



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 113th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 159

WASHINGTON, THURSDAY, SEPTEMBER 26, 2013

No. 129

House of Representatives

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

DESIGNATION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

WASHINGTON, DC,
September 26, 2013.

I hereby appoint the Honorable DOUG LAMALFA to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

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

MORNING-HOUR DEBATE

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

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

SPECIAL IMMIGRANT VISA PROGRAM

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

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, in 2007, I introduced the first legislation to help the Iraqi and Afghan nationals that helped Americans in those countries to get them to safety in the United States. These are the people who were interpreters, guides, and drivers—people who performed countless tasks without which our military, diplomatic, and redevelopment efforts

would have been impossible. There was an implicit promise that, as they risked their lives to help us, we would work to protect them when the American presence was scaled down. Thousands of these people are now threatened on a daily basis by people with very long memories.

It would seem as though this shouldn't be an impossible task. After all, these are people who risked their lives to protect and serve Americans. If they had wanted to harm us, they had countless opportunities to lead people down the wrong path, attack, assault, and mislead; but, by all accounts, thousands of these people performed critical tasks faithfully, if not flawlessly.

What has not been flawless is how the State Department and Homeland Security have managed the Special Immigrant Visa program we fought so hard to establish. It takes incredible effort to fight bureaucracy, delays, and the procedural hurdles, which too often end in frustration. Approvals have been just a trickle, and there is no sign of improvement. Instead, the program could disappear.

The authorization for the Iraqi Immigrant Visa expires in 4 days. And this is a country that is on the verge of collapse. Violence is on the upswing and these people have been left twisting. Many have been forced into hiding. Others, along with their families, have not just been threatened, but killed.

We have been unable to get anything on the continuing resolution to keep the program alive. Frankly, given the state of play in Congress right now, the continuing resolution doesn't look like a very stable basis for hope.

There is a possible solution: a unanimous consent provision that will extend the program, at no additional budget cost, which will keep the pipeline open to accept visas until we can get back to meeting our moral obligation.

It should be a simple matter to pass the House. There is overwhelming bi-

partisan support that is led in the most articulate and forceful way by new Members in both parties, like TULSI GABBARD and ADAM KINZINGER, who are themselves veterans of Iraq and Afghanistan. This bipartisan group of recent veterans has seen the invaluable service and sacrifices of these people, and they feel a deep commitment to their safety. Sadly, not everybody in Congress feels that commitment, that moral obligation. The House Judiciary Committee leadership has been passive, if not outright opposed.

There's no guarantee that there will be a continuing resolution. In fact, the odds are getting a little more remote by the day. If this program shuts down for even a few hours, it will set back progress because of the cumbersome, convoluted nature of the program and security checks. People will be forced back to square one for approval, with their lives in great peril.

I would hope the House Republican leadership does not allow one or two people to veto meeting our moral obligation that has such broad bipartisan support. It will be to the shame of this body if we can't come together and protect the people we counted on in battle—and who are now counting on us.

This sad story is documented in Kirk Johnson's recent book, "To Be a Friend is Fatal: The Fight to Save the Iraqis America Left Behind." The title really says it all: "To Be a Friend is Fatal: The Fight to Save the Iraqis America Left Behind."

So far, we have failed them. I hope the House will rise to the occasion before it's too late.

IN REMEMBRANCE OF HARRIET HOWARD

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

□ This symbol represents the time of day during the House proceedings, e.g., □ 1407 is 2:07 p.m.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.



Printed on recycled paper.

H5835

Mr. DESJARLAIS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in remembrance of Harriet Howard, a great Tennessean who recently passed away.

Harriet Howard, of Rutherford County, is known throughout our community for her tireless efforts on behalf of our military veterans. Not only did Harriet devote countless hours to volunteer work; she helped ensure that veterans in our State have access to the care they need and deserve.

