where attacks were emanating against our own soldiers. We have to apologize to a country who is supplying and funding the Taliban that's killing American soldiers.

Yeah, it's confusing to Americans and it's confusing to our allies. And that's why, when a handful of us were in Afghanistan in April, we were a little surprised that this administration did not want us to meet with our Northern Alliance friends, among them General Dostum. Instead, this administration prefers to address them as war criminals. Yeah, they fight tough. They defeated the Taliban. They fight like the Taliban. And they have no interest in losing because they know it means they lose their lives, they lose their homes, they lose their country. So they fight viciously.

And we were able to take out the Taliban initially with a few hundred soldiers. Less than 500 Americans. We had intelligence. We had special ops. We provided air cover, provided some weapons. And the Taliban was routed. We had a hundred thousand or so military into Afghanistan. We've become occupiers. Occupiers don't do well in that part of the world. Yet this administration continually throws our allies under the bus, thinking if we just embrace our enemies, if we make a great speech, maybe if I read from the teleprompters effectively enough, then they'll see how wonderful I am and America is and they'll come fall and embrace us and just want to provide us nothing but love and affection.

It's an unrealistic view of the world. And yes, I'm a Christian and I believe everyone should be free to worship or not worship as they please. But that is not the case in Egypt right now. It's not the case in Libya right now. It's not the case in Afghanistan right now. It's not the case anywhere in any country where sharia is the law. We want Muslims, we want atheists to be free to worship, not worship. This is America. But any group, whether atheists or any other religion in the world that attempts to force us to comply with their religious laws, should not be tolerated.

Some say you've got a bunch of xenophobes and Islamaphobes. It's interesting that the term Islamaphobe basically was generated by the Organization of Islamic Council, the OIC, that has 50 States—no, wait. They've got 57 States and we've got 50; or we've got 57 and they've got 50. I get confused. Somebody on CNN said, Well, the only reason the President said the U.S. had 57 States is he was tired. So maybe I'm just tired. I can't remember who has 57, who has 50. Some people don't understand sarcasm either.

But the OIC promulgated that term and they've given millions and millions and millions of dollars to universities in America, including some Ivy League schools. They're not Islamaphobes. They have sold their soul for money. Sure, if you will give us millions, you bet you—hundreds of thousands even—we'll teach a course on Islamaphobia. We'll denigrate other religions. We'll denigrate the Founders. We'll denigrate those who would lay down their lives for this country's freedom, and we'll call them Islamaphobes.

Well, there's no Islamaphobia here. That's why I told the security detail at the American Embassy in Afghanistan's capital, when I was told I was not going to be able to go meet our allies at the Massoud residence, our friend Massoud knows something about sacrifice. His brother possibly could have united Afghanistan, but was assassinated a day or so before 9/11 because the Taliban knew that he might be able to unite the country. And if the United States figured out this is where the attack emanated, training emanated from, then they may come. So they assassinated my friend's brother.

General Dostum, who led that gallant charge uphill against the Taliban in the face of RPGs and bullets flying, offered to take me on horseback to reenact that internationally famous battle uphill against all odds. What courage on our behalf and on behalf of people who want freedom in Afghanistan. I was certainly willing—I have grown up riding horses—until the interpreter told me, You do understand, they don't have leather saddles. They're all wood. That kind of changed my desire to do that.

But General Dostum, Massoud, these great Northern Alliance leaders that fought for us, who lost friends and family fighting with us and for us, have been thrown under the bus. But as I told the head of the security detail there, I was going to meet our friends at the Massoud residence. And after I was told we couldn't go, I let them know that I had talked to my friend Mr. Massoud and that they were sending secured vehicles to pick me up and at least two or three other Members of Congress that would go. And when I was told that would not be secure, we couldn't do that, I made clear that they would have to take me down before I got to the gate of the Embassy compound, because I was going, and that I would do that after our next meeting with our soldiers—American soldiers. After the meeting, I was told, We've arranged security for you to go to the meeting so you don't have to ride with the Massoud security folks.

□ 2040

We had a good meeting. It was great to see them. They have trouble understanding why this administration has forsaken them, our allies. I don't hear anybody here calling this administration Islamophobes because they have thrown our Muslim friends under the bus. But they are the enemy of our enemy, the Taliban. And this administration, this President, has made clear to this corrupt regime over there that, look, we're going to be out on this day certain; you'll be on your own for the military.

Well, now, they're negotiating some kind of deal where we may provide some help. But Karzai, for all the things he is, he is not totally stupid. He is not a stupid man. And he knows if all our soldiers are gone, and with all the support that Pakistan has given the Taliban, then the Taliban is going to be there. They will be as vicious as they have in the past, and he'd better make some peace with the Taliban. That's why they've been allowed such freedom in the Afghan capital to the point that the Taliban leader would tell and proclaim, yes, we all can see because the U.S., because the Obama administration is begging them to come negotiate and we'll buy them things, we'll release their thugs that have killed Americans, killed innocents, but we'll release them, we'll do whatever. You just come talk to us.

It's obvious to the world that we've lost. This administration is sending dangerous signals to our allies that you cannot trust this country as an ally of this country. You'd better watch your back. So when this administration says, we've got your back, you better be wearing something that will stop a knife because it could be forthcoming. As President Mubarak found, as the Northern Alliance found, as freedom lovers in Iran have found, as freedom desirers at Camp Ashraf have found, and as some of our allies in Israel have found, this administration is the first American administration to vote with Israel's enemies a couple of years ago when we voted with Israel's

enemies to require them to disclose their weaponry.

So it's confusing to people around the world. Should we take a chance on being a friend to America because a year or two later they may embrace our enemies and throw us under the bus?

