

year, I joined the Hawks and the USA Warriors veterans team for an outdoor hockey game at Soldier Field. The Hawks gave these vets—most of whom are Purple Heart recipients—a once-in-a-lifetime experience they will never forget.

And I suppose this is what the Hawks do best, provide their fans—fans in Chicago and around the world—with memories they will never forget. I look forward to the new memories yet to be made during future Stanley Cup victories, games with Blackhawk players who are just kids right now with the memory of shots heard around the hockey world ringing through their heads.

Mr. Speaker, hockey is a special sport that brings people together, improves our communities, and, most importantly, makes people dream the impossible and do the improbable. The entire world saw that this week thanks to the 2013 Stanley Cup Champion Chicago Blackhawks.

Go Hawks. And as always, my kind of town, Chicago is.

OBAMA'S WAR ON COAL

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

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, American coal families are under attack, not from a foreign power or a natural disaster, but by an administration that has resolutely, perversely, and now overtly proposed to end coal mining and coal-fired power generation in these United States.

President Obama's calamitous climate change plan announced yesterday is the latest job-killing bomb to be dropped on Kentucky, West Virginia, Illinois, and dozens of coal States already knocked down after 4 years of administration policies. This administration has used code words like "streamlining" and "permit reviews" to shell our communities with regulations and red tape that even the most sophisticated businesses can't adhere to.

Now the White House is dismantling our strategic energy advantage and unilaterally disarming our economy in broad daylight. I quote White House climate adviser Daniel Schrag straight out of the White House: "A war on coal is exactly what's needed."

Mr. Speaker, a war on coal is exactly what is not needed. A war on coal is a war on middle class Americans. It's a war on jobs, all kinds of jobs. It's already claimed 5,700 direct Kentucky jobs in just a year and a half, the vast majority of those in my economically challenged district.

There is no recovery in Inez or high-tech boom in Harlan, Mr. President. My families are struggling to get back to work, pay their bills, or find salaries comparable to coal mining. And my communities are losing their main employers. This climate plan makes the situation worse, dimming the prospects of reopening the mines even further.

Moreover, this disastrous climate change plan is a plan for America's economic and security decline. This plan would only lead to higher electric bills and increased dependence on foreign enemy sources. And to think someone has the audacity to say, "We need a war on coal." Well, what we need is a war on that line of thinking.

This administration's stringent rules and absurd mandates are simply meant to force coal-fired power plants to stop burning coal or shutter the facilities altogether. I call it strangulation by regulation.

□ 1010

Mr. Speaker, more than 200 coal plants have already closed across 25 States, and now seven new EPA regulations are on track to do even more damage. I'm losing one of the biggest employers in Lawrence County to this onslaught—1,200 good-paying jobs.

In total, the closure of mines, shuttering of power plants, and resulting hikes in electric rates are expected to cost the U.S. economy some 887,000 jobs per year. Please tell me how this is in our national interest, how this is leading America forward. In 2008, the President promised to bankrupt the coalfields. And yesterday, he took a giant step toward that reckless, shameful goal.

STUDENT LOAN INTEREST RATES

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

Mr. ISRAEL. Mr. Speaker, in 5 days, the student loan interest rate will double. It will go from 3.4 percent to 6.8 percent. That is a \$4,500 increase for many college students. At a time when they're struggling to make ends meet, struggling to pay their tuition and their housing expenses to prepare to join the workforce and build careers and at a time when they're struggling to pay their debts, we're going to increase their debt.

I want to commend to my colleagues a report that just came out from the Joint Economic Committee staff that talks about how student loan debt has skyrocketed over the past several years. Here's how the study concludes:

The increasing debt burden presents challenges for recent graduates just beginning their careers and poses a potential risk to the economy, since individuals who shoulder heavier debt balances may delay purchasing a home, buying a car, starting a family, and saving for retirement. On average, recent graduates left college with student loan debt of 60 percent of their annual income.

Mr. Speaker, 60 percent of their annual income will be spent paying back their debts from college. And if we don't compromise, it's going to be even more than that.