Harriet launched a well-known public communications campaign that led to female veterans receiving quality medical coverage. She set up a petition drive to prevent the Alvin C. York VA Medical Center in Rutherford County from closing. Today, the hospital remains open as a direct result of her efforts. Finally, she raised more than \$125,000 for the Tennessee Fisher House for a new facility in Murfreesboro. Harriet also served her country in the military as a Navy clerk for more than 39 years.

Our State owes an immeasurable debt of gratitude to Ms. Howard. I know she is missed by countless veterans and their families.

UNBUDGED IN OUR TRACKS

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

Mr. QUIGLEY. Mr. Speaker, lately, the people's House, this House of Representatives, has been called a lot of other things—dysfunctional, unpopular, and gridlocked—but one word, inspired by Charles Dickens, seems particularly fitting these days: bleak.

In 1852, Charles Dickens wrote the novel "Bleak House" about the dismal failures of the British judicial system. The title "Bleak House" refers to the main courthouse, above which reads the warning:

Suffer any wrong that can be done you rather than come here.

Given the recent inaction, and perhaps dysfunction, I feel a similar moniker may need to be placed above our own door.

This body has reached a point where our inaction is no longer harmless. Our inability to act and govern is having real and harmful effects. We are on the verge of causing great suffering.

Take, for example, health care. We passed health care reform 3 years ago. While everyone does not like all of its provisions, the fact is it's the law of the land. It's not going away. But rather than working together to improve the bill, as has been done with every other major piece of legislation, such as Medicare part D, many in this House are not only refusing to make adjustments; they are trying to stop its implementation altogether. There are efforts under way to dissuade young people from signing up for insurance, to prevent assisters from helping folks access insurance, and to scare seniors. Rather than coming together to improve our health care system, the dys-

function of this body is actually harming the health and well-being of millions of people.

Take the inability to pass a continuing resolution as another example of how the gridlock of this body is hurting our country. What was once a routine act of debating funding levels and priorities and passing a budget has devolved into a hijacking of government and the funding of health care. This is a game of chicken that risks shutting down the entire government and injuring millions of Americans.

Leaders on the other side of the aisle understand the devastating effect of such a shutdown. Speaker JOHN BOEHNER said in April 2011:

If you shut down the government, it'll end up costing more than you'll save because you interrupt contracts.

Yet despite such warnings, we continue to risk a deeply damaging government shutdown.

Finally, efforts to increase the debt limit should serve as another sober reminder of how dysfunctional and harmful this body has become. The debt limit has been raised 78 times, including 49 times by Republican Presidents and 29 times by Democratic Presidents. Once again, what was once standard operating procedure has become a hostage for extreme positions.

Many in this House are willing to risk the full faith and credit of the United States in order to push their extremism. Defaulting on our debt would cause irreparable damage to our recovery and risk sending us back into recession. As George W. Bush's chief economic adviser, Keith Hennessey, put it:

Not raising the debt limit could lead to "a catastrophic event."

Still, we continue down this dangerous path.

And these are just a few of the most topical examples. The list of items we are unable to tackle goes on and on: tax reform, entitlement reform, reauthorization of No Child Left Behind, transportation and infrastructure, immigration reform, postal reform, a decent farm bill, and commonsense gun violence legislation. We are indeed making Truman's do-nothing Congress look positively busy.

Yesterday, Senator CRUZ quoted Dr. Seuss. Today, I would like to do the same. But I am drawing from a different Seuss tale, the story of "The Zax." For those not familiar, the Zax is about two Zaxes going two different directions and who meet face-to-face. Each Zax refuses to go any direction but the direction it was headed. The Zaxes stand so long that a highway overpass is built over them, and the story ends with each Zax still standing there "unbudded in their tracks."

From Dickens to Seuss, great writers can teach us and warn us about the dangers of obstinacy and intransigence. Refusing to act has surely led us to a very bleak place indeed. Let's not end up like the Zaxes, "unbudded in our tracks," and unable to tackle the great challenges of our time.

CONGRATULATING TIDIOUTE COMMUNITY CHARTER SCHOOL

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

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I rise in recognition of Tidioute Community Charter School in Tidioute, Pennsylvania.