I do believe in the teachings of Jesus. I do believe in the teachings and have been there where they say it's pretty certain this is where Jesus delivered the Sermon on the Mount and told us who it was who was blessed. So some say, well, shouldn't our government turn the other cheek? Blessed are those who mourn. Shouldn't we be the peacemakers? Yes, we should be the peacemakers. But as a government, we have a different obligation. Ours is to protect our people. We are to protect those who live in America, who have trusted us to be their public servants so that they can live out the beatitudes if they choose, so that they can live out and follow the teachings of whatever religious leader they choose. But they can't do that unless we keep them safe.

I'm reading a book that I started yesterday called ''The Harbinger.'' It indicates God withdrew His hand from our protection on 9/11. There are interesting things in that book. It's time we look at the signs and we understand from world history that you don't turn on your allies and embrace your enemies and expect to save your country. You convince others who might be tempted to be your allies not to be. You teach your enemies that you are weak in the same way individuals on a school playground do not convince a bully that they are strong when they start giving gifts to the bully and try to buy the bully's kindness and respect because what it buys is not respect, it is contempt. And that is the way this country is now viewed around the world.

If you are evil in the world, just as Romans 13 points out, if you do evil, you should be afraid because this government does not have the sword in vain. We owe a duty to freedom-loving people around the world not to become weak but to protect freedom here so others can enjoy freedom other places knowing that the United States of America does not embrace and fall in love with terrorists or terrorist organizations or leaders of terrorist groups. We fight them, and we embrace those who love peace, not terrorism; and we make the world and this country safer in so doing.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I will include in the RECORD a letter. This is Act for America. I brought this up before, but because we have rules that don't allow things that include too many pages, we had to revisit the issue because there are so many thousands and thousands of signatures. It can be found at this Web site for Act for America. This is a petition and a letter sent to the Honorable JOSEPH LIEBERMAN, the Honorable PATRICK LEAHY, the Honorable DIANNE FEINSTEIN, the Honorable PETER KING, the Honorable LAMAR SMITH, and the Honorable MIKE ROGERS. It's signed online by thousands and thousands of verified signatures, and those can be found from Act for America, Pensacola, Florida.

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

ACT! FOR AMERICA,
Pensacola, FL, July 9, 2012.

Hon. LOUIE GOHMERT,
Rayburn House Office Building,
Washington, DC.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN GOHMERT: Attached, please find an ACT! for America Open Letter to targeted members of the U.S. Congress. The letter has been signed by over 21,000 Americans—all of whom are very concerned with ongoing actions by the FBI related to the language of the agency's counterterrorism training materials.

ACT! for America shares the concerns of some Members of Congress, yourself included, that the ongoing purge of counterterrorism training materials used by the FBI as well as state and local law enforcement is a danger to our nation. Further, we see these actions as a continuation of concerted efforts to manipulate, if not altogether eliminate, a clear definition of the threat that radical Islam poses to our nation.

We hope this letter will serve as a useful token of the concern the American people have for this issue as well. It also may be found on our website: http://www.actforamerica.com/index.php/fbi-petition.

Thank you very much for all of your efforts in the United States Congress. The 240,000 members of ACT! for America stand with you every step of the way.

With warm regards,

LISA PIRANEO,
Director of Government Relations,
ACT! for America.

Enclosure.

ACT! FOR AMERICA,
Pensacola, FL.

PLEASE PUT AN IMMEDIATE STOP TO PLANNED CHANGES IN THE FBI'S COUNTERTERRORISM TRAINING POLICIES

Hon. JOSEPH I. LIEBERMAN,
Chair, Senate Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs Committee.
Hon. PATRICK LEAHY,
Chair, Senate Judiciary Committee.
Hon. DIANNE FEINSTEIN,
Chair, Senate Select Intelligence Committee.
Hon. PETER KING,
Chair, House Homeland Security Committee.
Hon. LAMAR SMITH,
Chair, House Judiciary Committee.
Hon. MIKE ROGERS,
Chair, House Permanent Select Intelligence Committee.

DEAR CHAIRMEN LIEBERMAN, KING, LEAHY, SMITH, FEINSTEIN AND ROGERS: We write to you today in strong opposition to proposed changes to FBI counterterrorism training materials.

We share the concern of many sitting Members of Congress that the ongoing purge of counterterrorism training materials used by the FBI and state and local law enforcement puts our nation at great peril. It is critically important to the safety of our nation and its citizens that our law enforcement officials are permitted to accurately define the threat, and based on that definition, put in place sound policies to protect our nation and its citizens. Law enforcement officials are the front line of counterterrorism, and they must have accurate training materials that cannot be modified at the whim of one or two Members of Congress, or outside consultants whose identities are kept secret from congressional oversight.

Whitewashing of law enforcement counterterrorism materials appears to be an informal implementation of U.N. Resolution 16/18 (the ''The Istanbul Process''). This resolution includes language that seeks to bypass the U.S. Constitution by laying the groundwork for criminalizing any action or speech against a religion, using protection against ''incitement to violence'' as the rationale. The State Department has vowed to aid the Istanbul Process, and this is completely unacceptable. This resolution and the policies it supports are completely prohibited by the First Amendment to the U.S. Constitution and must be rejected by the United States. Political correctness must not trump constitutional rights, nor hamper our country's ability to protect itself by muzzling law enforcement.

We strongly encourage you to hold hearings on this issue and, further, to do all that you can to put an immediate halt to any changes in law enforcement counterterrorism policies before they have been fully vetted through congressional oversight. Your committees share jurisdiction over these matters.

Please know that the American public is becoming more educated about the threats posed to our nation by those who support and/or perform acts of terrorism in the name of political/radical Islam. We are looking to our elected officials to enact sound policies that will protect us, as they swore to do when they took their oaths of office.