I've always believed, and I know many of my colleagues have always believed, that you build an economy by building the middle class. And you expand the middle class by making sure

that middle class families can afford college and that college is accessible. I do not understand an economic strategy that says that you make it harder and more expensive for the middle class to go to college; nor do I understand an argument that we cannot afford to keep the interest rate low, but we can spend \$40 billion subsidizing the five richest oil companies in America who do not need those subsidies.

The middle class deserves those subsidies. Middle class students trying to get into college deserve subsidies. But to say that they cannot have those subsidies and that we're going to double the interest rate on them while preserving a \$40 billion subsidy to the richest oil companies on Earth is not only bad policy; it's ruinous economic strategy.

Mr. Speaker, I do not know why anybody in this body would want to make it harder and more difficult for students to go to college at a time when we are competing with China and South Korea and other countries around the world to continue our strength and power over the next several decades.

It is essential that we find a compromise, Mr. Speaker. There is an unquenchable thirst by Americans for compromise in this body. I, for one, as well as members of the House Democratic Caucus, am ready, willing, and able to compromise over the next 5 days. We just need somebody to compromise with. We need a compromise that is fair to the middle class, puts middle class families first, puts college students first, puts college affordability first, and puts partisan politics aside.

SECURING THE BORDER

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

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Mr. Speaker, a great deal has been said about the border surge over in the Senate. In typical Senate-think, they have seen a problem and decided to throw money at the problem, even if a lack of funding is not the problem they are facing.

This map divides the country up into the Border Patrol sectors. The numbers are from 2010. The numbers are different today but, obviously, the ratios are about the same. In this year, one has to ask the question of why were 56 illegal entries apprehended in the main sector and 200,000 apprehended in the Arizona sector. What was the difference between those two?

If you were trying to sneak into a baseball game, something I'm not advocating, but if you were trying to do that, you don't jump over the turnstile where a cop is standing. You go around the corner and find the hole in the fence so no one will actually see what you are doing. The drug cartels are not stupid. They are looking for that hole in the fence. Obviously, this sector is where the majority of the illegals and

the illegal drugs and the illegal human trafficking and potential terrorism exists.

So the question has to be: Why is that the entrance level of choice? It's actually very simple. Everything that is red is land that's owned by the Federal Government on this map. In Arizona, 80 percent of the border is owned by the Federal Government. Over half of that is in the "Wilderness" category, "Endangered Species," or "Conservation Habitat" category, where, by special law, the legislation provides this land a special status which prohibits the Border Patrol from entering that area. They can't enter in a motorized vehicle. They can't even pedal a bicycle. They can go into that area on foot, on specially fed horses, and that is it. The drug cartels recognize this. They're not stupid. And they realize that this is the problem.

When this Congress insisted a fence be built along the California border, we passed legislation that waived 40 environmental laws that were prohibiting the fence from being built. Those same 40 laws are the laws that prohibit the Border Patrol from going along the red areas of that border and doing their job, which simply means, as ironic as it sounds, Federal law is stopping the Federal Border Patrol from going on Federal land to do a Federal purpose, which is federally stupid. But this is, indeed, what we're doing.

The Border Patrol actually cares about the environment. Drug cartels don't at all. This cacti, cut down by the drug cartel, is an endangered species. It was cut down there to stop east-west access on the only road that allows the Border Patrol to follow in that particular area.

This truck is a temporary sensor device in a wilderness area. The Border Patrol wanted to move it from point A to point B. It took them 6 months to get approval by the land manager in that area before they could back the truck up and move the truck over to another stop because the land manager was not happy with the Border Patrol being in his Wilderness territory. And the law was on the side of the land manager, not on the side of the Border Patrol.

The Senate has tried to say that they're coming up with a compromise solution to increase border security. In actuality, they have done just the opposite. They have put language in there that says that the Homeland Security Secretary can, notwithstanding any other law, require certain elements to be built in this particular area. But that allows the Secretary of Homeland Security to have the political discretion of whether to do it or not. It allows the Secretary of Homeland Security to have immediate access into these border areas, but only in Arizona. If they go anywhere else along this border, they have to have the written approval of the Secretary of the Interior as well as the Secretary of Agriculture. And most importantly, it says in there

that the manner in which the Homeland Security Secretary shall make these decisions must be in the manner that best protects the natural and cultural resources on Federal land.