Earlier this week, the United States Secretary of Education awarded Tidioute Community Charter School the recognition of National Blue Ribbon School for 2013. The National Blue Ribbon is awarded to public and private elementary, middle, and high schools where students are achieving very high learning standards or are making notable improvements toward those standards.

Mr. Speaker, the National Blue Ribbon Award reaffirms the hard work of the students, faculty, and families who make up the Tidioute Community Charter School. I commend them for creating an environment where young minds are able to gain knowledge and skills; and, through a rigorous curriculum, students have developed the character to realize their own full potential.

Tidioute Community Charter School students exemplify just what it means to be young learners preparing for their roles in the 21st century. Equally so, the quality instruction, creativity, and support of the teachers and families have made the Tidioute Community Charter School deserving of our praise.

END HUNGER NOW

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

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I come to the floor today to again talk about the need to end hunger now.

Last week, this House passed a bill that cut \$39 billion from the Nation's preeminent anti-hunger safety net program, the Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program, or SNAP. Formerly known as food stamps, SNAP is a program that provides food to low-income individuals and their families. It also has among the lowest error rates of any Federal program. Additionally, the bill contained new work requirements for people receiving SNAP benefits.

Mr. Speaker, the notion of new and stricter work requirements sounds terrific. I'm sure it polls very well. But the reality is that the majority of people receiving SNAP who can work, actually do work. In fact, working people are the fastest-growing priority of the SNAP program.

And let me note that SNAP already has work requirements for able-bodied adults without dependents. Under current law, they are eligible for SNAP benefits for only 3 out of every 36 months unless they work 20 hours a

week or are in a State-run unemployment or training program. The law specifically states they must take a job if it is offered to them, and cannot quit.

States can apply for waivers for areas of high unemployment. During this very difficult economic time, 48 States and jurisdictions currently do so. In other words, Republican and Democratic Governors alike understand that forcing people to find a job before they can get their food benefits doesn't make any sense if there are no jobs to find.

The Republican bill would eliminate those State waivers and impose harsh financial penalties on States that refuse to implement the new work requirements. So much for States' rights.

□ 1015

But more broadly, Mr. Speaker, it's important to note that what we do in Congress is not done in a vacuum. Every action we take is linked together. Every piece of Federal policy that we pass has a reaction on other Federal policies.

For the past 3 years, we have seen this Tea Party-controlled House of Representatives attempt to weaken our educational system, prevent people from obtaining health care, cut childcare programs, cut transportation funding and affordable housing, cut job training programs, try to take health care away from people who have insurance, and prevent bills that create jobs from coming to the floor. In other words, at the same time my Republican friends are telling poor people that they need to work in order to get food benefits, they are doing everything possible to make it harder for people to find a job that pays a living wage.

Now, think about a young single mother who is trying to make a better life. Republicans want to cut Pell Grants, cut funding to community colleges, and cut job training programs, which means it's harder for her to get the skills she needs. This sequester has meant cuts to Head Start programs, which makes it harder to find affordable childcare so that she can go to work. Cuts in transportation funding make it more difficult and expensive for her to get to a job if she can find one.

They reject health insurance for everyone, which gives her a perverse incentive to stay on Medicaid. They oppose raising the minimum wage, which means that even if she can find a job, it likely won't pay enough to provide for her family.

Mr. Speaker, slashing government just for its own sake means cutting education, stifling innovation and job creation, and preventing people from making ends meet.

I have come to this floor week after week to talk about how we can end hunger now. Week after week, I have called for a White House conference on food and nutrition, urging the President to bring policy and political experts to the White House to come up

with a comprehensive plan to End Hunger Now—a plan that could dramatically reduce the number of people who rely on SNAP and reduce the amount of money we spend on the program. This is an issue that can and must be solved.

Last week, this House took a huge step backwards, a step that will make more people hungry in America. It was an awful thing to do. The Congressional Budget Office estimates that 3.8 million people will lose their benefits; 170,000 veterans will lose their food benefits.