Sincerely,

This petition signed by 21,195 verified signators. For a full list of signators please send your request to: ACT! For America, PO Box 12765, Pensacola, FL 32591.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. COBLE (at the request of Mr. CANTOR) for today on account of travel delays due to weather.

Mr. CULBERSON (at the request of Mr. CANTOR) for today on account of a family obligation.

Mr. DESJARLAIS (at the request of Mr. CANTOR) for today on account of flight delays.

SENATE BILL REFERRED

A bill of the Senate of the following title was taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 3238. An act to designate the Department of Veterans Affairs community based outpatient clinic in Mansfield, Ohio, as the David F. Winder Department of Veterans Affairs Community Based Outpatient Clinic, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

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 Speaker pro tempore, Mr. THORNBERRY, on Friday, June 29, 2012:

H.R. 4348. An act to authorize funds for Federal-aid highways, highway safety programs, and transit programs, and for other purposes.

BILLS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Karen L. Haas, Clerk of the House, reported that on June 29, 2012, she presented to the President of the United States, for his approval, the following bills:

H.R. 6064. To provide an extension of Federal-aid highway, highway safety, motor carrier safety, transit, and other programs funded out of the Highway Trust Fund pending enactment of a multiyear law reauthorizing such programs.

H.R. 2297. To promote the development of the Southwest waterfront in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes.

H.R. 33. To amend the Securities Act of 1933 to specify when certain securities issued in connection with church plans are treated as exempted securities for purposes of that Act.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. GOHMERT. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 8 o'clock and 48 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, July 10, 2012, at 10 a.m. for morning-hour debate.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

6738. A letter from the Secretary, Commodity Futures Trading Commission, transmitting the Commission's ''Major'' final rule—Core Principles and Other Requirements for Designated Contract Markets (RIN: 3038–AD09) received June 19, 2012, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

6739. A letter from the Associate General Counsel for Legislation and Regulations, Department of Housing and Urban Development, transmitting the Department's final rule—Revision to the Section 8 Management Assessment Program Lease-Up Indicator [Docket No.: FR–5532–F–02] (RIN: 2577–AC76) received June 13, 2012, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Financial Services.

6740. A letter from the Senior Counsel for Regulatory Affairs, Department of the Treasury, transmitting the Department's ''Major'' final rule—Assessment of Fees on Large Bank Holding Companies and Nonbank Financial Companies Supervised by the Federal Reserve Board To Cover the Expenses of the Financial Research Fund (RIN: 1505–AC42) received June 19, 2012, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Financial Services.

6741. A letter from the Associate Division Chief, Policy Division, PSHSB, Federal Communication Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule—Review of the Emergency Alert System; Independent Spanish Broadcasters Association, the Office of Communications of the United Church of Christ, Inc., and the Minority Media and Telecommunications Council, Petition for Immediate Relief; Randy Gehman Petition for Rulemaking [EB Docket No.: 04–296] received May 29, 2012, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

6742. A letter from the Director, Office of Congressional Affairs, Nuclear Regulatory Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule—Safety Evaluation by the Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation; Nuclear Energy Institute Topical Report 94–01, Revision 3, ''Industry Guideline for Implementing Performance-Based Option of 10 CFR Part 50, Appendix J'' received May 29, 2012, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

6743. A letter from the Director, Office of Congressional Affairs, Nuclear Regulatory Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule—Regulatory Guide 1.215, Revision 1, Guidance for ITAAC Closure Under 10 CFR Part 52 received May 29, 2012, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

6744. A letter from the Director, Office of Congressional Affairs, Nuclear Regulatory Commission, transmitting the Commission's ''Major'' final rule—Revision of Fee Schedules; Fee Recovery for Fiscal Year 2012 [NRC–2011–0207] (RIN: 3150–AJ03) received June 19, 2012, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

6745. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting Transmittal No. DDTC 12–061, pursuant to the reporting requirements of Section 36(c) of the Arms Export Control Act, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

6746. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting Transmittal No. DDTC 12–058, pursuant to the reporting requirements of Section 36(c) of the Arms Export Control Act, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

6747. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting Transmittal No. DDTC 12–016, pursuant to the reporting requirements of Section 36(c) of the Arms Export Control Act; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

6748. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting Transmittal No. DDTC 12–045, pursuant to the reporting requirements of Section 36(c) of the Arms Export Control Act; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

6749. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting Transmittal No. DDTC 12–024, pursuant to the reporting requirements of Section 36(c) of the Arms Export Control Act; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

6750. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting Transmittal No. DDTC 12–037, pursuant to the reporting requirements of Section 36(c) of the Arms Export Control Act; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

6751. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting Transmittal No. DDTC 12–036, pursuant to the reporting requirements of Section 36(c) of the Arms Export Control Act; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

6752. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting Transmittal No. DDTC 12–011, pursuant to the reporting requirements of Section 36(c) of the Arms Export Control Act; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

6753. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting Transmittal No. DDTC 12–007, pursuant to the reporting requirements of Section 36(c) of the Arms Export Control Act; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

6754. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting Transmittal No. DDTC 12–054, pursuant to the reporting requirements of Section 36(c) of the Arms Export Control Act; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

6755. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting Transmittal No. DDTC 12–030, pursuant to the reporting requirements of Section 36(c) of the Arms Export Control Act; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

6756. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting Transmittal No. DDTC 12–027, pursuant to the reporting requirements of Section 3(c) of the Arms Export Control Act; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

6757. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting Transmittal No. DDTC 12–031, pursuant to the reporting requirements of Section 36(c) of the Arms Export Control Act; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