I'm sorry, but as soon as they put that language in there, it requires some bureaucrat to establish what the standard is, and it opens it up to someone else initiating litigation that that is not the best standard possible. In essence, we're back in a worse situation.

They wish to have another 25,000 Border Patrol agents. This is what our fence looks like in Arizona today. This is a fence, this is Mexico, that's Arizona, and the open area is the animal habitat to allow animals to go back and forth from Mexico and Arizona. The one road on here is the only road in which the Border Patrol is allowed to go. You can have another 100,000 agents in that area, and you'll simply find out that it won't help unless you let them go outside of that one road.

We don't need money. What we need is access. What the Senate is proposing is actually worse than the status quo.

□ 1020

CLIMATE CHANGE

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

Mr. MCNERNEY. Mr. Speaker, the impacts of climate change can no longer be denied—superstorm hurricanes, massive tornados, record-breaking droughts and heat spells, accelerating melting of glaciers, and increasing ocean salinity. Due to the effects of climate change, many highly populated communities at low elevation face increasing pressure from storms and rising waters, potentially driving massive migrations to higher ground. If we continue on this path, extensive and severe droughts will hurt food production and fresh water supplies in the United States. Similar occurrences around the world will certainly be destabilizing and potentially draw the United States into dangerous conflicts.

Most climate change models predict increasing severity of these and other effects. However, the reality is that most computer models are being outpaced as the carbon buildup and energy trapped in the atmosphere accelerates.

Despite these developments, there is an increasing partisan divide on the issue of climate change. Many of my Republican colleagues are either in complete denial that global warming is happening, don't believe human activity is causing the problem, or think that it would be too expensive to take the necessary steps to mitigate and adapt to global warming. This gross partisan behavior in denial of science is becoming a clear and present threat to our national security and well-being.

Would we sit by if a foreign power built up a threatening military force

on one of our borders? Of course not. And yet, climate change presents a threat that's just as dangerous.

So what will it take for this Nation to greatly reduce carbon we are adding to the atmosphere and begin the process of preparing for the changes that are coming? Will it take a global weather catastrophe? Will it take several more Hurricane Sandy's? How many years of drought will the Midwest be forced to endure?

With global warming, the signs of change are overwhelming. We cannot wait for a global catastrophe that will impose massive suffering enough to overcome our civil institutions. Our national security depends on us taking action now.

The good news is that if we do take action now, the cost is affordable and the benefits are significant. Even if climate change were not a threat, reducing our consumption of fossil fuels will make the environment cleaner and energy costs less volatile. Increasing energy efficiency will greatly reduce family utility bills while making our homes more comfortable. Using renewable energy creates stable jobs. On the other hand, if we wait until a global or regional climate catastrophe forces desperate action, the consequences will be expensive and possibly deadly.

Those who reject science and deny human-caused climate change are fostering a dangerous threat to our Nation's future and to future generations of all Americans. I hope that those who deny the effects of climate change see the danger that they are subjecting our Nation to, or that the voters elect representatives who will take the responsible actions necessary to address the imminent threat of climate change.

WILDFIRE RESOLUTION

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

Mr. TIPTON. Mr. Speaker, the West Fork Complex Fire—acreage burning now in Colorado—is more than 141 square miles and counting. The East Peak Fire—over 13,000 acres and counting. These are just two of the fires that are burning in my district now, and it is still early summer. Tens of thousands of acres of forests are already gone and entire communities are being threatened.

Brave men and women are working around-the-clock to be able to stop this devastation. They are truly incredible, and I want to thank all of them for all they are doing to be able to protect property, save lives, and to be able to contain these wildfires.

Just like the wildfires that have ravaged our State over the last decade, these fires have destroyed property and are doing irreversible damage to the environment—to the fragile ecologies and watersheds on which we rely.

The incident commanders in charge of the suppression efforts on the West