Ending hunger used to be a bipartisan issue. Surely, it can be again.

HEALTH CARE PERSPECTIVES

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

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, today I want to bring two very contrasting perspectives to the floor with regard to health care. One of them starts with an individual that we are all familiar with, and when he talks, people listen.

On March 1, 2010, Warren Buffett said:

I would much rather see a plan C that really attacks costs in regard to health care. And I think that's what the American public wants to see. The American public is not behind this bill. And we need the American public behind the bill.

Now, he has changed his position two or three times and it is hard to get a beat on exactly how he feels about ObamaCare, but when he talks, people listen. The problem is the people we need to hear from the most aren't being heard.

I got a letter from Christy in Jonesboro, in my district, and I'm going to share that letter with you today. It says:

As I was listening to the radio this morning, people were calling in about how ObamaCare is already affecting them. I just want you to know a little about our family.

My husband and I are 48 years old, have been married 29 years, and have three daughters, ages 16, 18, and 23—all still living at home, although the 23-year-old does work a full-time job.

My husband has been an auto-body mechanic for most of his life. This has taken a serious toll on his body as a result of strenuous physical labor paired with breathing chemicals. He has worked at numerous body shops—always looking for a better environment/pay/benefits. I will say, as a body man's wife, the people making good livings in this area are the body shop owners and the health insurance companies.

Every shop he ever worked at offered him health insurance, but the premiums were always around \$200 a week just for him. There was no way we could afford \$800 a month for something that may or may not happen.

Our family of five has rarely been sick. I have tried to practice preventative health care by what I feed my family because I'm positive a large percentage of health costs are due to diet.

My husband makes \$500 a week, on average; my daughter makes a little over \$300 a week. Our rent is \$800 a month. Utilities run

\$200. We can barely afford the \$47 liability insurance on my husband's vehicle. My daughter pays the \$95 liability insurance on her vehicle.

We have barely been able to buy groceries, and I know how to shop frugally. We have no credit cards or expensive habits. We use the library a great deal. My question is: What will we do when we are fined because we don't have health insurance? There is absolutely no way we can afford health insurance for a family of five.

It is hard to go day by day watching what is happening with the government of this once great Nation. I am so discouraged and disappointed, and I try not to fear the future when it comes to the American Government, which will dictate my future regardless. Thank you for your time.

Respectfully, Christy in Jonesboro, Arkansas.

I want Christy to know, and I want everybody in America to know, that I hear you. Those guys that are driving the nails, those guys that are turning the wrenches, the nurses that are providing health care, the firemen who are doing their jobs working the 40-hour week, barely making ends meet, and we're piling more and more debt on this country—\$1.3 trillion in additional costs, when Social Security and Medicare are nearing bankruptcy. It's unconscionable.

I want folks to know, certainly in my district and folks across the country, that there are people here that hear you. And we're going to work for you and try to fix this problem because we can't sustain this any longer.

CONGRATULATING ORACLE TEAM USA

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI).

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague from Illinois (Mr. DAVIS) for his courtesy to allow me, with great enthusiasm, to come to the floor to salute Team America, the Oracle Team USA, which came from behind to win the America's Cup.

As many people may be aware, and some not, over the past year or so the San Francisco Bay Area has been home to the America's Cup race. It's a venerable race. It is usually out to sea, where people in their sailboats could witness what was going on or see it on TV. Because of the vision of Larry Ellison, it was brought to San Francisco Bay. It went from white caps to blue collar, and anyone who could see the bay could see the America's Cup race. The shores were lined with people, and anyone who had a view of the water could see something spectacular happen.

For the past 2 weeks, San Francisco was home to the 34th America's Cup Finals, where Oracle Team USA and Emirates New Zealand raced across the bay for the right to win the oldest trophy in international sport.