6758. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting Transmittal No. DDTC 12–060, pursuant to the reporting requirements of Section 36(c) of the Arms Export Control Act; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

6759. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting Transmittal No. DDTC 12–043, pursuant to the reporting requirements of Section 36(d) of the Arms Export Control Act; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

6760. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting Transmittal No. DDTC 12–082, pursuant to the reporting requirements of Section 36(d) of the Arms Export Control Act; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

6761. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting Transmittal No. RSAT–12–2930, pursuant to the reporting requirements of Section 3(d) of the Arms Export Control Act; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

6762. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting Transmittal No. DDTC 12–087, pursuant to the reporting requirements of Section 36(d) of the Arms Export Control Act; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

6763. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting Transmittal No. RSAT–12–2931, pursuant to the reporting requirements of Section 3(d) of the Arms Export Control Act; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

6764. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting Transmittal No. DDTC 12–012, pursuant to the reporting requirements of Section 36(d) of the Arms Export Control Act; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

6765. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting Transmittal No. DDTC 12–041, pursuant to the reporting requirements of Section 36(c) and 36(d) of the Arms Export Control Act; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

6766. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting Transmittal No. DDTC 12–026, pursuant to the reporting requirements of Section 36(c) and 36(d) of the Arms Export Control Act; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

6767. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting Transmittal No. DDTC 12–017, pursuant to the reporting requirements of Section 36(c) and 36(d) of the Arms Export Control Act; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

6768. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting Transmittal No. DDTC 12–023, pursuant to the reporting requirements of Section 36(c) and 36(d) of the Arms Export Control Act; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

6769. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting Transmittal No. DDTC 12–002, pursuant to the reporting requirements of Section 36(c) and 36(d) of the Arms Export Control Act; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

6770. A letter from the Chairman of the Council, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting Transmittal of D.C. ACT 19–385, ''Fiscal Year 2013 Budget Support Act of 2012''; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

6771. A letter from the Chief Administrative Officer, transmitting the quarterly report of receipts and expenditures of appropriations and other funds for the period April 1, 2012 through June 30, 2012 as compiled by the Chief Administrative Officer, pursuant to 2 U.S.C. 104a Public Law 88–454; (H. Doc. No. 112—122); to the Committee on House Administration and ordered to be printed.

6772. A letter from the Senior Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Standard Instrument Approach Procedures, and Takeoff Minimums and Obstacle Departure Procedures; Miscellaneous Amendments [Docket No.: 30844; Amdt. No. 3480] received June 8, 2012, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

6773. A letter from the Senior Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Standard Instrument Approach Procedures, and Takeoff Minimums and Obstacle Departure Procedures; Miscellaneous Amendments [Docket No.: 30843; Amdt. No. 3479] received June 8, 2012, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

6774. A letter from the Senior Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Standard Instrument Approach Procedures, and Takeoff Minimums and Obstacle Departure Procedures; Miscellaneous Amendments [Docket No.: 30842; Amdt. No. 3478] received June 8, 2012, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

6775. A letter from the Attorney-Advisor, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—National Standards for Traffic Control Devices; the Manual on Uniform Traffic Control Devices for Streets and Highways; Revision; Final Rule [FHWA Docket No.: FHWA–2010–0170] (RIN: 2125–AF41) received June 8, 2012, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

6776. A letter from the Senior Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Standard Instrument Approach Procedures, and Takeoff Minimums and Obstacle Departure Procedures; Miscellaneous Amendments [Docket No.: 30834; Amdt. No. 3471] received June 8, 2012, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

6777. A letter from the Senior Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Amendment of Restricted Area R–2502E; Fort Irwin, CA [Docket No.: FAA–2012–0461; Airspace Docket No.: 12–AWP–1] (RIN: 2120–AA66) received June 8, 2012, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

6778. A letter from the Senior Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Standard Instrument Approach Procedures, and Takeoff Minimums and Obstacle Departure Procedures; Miscellaneous Amendments [Docket No.: 30833; Amdt. No. 3470] received June 8, 2012, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

6779. A letter from the Senior Regulations Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Procedures for Transportation Workplace Drug and Alcohol Testing Programs: 6-acetylmorphine (6–AM) Testing [Docket No.: DOT-OST–2010–0026] (RIN: 2105–AE14) received June 8, 2012, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

6780. A letter from the Senior Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Flightcrew Member Duty and Rest Requirements; Correction [Docket No.: FAA–2009–1093; Amdt. Nos. 117–1A, 119–16A, 121–357A] (RIN: 2120–AJ58) received June 8, 2012, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

6781. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—National Standards for Traffic Control Devices; the Manual on Uniform Traffic Control Devices for Streets and Highways; Revision [FHWA Docket No.: FHWA–2010–0159] (RIN: 2125–AF43) received June 8, 2012, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

6782. A letter from the Senior Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Amendment of Restricted Area R–2917, De Funiak Springs, FL [Docket No.: FAA–2012–0226; Airspace Docket No. 12–ASO–10] (RIN: 2120–AA66) received June 8, 2012, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

6783. A letter from the Senior Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—IFR Altitudes; Miscellaneous Amendments [Docket No.: 30841; Amdt. No. 500] received June 8, 2012, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

6784. A letter from the Senior Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Amendment of Class D and E Airspace; Baltimore, MD [Docket No.: FAA–2012–0014; Airspace Docket No. 12–AEA–1] received June 8, 2012, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

6785. A letter from the Senior Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Modification, Revocation and Establishment of Air Traffic Service Routes; Windsor Locks Area; CT [Docket No.: FAA–2011–1386; Airspace Docket No. 11–ANE–11] (RIN: 2120–AA66) received June 8, 2012, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

