we should not be surprised that industry will not always support—and rarely ask—to be regulated. History shows that industry groups initially opposed new requirements for seat belts and air bags, limitations on mercury pollution and even restrictions against child labor. In the short-term, narrow private interests often conflict with the broader public interest. Over time, well-designed and consistently-enforced rules often prove to be less costly and more beneficial than originally expected.

Democrats and Republicans should be working together to improve the federal regulatory structure. Our shared focus in Congress should be on reforming regulations to increase results and reduce costs. Partisan attempts to weaken common sense rules and protections will not make our economy—or our country—stronger.

I urge my colleagues to reject H.R. 367 because it undermines public safety and distracts Congress from the urgent task of creating jobs.

ENERGY CONSUMERS RELIEF ACT OF 2013

SPEECH OF

HON. GENE GREEN

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 31, 2013

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 1582) to protect consumers by prohibiting the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency from promulgating as final certain energy-related rules that are estimated to cost more than $1 billion and will cause significant adverse effects to the economy, with Ms. Ros-Lehtinen in the chair.

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas. Mr. Chair, I rise today in opposition to the Scalise amendment to H.R. 367, the Regulations From the Executive in Need of Scrutiny (REINS) Act. While Mr. Scalise may have the best intentions in trying to prevent the Administration from regulating carbon, the amendment actually subjects any regulation that places a fee, price or levy on pollution to the Congressional approval procedure mandated under the bill.

While some of my colleagues would still definitely support that, there are some unintended consequences to this approach. Take Houston, for example.

Houston has two programs that put a price on nitrogen oxide and volatile organic compound emissions. These market-based programs have been successful in lowering smog levels. Houston has had to have its programs approved by the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) as part of the state implementation plan (SIPs) under the Clean Air Act.

Under the Scalise amendment, the EPA cannot approve state programs in SIPS that would put a fee on emissions without an act of Congress. Houston's program could remain in place, but if they ever wanted to strengthen, relax or otherwise modify the program, it appears that the Scalise amendment would prevent that from happening. That would require Houston to find another way to comply with the Clean Air Act, which would likely be less flexible and more burdensome.

I want to be clear that I do not support the Administration devising a carbon control program; that is the job of the Congress. That said, this Congress must get to work and pass a bill that deals with carbon with input from Members that represent diverse constituencies nationwide. Cap and Trade legislation will not pass this Congress, but I believe a solution can be found for controlling carbon emissions by using nuclear and natural gas to generate electricity.

I encourage my colleagues to oppose this amendment.

BIPARTISAN STUDENT LOAN CERTAINTY ACT OF 2013

SPEECH OF

HON. RUSH HOLT

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 31, 2013

Mr. HOLT. Mr. Speaker, I oppose H.R. 1911, the Senate bill called the "Bipartisan Student Loan Certainty Act". While some argue the bill is better than the bill the House passed earlier this year, this bill fails to guarantee that students can have affordable loans to go to college. It fails to take interest rates on college loans as low as we could or should, and it allows the rates to grow to truly unacceptable levels.

Wall Street, whose reckless policies caused the greatest fiscal crisis since the Depression, is able to borrow money at 0.75 percent interest, yet under this bill, students will have to pay far more than that to borrow for their studies. Proponents of this bill claim that they are lowering interest rates for students, although they do not lower them as low as the rate we set several years ago and that was in effect until last month. Worse, the bill allows rates to go far higher than the already very high rates that began in July. Why? Why should students pay interest eight, nine, ten times higher than the rate that Wall Street pays. This bill will have some students paying interest rates as high as ten and a quarter percent. Ten and a quarter percent! Maybe not this year, but in future years. Ten and a quarter percent!

This is a very serious issue for our overall economic health. Student loan debt now stands at over $1 trillion. It is the second highest debt in the nation, only mortgage debt is higher. Furthermore, to help our economy grow we should be encouraging motivated, prepared students to go to college, not making it more expensive and inaccessible for them. The New York Federal Reserve has noted that the tremendous burden of student debt is slowing the economy. People strapped with debt cannot buy a house, they cannot spend money to improve our economy, and they cannot make strides to further improve their quality of life.

The authors of the legislation passed earlier this year and of this bill are stuck on the idea of trying to balance the budget on the backs of students and recent students. Why should they have to pay to restore the economy? They are not in a good financial position to pay for the misdeeds of Wall Street. Why shouldn't those made wealthy by Wall Street's misdeeds pay; they can afford it. In the past year, the federal government has already made more than $50 billion dollars in profit off student loan interest. Why should we continue to squeeze more revenue for the government out of students and former students?

Senator ELIZABETH WARREN has it right. Her plan would allow students to borrow at the same rate Wall Street does, the discount rate, the low rate that banks pay. Why should Wall Street get to borrow money at the lowest interest rate while college students pay more? They shouldn't. We will saddle with heavy debt the very people we want to go out and build businesses and raise families and work toward the American Dream.

This debate comes down to an important question of domestic policy and priorities. How important is it to us as a country to make college accessible for students so they can improve their lives and improve our country? We do it by making college more affordable—through increasing Pell Grants, by allowing students to borrow money at the same rates that Wall Street banks pay. We do it by not taking money from students to pay for the mess that Wall Street caused in the first place.

IN RECOGNITION OF SHARON WILLIAMS

HON. JACKIE SPEIER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 2, 2013

Ms. SPEIER. Mr. Speaker, I rise to honor the remarkable Sharon Williams, the long-time director of Menlo Park-based JobTrain. Sharon is retiring after forty years of instilling optimism in each JobTrain client and building life skills amongst an entire community. I have watched with amazement over these many years as Sharon has guided the JobTrain organization.

Sharon earned her BA in English from the University of the Pacific in 1965 and her teaching credential from San Francisco State University in 1968. She joined JobTrain in 1973 as a GED teacher. She became Director of Development in 1978 and a short time later took over as Executive Director. Conducting job training classes and connecting people with jobs was very difficult in the late 1970s. Sharon guided JobTrain and its clients through difficult financial times and built a stunningly successful career and job education center.

With Sharon's outstanding leadership, JobTrain has offered cutting-edge and traditional job training, everything from solar panel installation classes to computer repair to culinary arts to laboratory technician training for biotechnology facilities. Knowing that life skills are a large component of the training done by JobTrain, Sharon and her staff insist that clients learn how to show up on time to work, become team members in the modern work environment, and learn how to balance work and the demands of a family.

Mr. Speaker and Members, Sharon Williams has infused JobTrain with the same "can do" attitude that she insists from her clients. I've visited JobTrain on several occasions, most recently in the last few months.

It's a very busy place. JobTrain helps 8,000 persons per year, and 600 of them receive full-time vocational training. At least 85 percent of those who enroll complete their training. 75 percent of those persons are placed in jobs, and 12 months after placement, 84 percent are still working. JobTrain's success is spelled out in these numbers. Sharon's contributions to the Peninsula are not limited to