The race was swift—boasting AC72s, the fastest catamarans the competition has ever seen. The race was long—lasting over 15 days, as these two incredible teams competed in 19 races. The

race was close—featuring the first “winner-takes-all” final race in 30 years.

And yesterday afternoon, the 34th America’s Cup finished with the most incredible comeback in history. After trailing Team New Zealand one to eight—Team USA had one, Team New Zealand had eight—Oracle Team USA surged ahead to win an unprecedented eight straight races to once again hold the America’s Cup trophy high above their heads.

Skipper Jimmy Spithill, Tactician Sir Ben Ainslie, and the entire Oracle Team USA sailed into the Port of San Francisco as champions, welcomed by the largest and loudest crowd to cheer their entrance into history—or any team in history.

There could be no better backdrop, in my view—or in the view of anyone who saw it—to such a momentous American moment when Team USA in San Francisco Bay crossed over to victory with the backdrop of the hugest American flag I have ever seen.

This all was a vision of Oracle Team Sponsor Larry Ellison, who was on the water with his crew joining in the celebration of his team’s second victory in America’s Cup. Larry Ellison’s vision democratized the Cup—as I said, from white caps to blue collar—by bringing the race so close to the shoreline that everyone who could view San Francisco Bay could view the excitement of America’s Cup.

That beautiful sight was made possible by the extraordinary leadership of San Francisco Mayor Ed Lee, California Lieutenant Governor Gavin Newsom, Mark Buell, who led a private sector initiative, Kyri McClellan of the America’s Cup Organizing Committee, and Daley Dunham with the Port of San Francisco.

Thank you to the Coast Guard, the National Park Service, and the Army Corps of Engineers for helping make this race a spectacular sight to see. With the help of these leaders and the local San Francisco maritime unions, the world witnessed one of the greatest moments in sports history on the beautiful bay.

The America’s Cup is the oldest and most prestigious trophy in yachting. Team USA won the very first race in 1851 and had successfully defended the Cup for the next 132 years, until 1983. Exactly 30 years later, the Cup returned home where it belongs—in the hands of American sailors who defied the odds, were so courageous, were so disciplined, who were so focused, who had such a strategic plan to give our country—USA, USA, USA—a victory we will never forget.

Thank you, Oracle Team USA, for putting your hearts, your souls, your everything, your all into the 34th America’s Cup. You have earned your place in history.

FOREIGN POLICY

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

Mr. ISSA. Mr. Speaker, as a proud Californian, I join Ms. PELOSI in congratulating Oracle Team USA. Ever since Dennis Conner brought the Cup to California, we, as Californians, are very proud of it.

I didn’t spend the weekend in San Francisco, though. I spent it in Libya and in Cairo, because, as we speak here today, the good things that are going on in America are often overshadowed by our poor foreign policy, our inattention to historic allies and obligations.

Today, war is going on in the Sinai, and the Egyptian Army is fighting it while we debate whether or not to support their effort. We debate whether or not a coup that overthrew a dictator who was elected—a man who no sooner got his office then he began moving Egypt toward shari’a law, abolishing its form of balance, including its judiciary and its parliament. We continue to debate.

The fact is we need allies in the region. Israel needs allies in the region. Egypt needs to protect borders from insurgency and terrorism to its south, in the Sinai, and along the Libyan border.

More than ever, the Libyan border is a concern for all of us. It is a lawless area. The term “Benghazi” often is taken for the sad loss of four brave Americans at our consulate, but the truth is Benghazi is the next Afghanistan if we cannot engage and stop the terrorism that is going on there. It is a training ground for insurgents—one of many.

So when many talk in foreign policy today about the Arab Spring, I’d like all Americans to understand, Mr. Speaker, the Arab Spring is, in fact, sulfur water spewing from mosques, from terrorist strongholds, from ideological extremists in the region. It is taking on a life of its own under this administration, and that life will end the secular life, the freedom of religion that many moderate Arab states have enjoyed for generations.