6786. A letter from the Senior Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Standard Instrument Approach Procedures, and Takeoff Minimums and Obstacle Departure Procedures; Miscellaneous Amendments [Docket No.: 30845; Amdt. No. 3481] received June 8, 2012, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

6787. A letter from the Senior Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Amendment of Class D Airspace; Coco Beach, FL [Docket No.: FAA–2012–0099; Airspace Docket No. 12–ASO–11] received June 8, 2012, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

6788. A letter from the Senior Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Standard Instrument Approach Procedures, and Takeoff Minimums and Obstacle Departure Procedures; Miscellaneous Amendments [Docket No.: 30840; Amdt. No. 3477] received June 8, 2012, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

6789. A letter from the Acting Deputy General Counsel, National Aeronautics and Space Administration, transmitting the Administration's ''Major'' final rule—Claims for Patent and Copyright Infringement [Notice: (12–0220)] (RIN: 2700–AD63) received June 28, 2012, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology.

6790. A letter from the Acting Deputy General Counsel, National Aeronautics and Space Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule—Claims for Patent and Copyright Infringement (RIN: 2700–AD63) received June 8, 2012, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology.

6791. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule—Implementation of Rev. Rul. 2006–57—Issues for Public Comment [Notice 2012–38] received June 8, 2012, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); 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:

[Following report was filed on July 2, 2012]

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin: Committee on the Budget. H.R. 5872. A bill to require the President to provide a report detailing the sequester required by the Budget Control Act of 2011 on January 2, 2013; with an amendment (Rept. 112–577). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

[Submitted July 9, 2012]

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington: Committee on Natural Resources. H.R. 1192. A bill to extend the current royalty rate for soda ash; with an amendment (Rept. 112–578). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington: Committee on Natural Resources. H.R. 2027. A bill to revise the boundaries of John H. Chafee Coastal Barrier Resources System Sachuest Point Unit RI–04P, Easton Beach Unit RI–05P, Almy Pond Unit RI–06, and Hazards Beach Unit RI–07 in Rhode Island (Rept. 112–579). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington: Committee on Natural Resources. H.R. 2154. A bill to correct the boundaries of the John H. Chafee Coastal Barrier Resources System Gasparilla Island Unit FL–70P; with an amendment (Rept. 112–580). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington: Committee on Natural Resources. S. 270. An act to direct the Secretary of the Interior to convey certain Federal land to Deschutes County, Oregon (Rept. 112–581). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. SMITH of Texas: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 6019. A bill to amend the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 to enhance the use of Juvenile Accountability Block Grants for programs to prevent and address occurrences of bullying and to reauthorize the Juvenile Accountability

Block Grants program; with an amendment (Rept. 112–582). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington: Committee on Natural Resources. H.R. 4402. A bill to require the Secretary of the Interior and the Secretary of Agriculture to more efficiently develop domestic sources of the minerals and mineral materials of strategic and critical importance to United States economic and national security and manufacturing competitiveness; with an amendment (Rept. 112–583 Pt. 1). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington: Committee on Natural Resources. H.R. 1171. A bill to reauthorize and amend the Marine Debris Research, Prevention, and Reduction Act: with an amendment (Rept. 112–584 Pt. 1). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. ISSA: Committee on Oversight and Government Reform. H.R. 4155. A bill to direct the head of each Federal department and agency to treat relevant military training as sufficient to satisfy training or certification requirements for Federal licenses; with an amendment (Rept. 112–585). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. UPTON: Committee on Energy and Commerce. H.R. 4273. A bill to clarify that compliance with an emergency order under section 202(c) of the Federal Power Act may not be considered a violation of any Federal, State, or local environmental law or regulation, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. 112–586). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. SESSIONS: Committee on Rules. H. Res. 724. A resolution providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 6079) 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. 112–587). Referred to the House Calendar.

DISCHARGE OF COMMITTEE

Pursuant to clause 2 of rule XIII, the Committee on the Judiciary discharged from further consideration. H.R. 4402 referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

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:

[Omitted from the Record of June 29, 2012]

By Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas.

H. Res. 718. A resolution raising a question of the privileges of the House.

[Submitted July 9, 2012]

By Mr. CANTOR (for himself, Mr. CAMP, Mr. KLINE, Mr. UPTON, Mr. SMITH of Texas, Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin, Mr. GRAVES of Missouri, Mr. HERGER, Mr. PITTS, Mr. ROE of Tennessee, Mr. MCCARTHY of California, Mr. ROSKAM, Mr. HENSARLING, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. PRICE of Georgia, Mrs. MCMORRIS RODGERS, Mr. CARTER, and Mr. DREIER):

H.R. 6079. A bill to repeal the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act and health care-related provisions in the Health Care and Education Reconciliation Act of 2010; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committees on Ways and Means, Education and the Workforce, Natural Resources, the Judiciary, House Administration, Rules, Appropriations, and the Budget, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. SMITH of Texas (for himself and Mr. CONYERS):

H.R. 6080. A bill to make improvements in the enactment of title 41, United States Code, into a positive law title and to improve the Code; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas (for herself, Mr. COSTELLO, Ms. WOOLSEY, Mr. MILLER of North Carolina, Mr. LIPINSKI, Ms. EDWARDS, Mr. LUJÁN, Ms. SEWELL, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Mr. CLARKE of Michigan, and Ms. BONAMICI):

H.R. 6081. A bill to accelerate research, development, and innovation in advanced manufacturing, to improve the competitiveness of American manufacturers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology.