Under President Morsi, we saw more than 50 Coptic churches burned; and in the days coming afterwards, even more by the Muslim Brotherhood, who somehow felt that one election based on one man, one vote, and one time would allow them to rule the largest Arab country forever as an Islamic state.

□ 1030

Mr. Speaker, I believe that all of my colleagues need to begin to look at the wrong direction we have taken. Stop celebrating an Arab Spring that really is about overthrowing allies who we have questions about whether or not they’re heading toward a democratic state. But we have no doubt we have pushed them toward the rule of law, toward institutions, and toward being part of a world that denounces and renounces various bad activities.

Mr. Speaker, I cannot stress strongly enough that if we continue to have a

policy of leading from behind, of indecision, of asking this body to spank somebody slightly for using chemical weapons while not taking an affirmative action toward a government that would respect its people, and particularly minorities and Christians in the region, then we have no policy and we have no allies.

Mr. Speaker, I take no pride in saying that when President Obama attempted to go into Syria, he did not get support from his own party nor my party nor virtually any of our historic allies for a reason. His plan was ill-conceived and led to no real positive change in Syria.

For our allies in the region—for Jordan, for Lebanon, for Egypt, and for Israel—we must develop a consistent policy where our enemies fear us and our allies respect and count on us always. We don’t have that today. I would call on all my colleagues to become more familiar with the Arab Spring and see the sulfur that comes up and is often mixed and misunderstood for drinking water.

WE DON’T SERVE TEENS

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

Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to join with the Democratic leader and chairman of the Oversight and Government Reform Committee in congratulating Team USA on winning the America’s Cup.

I rise today to inform my colleagues about a consumer protection initiative of the Federal Trade Commission to address underage drinking in the United States known as “We Don’t Serve Teens.”

People may not think of underage drinking as a consumer protection issue. But We Don’t Serve Teens is an annual educational effort each September as teens head back to high school and college. The goal is to sustain and build on the progress our Nation has made in combating underage drinking. In my hometown of Chicago, Crown Imports is leading an effort to publicize the We Don’t Serve Teens message.

We need the active involvement of parents, older siblings, relatives, educators, and other adults. Years of government surveys show that a significant number of young teens get alcohol from their own homes or the homes of friends or extended family members. Most parents are extremely careful about watching what their younger children eat or drink. For our teens, maintaining vigilance over the refrigerator, the wine rack, or the liquor cabinet is equally important.

Illegal underage drinking among older teens is a more formidable challenge. They are mobile and often able to obtain alcohol from older friends and family members, including older students in colleges and universities.

With that access and mobility comes sad statistics.

An August 2012 report by the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration indicated that 839 drivers under the age of 21 were killed in drunk driving crashes in the United States during 2010. Several thousand were seriously injured, some with permanent disabilities. These tragedies are 100 percent preventable. But as every parent knows, our teens do not always make the best decisions, and some simply need more active supervision.

Back in 2006, when bipartisanship was still a hallmark of this body, our colleagues on the Appropriations Committee, LUCILLE ROYBAL-ALLARD and FRANK WOLF, teamed up to enact the Sober Truth on Preventing Underage Drinking Reauthorization Act, better known as the STOP Act. They are still committed to reauthorizing that legislation, which has helped align the policies of several Federal agencies involved in reducing and preventing underage drinking. The reauthorization bill introduced this year is H.R. 498. I urge my colleagues to support the legislation to sustain momentum in efforts to combat underage drinking.

In the district I represent, an organization that has benefited from the STOP Act grant is the Brighton Park Drug-Free Community Coalition. Their efforts embody the spirit of the We Don't Serve Teens initiative. Civic-minded adults have organized "block clubs" to monitor neighborhood conditions that can contribute to illegal underage drinking and other substance abuse. They also enlisted neighborhood retailers for assistance and a shared commitment to prevent illegal underage sales to minors.