By Mr. HASTINGS of Washington:

H.R. 6082. A bill to officially replace, within the 60-day Congressional review period under the Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act, President Obama's Proposed Final Outer Continental Shelf Oil & Gas Leasing Program (2012-2017) with a congressional plan that will conduct additional oil and natural gas lease sales to promote offshore energy development, job creation, and increased domestic energy production to ensure a more secure energy future in the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. LUCAS (for himself and Mr. PETERSON):

H.R. 6083. A bill to provide for the reform and continuation of agricultural and other programs of the Department of Agriculture through fiscal year 2017, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. SMITH of New Jersey (for himself and Mr. DOYLE):

H.R. 6084. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide a refundable tax credit for education and training expenses relating to autism spectrum disorders to increase the number of teachers with such expertise; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BOUSTANY:

H.R. 6085. A bill to amend section 40 of the Revised Statutes of the United States to clarify that for purposes of determining whether a Member of the House of Representatives is subject to a deduction from in pay by reason of absence from the House on a day, the Member shall be considered to be absent if the Member misses any vote held in the House on that day, and for other purposes; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. HEINRICH:

H.R. 6086. A bill to direct the heads of Federal public land management agencies to prepare reports on the availability of public access and egress to Federal public lands for hunting, fishing, and other recreational purposes, to amend the Land and Water Conservation Fund Act of 1965 to provide funding for recreational public access to Federal land, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources, and in addition to the Committee on Agriculture, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Ms. MCCOLLUM (for herself and Mr. SCHOCK):

H.R. 6087. A bill to protect girls in developing countries through the prevention of child marriage, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. SCHWEIKERT:

H.R. 6088. A bill to repeal certain tax increases enacted as part of health care reform; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. TIPTON (for himself, Mr. COFFMAN of Colorado, Mr. GARDNER, Mr. GOSAR, Mr. LAMBORN, and Mr. WALDEN):

H.R. 6089. A bill to address the bark beetle epidemic, drought, deteriorating forest health conditions, and high risk of wildfires on National Forest System land and land under the jurisdiction of the Bureau of Land Management in the United States by expanding authorities established in the Healthy Forest Restoration Act of 2003 to provide emergency measures for high-risk areas identified by such States, to make permanent Forest Service and Bureau of Land Management authority to conduct good-neighbor cooperation with States to reduce wildfire risks, and for other purposes; 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 Ms. NORTON:

H. Res. 725. A resolution expressing support for dancing as a form of valuable exercise and artistic expression and for the designation of July 28, 2012, as National Dance Day; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

241. The SPEAKER presented a memorial of the House of Representatives of the State of Hawaii, relative to House Resolution No. 80 encouraging the Congress to create a separate branch of the United States Armed Forces to combat cyber crime, warfare, and terrorism; to the Committee on Armed Services.

242. Also, a memorial of the House of Representatives of the State of Hawaii, relative to House Concurrent Resolution No. 216 urging the Armed Services Committee to act favorably on H.R. 2148; to the Committee on Armed Services.

243. Also, a memorial of the House of Representatives of the State of Louisiana, relative to House Concurrent Resolution No. 94 memorializing the Congress to take such actions as are necessary to encourage and enable the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission to expedite the review and approval of Cheniere Energy's Sabine Pass Liquified Natural Gas facility; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

244. Also, a memorial of the House of Representatives of the State of Louisiana, relative to House Concurrent Resolution No. 10 memorializing the Congress to encourage the National Marine Fisheries Service, the Gulf of Mexico Marine Fisheries Council, and the Gulf of Mexico Fisheries Management Council to adopt a weekend-only fishery management scheme for red snapper for 2012; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

245. Also, a memorial of the House of Representatives of the State of Hawaii, relative to House Resolution No. 130 urging the Congress to enact the VISIT USA Act; jointly to the Committees on the Judiciary and Homeland Security.

246. Also, a memorial of the House of Representatives of the State of Hawaii, relative to House Resolution No. 25 supporting the Visa Improvements to Stimulate International Tourism to the United State of America; jointly to the Committees on the Judiciary and Homeland Security.

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. CANTOR:

H.R. 6079.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

In *National Federation of Independent Business v. Sebelius,* the Supreme Court rejected the constitutional basis offered by proponents of the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act, the interstate commerce clause found in Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 of the Constitution. Having eliminated the requirement that all Americans buy insurance, the Supreme Court recast the law's penalty for not buying insurance as a tax, which Americans would pay in lieu of purchasing insurance, and five Justices upheld this tax under the taxing power of Congress, found in Article I, Section 8, Clause 1. With the individual requirement to buy insurance having been found unconstitutional, and, with the compulsory nature of that requirement being central to the funding mechanism contemplated under the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act, Congress hereby repeals the Act in its entirety. Furthermore, Congress did not intend and does not now intend to invoke its taxing power in relation to the individual requirement to buy insurance.

The Congress, the Executive, and the Judiciary are obligated to act according to the principle of coordinate branch construction based on their respective obligations to ensure that all their actions are constitutional. This is the clear meaning of the Vesting Clauses of Articles I, II, and III along with the Supremacy Clause of Article VI, as well as of the Oath of Office that each constitutional officer of the Federal government must take pursuant to Article VI. James Madison made this clear in 1834 stating, ''As the Legislative, Executive, and Judicial departments of the United States are co-ordinate, and each equally bound to support the Constitution, it follows that each must in the exercise of its functions be guided by the text of the Constitution according to its own interpretation of it.''

The ''Repeal of Obamacare Act'' repeals the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act and title I and subtitle B of title II of the Health Care and Education Affordability Reconciliation Act of 2010, which included several specific provisions that extend beyond the enumerated powers granted to Congress by the Constitution, including, in particular, the Commerce, Taxing, and the Spending Clauses of Article I, Section 8, as well as the Necessary and Proper Clauses contained therein, and that otherwise improperly extend authority to Federal agencies in a manner inconsistent with the Vesting Clause of Article I, Section 1.

The general repeal of this legislation is consistent with the powers that are reserved to the States and to the people as expressed in Amendment X to the United States Constitution.

By Mr. SMITH of Texas:

H.R. 6080.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Congress has the power to enact this legislation, which makes improvements in the enactment of title 41, United States Code, into a positive law title and improves the Code, pursuant to Article I, Section 8, Clause 18 of the Constitution.

By Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas:

H.R. 6081.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following: Article I, section 8 of the Constitution of the United States.

By Mr. HASTINGS of Washington:

H.R. 6082.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article IV, Section 3, clause 2

By Mr. LUCAS:

H.R. 6083.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following: The ability to regulate interstate commerce pursuant to Article 1, Section 8, Clause 3.

By Mr. SMITH of New Jersey:

H.R. 6084.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause I of the Constitution

By Mr. BOUSTANY:

H.R. 6085.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 9, Clause 7 which states that no money shall be drawn from the Treasury, but in Consequence of Appropriations made by Law; and a regular Statement and Account of the Receipts and Expenditures of all public Money shall be published from time to time. The Appropriations Clause provides Congress with a mechanism to control or to limit spending by the federal government

By Mr. HEINRICH:

H.R. 6086.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following: Article IV, Section 3 of the United States Constitution.

By Ms. MCCOLLUM:

H.R. 6087.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18, which gives Congress the power ''To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing powers.''

By Mr. SCHWEIKERT:

H.R. 6088.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Amendment 16 of the Constitution states: The Congress shall have power to lay and collect taxes on incomes, from whatever source derived, without apportionment among the several States, and without regard to any census or enumeration.

By Mr. TIPTON:

H.R. 6089.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 4, Section 3: The Congress shall have Power to dispose of and make all needful Rules and Regulations respecting the Territory or other Property belonging to the United States; and nothing in this Constitution shall be so construed as to Prejudice any Claims of the United States, or of any particular State.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 139: Mrs. CHRISTENSEN.
H.R. 218: Mr. MEEKS.
H.R. 459: Mr. CLARKE of Michigan, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. BUCSHON, Mr. HASTINGS of Washington, and Ms. PINGREE of Maine.
H.R. 694: Ms. WILSON of Florida.
H.R. 733: Mr. LEVIN, Mr. BERG, Mr. DIAZ-BALART, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. GRAVES of Missouri, Mr. POLIS, Mrs. BONO MACK, Mr. LATTA, and Mr. YOUNG of Florida.
H.R. 860: Mr. CUELLAR and Ms. HANABUSA.
H.R. 865: Mr. CHANDLER.
H.R. 997: Mr. MURPHY of Pennsylvania.
H.R. 998: Mr. HOYER.
H.R. 1063: Mr. HARRIS and Mr. BUCHANAN.
H.R. 1171: Ms. BONAMICI.
H.R. 1219: Mr. KISSELL.
H.R. 1244: Mr. POE of Texas.
H.R. 1265: Mr. PASCRELL.
H.R. 1322: Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. LOEBSACK, and Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia.
H.R. 1464: Mr. LAMBORN.
H.R. 1546: Mr. KISSELL.
H.R. 1742: Mr. GRIJALVA and Mr. HINOJOSA.
H.R. 1775: Mr. BARROW, Mr. CRITZ, Ms. BORDALLO, and Mr. BOUSTANY.
H.R. 1855: Mr. CHANDLER.
H.R. 1909: Mr. RUSH.
H.R. 1912: Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas.
H.R. 1956: Mr. WOMACK.
H.R. 1968: Mr. MURPHY of Pennsylvania.
H.R. 2040: Mr. ROE of Tennessee.
H.R. 2053: Mr. CHANDLER.
H.R. 2077: Mr. DOLD.
H.R. 2140: Ms. SCHAKOWSKY and Mr. WELCH.
H.R. 2154: Mr. MORAN.
H.R. 2168: Mr. STARK.
H.R. 2268: Mr. SCOTT of Virginia.
H.R. 2295: Mr. BENISHEK.
H.R. 2316: Mr. MCDERMOTT and Mr. MORAN.
H.R. 2437: Mr. HONDA.
H.R. 2472: Mr. COFFMAN of Colorado.
H.R. 2499: Mr. LOBIONDO.
H.R. 2580: Ms. CLARKE of New York.
H.R. 2655: Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. KISSELL, and Mr. HINCHEY.
H.R. 2672: Mr. KISSELL.
H.R. 2689: Mr. HONDA.
H.R. 2730: Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio.
H.R. 2866: Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN and Mr. HANNA.
H.R. 2948: Mr. MCINTYRE.
H.R. 2969: Mr. FORBES, Mr. JONES, Mr. CONYERS and Mr. KISSELL.
H.R. 3187: Mr. CHAFFETZ, Mr. BISHOP of Utah, Mr. MICHAUD, Mr. PAULSEN, Mr. PERLMUTTER, Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Ms. FUDGE, Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York, and Mr. LATTA.
H.R. 3238: Mr. HIMES.
H.R. 3315: Mr. PRICE of Georgia.
H.R. 3337: Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio.
H.R. 3395: Mr. DUFFY.
H.R. 3510: Ms. DELAURO.
H.R. 3643: Mr. WOMACK.
H.R. 3709: Mr. JORDAN.
H.R. 3767: Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN and Ms. JENKINS.
H.R. 3780: Mr. SCHOCK.
H.R. 3798: Ms. SUTTON, Ms. MATSUI, and Mr. POLIS.
H.R. 3803: Mr. GUINTA.
H.R. 3821: Mr. HONDA.
H.R. 3861: Mr. ROGERS of Michigan.
H.R. 4035: Mr. SCHOCK.
H.R. 4066: Mrs. ELLMERS and Ms. JENKINS.
H.R. 4070: Mr. GRIFFIN of Arkansas and Mr. MICHAUD.
H.R. 4083: Mr. WAXMAN.
H.R. 4103: Mr. BUCHANAN, Ms. SPEIER, and Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California.
H.R. 4124: Ms. SCHAKOWSKY.
H.R. 4155: Ms. HIRONO and Mr. CONNOLLY of Virginia.

H.R. 4158: Mr. BROUN of Georgia.
H.R. 4163: Mr. CLAY.
H.R. 4170: Ms. LEE of California.
H.R. 4186: Mr. GRIFFIN of Arkansas.
H.R. 4227: Mr. COHEN.
H.R. 4235: Ms. WILSON of Florida, Mr. HIMES, Mr. CANSECO, Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York, and Mr. HULTGREN.
H.R. 4296: Mr. ROONEY and Mr. MCINTYRE.
H.R. 4346: Mr. BLUMENAUER.
H.R. 4402: Mr. MCCLINTOCK.
H.R. 4405: Mr. OLVER and Mr. STARK.
H.R. 5129: Mr. CICILLINE.
H.R. 5381: Mr. BISHOP of Utah.
H.R. 5542: Ms. FUDGE, Mrs. MALONEY, Mr. FILNER, Ms. NORTON, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. MURPHY of Connecticut, Mr. CRITZ, Mr. LARSEN of Washington, Mr. MICHAUD, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, and Mr. CLARKE of Michigan.
H.R. 5684: Mr. PETERS, Mr. KEATING, Mr. ELLISON, and Mr. CARSON of Indiana.
H.R. 5707: Mr. HIMES.
H.R. 5742: Mr. SHERMAN.
H.R. 5749: Mrs. MALONEY.
H.R. 5791: Mr. NUNES.
H.R. 5822: Mr. WOLF.
H.R. 5871: Mr. POLIS and Mr. YOUNG of Indiana.
H.R. 5893: Mr. SCHILLING.
H.R. 5894: Mr. WILSON of South Carolina.
H.R. 5910: Mr. SCHILLING.
H.R. 5925: Mr. GIBSON.
H.R. 5943: Ms. HOCHUL, Mr. ROE of Tennessee, Mr. OWENS, and Mr. GRIJALVA.
H.R. 5952: Mr. COBLE.
H.R. 5957: Mr. BROUN of Georgia.
H.R. 5974: Mr. MICHAUD and Ms. BALDWIN.
H.R. 5978: Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Mr. OLVER, and Ms. CASTOR of Florida.
H.R. 5995: Mr. MCDERMOTT.
H.R. 5998: Mr. GUTHRIE and Mr. KISSELL.
H.R. 6019: Ms. HIRONO.
H.R. 6025: Mr. BURTON of Indiana.
H.R. 6043: Mr. BURGESS, Mr. MURPHY of Connecticut, and Mrs. BONO MACK.
H.R. 6047: Mr. MCCLINTOCK and Mr. WESTMORELAND.
H.J. Res. 72: Mr. FILNER.
H.J. Res. 110: Mr. CAMP and Mr. YOUNG of Alaska.
H. Con. Res. 129: Mr. GUINTA, Mr. MICHAUD, and Mr. WOMACK.
H. Res. 20: Ms. HAHN.
H. Res. 111: Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Mr. ADERHOLT, Mr. LARSEN of Washington, Mr. CULBERSON, and Mrs. BONO MACK.
H. Res. 130: Mr. KILDEE and Mr. GRIJALVA.
H. Res. 134: Ms. ESHOO.
H. Res. 304: Mr. JACKSON of Illinois.
H. Res. 623: Mr. SCHILLING.
H. Res. 663: Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio.
H. Res. 676: Mrs. LOWEY and Ms. TSONGAS.
H. Res. 690: Mr. POLIS.
H. Res. 695: Mr. NUGENT.
H. Res. 713: Mr. CONYERS, Mr. RUSH, Ms. BROWN of Florida, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. DEUTCH, Ms. NORTON, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Ms. BASS of California, Ms. HAHN, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. CLARKE of Michigan, and Ms. RICHARDSON.

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. CAMP

The provisions that warranted a referral to the Committee on Ways and Means in H.R. 6079, the ''Repeal of Obamacare Act,'' 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. DREIER

The provisions that warranted a referral to the Committee on Rules in H.R. 6079 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 Resources in H.R. 6079 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 provisions that warranted a referral to the Committee on Education and the Workforce in H.R. 6079, the Repeal of Obamacare Act, do not contain any congressional earmarks, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits as defined in clause 9 of rule XXI.

OFFERED BY MR. DANIEL E. LUNGREN OF CALIFORNIA

The provisions that warranted a referral to the Committee on House Administration in H.R. 6079 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. 6079 do not contain any congressional earmarks, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits as defined in clause 9 of rule XXI.

OFFERED BY MR. RYAN OF WISCONSIN

The provisions that warranted a referral to the Committee on the Budget in H.R. 6079, repeal of PL 111–148, PL 111–152, 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.

OFFERED BY MR. SMITH OF TEXAS

The provisions that warranted a referral to the Committee on the Judiciary in H.R. 6079 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 provisions that warranted a referral to the Committee on Energy and Commerce in H.R. 6079 do not contain any congressional earmarks, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits as defined in clause 9 of rule XXI.

DELETIONS OF SPONSORS FROM PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were deleted from public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 3798: Mr. WEST.