In many metropolitan areas around the Nation, those who sell and serve alcohol beverages have been supportive of the We Don't Serve Teens initiative. I mentioned that Crown Imports is leading the effort in Chicago with a media campaign that includes outdoor advertising, radio, and television messages that will be seen by millions of adults. Other brewers and importers are taking the lead in New York, Milwaukee, St. Louis, and other metropolitan areas.

I commend the FTC for its leadership on the We Don't Serve Teens and all who support this valuable program. It is worth the effort.

AFFORDABLE CARE ACT

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

Mr. GARDNER. Mr. Speaker, when the President began his push to pass the partisan Affordable Care Act, he did so with two primary promises: the promise that if you like your health care plan, you will be able to keep your health care plan, period. No one will take it away. That was the plan that this Chamber voted for when they passed the so-called Affordable Care

Act. That was the plan the United States Senate voted for when they passed the so-called Affordable Care Act: If you like your health care, you can keep it.

In 2011, Richard Foster, the Chief Actuary of Medicare, testified before Congress that this promise would not come true, the promise that if you liked your health care, if you liked your health insurance plan, you would get to keep it. The Chief Actuary of Medicare—he is not a Democrat or Republican appointee—said that this promise, the promise that was made when this bill passed, won't come true.

Over the past several months, my office has received countless letters, emails, tweets and Facebook comments from people around this country and around my district in Colorado who have said thanks to ObamaCare they are losing their health insurance, they are losing their family's plan. This promise for them is not coming true.

When I first got elected to Congress, I made a decision that I would reject congressional health insurance, that I would reject the Federal health care plan, because I wanted to be in the same boat as my constituents. Just a couple of weeks ago, I too received a letter in the mail from our insurance plan, our private provider, in Colorado for our family, and it said this: We notify you about the upcoming discontinuation of your plan. This letter right here that says my family's plan is being canceled.

Mr. President, where is the promise? Mr. President, if you like your health care plan you'll be able to keep it—tell that to the thousands of people in my district who are losing their health insurance, to my family, to millions of people around this country for whom this promise that you made when you sold this bill is not coming true.

The plan that my family had was an affordable plan. We shopped for it. We worked hard to find a plan that met our needs in rural Colorado. We found a plan that is now being canceled. The plan that replaces it—the plan that replaces it—now increases in cost by over 100 percent. In fact, the plan that is most similar to the one we had is now going up to \$1,480 a month. It is a 100 percent increase from the plan that we had.

But the President said if you had your health insurance that you liked, you would get to keep it. The President also said the second primary promise, though, was that if you had your plan and you got to keep it, we're going to make sure that this bill, the Affordable Care Act, brings down your cost. Yet we know that that's not coming true either, as people around this country are facing higher insurance costs, higher plan costs, canceling their plans, forcing them to go to other alternatives.

In the letter that we received canceling my family's plan it said this: that I have options, I have options to

purchase another individual health plan from us, purchase a plan from another carrier, or go through the health care exchange in Colorado, an exchange that was just reported in the newspaper to have significant computer glitches even though it is supposed to be up and running on October 1. But not one of these options, not a single one of these options include being able to keep the plan that my family had, despite the President's promise, the promise that if you liked your insurance you would be able to keep it.

Mr. President, where is your promise today? Will you explain to the American people that neither of those promises—the primary reasons you pushed the health care bill—are untrue. Explain that to the American people.

In recent reports we've seen from Forbes an analysis that ObamaCare will increase underlying insurance rates for younger men by an average of 97 to 99 percent and for women by an average of 55 to 62 percent. HHS compared what the Congressional Budget Office projected rates might look like in 2016 to its own findings. What happened, of course, in this analysis was that premiums, according to Forbes, nationwide will be around 16 percent lower. That's what they said. But after the analysis, after the analysis by CBO, which looked at the projected rates in 2016 compared to its own findings, neither of those numbers tell you the statistic that really matters: how much rates will go up next year under ObamaCare relative to this year, prior to the law taking effect. Looking at families like mine, a 100 percent increase.

We've received stories from around the district—people who have seen their costs increase, people who have seen their insurance canceled. We received a message over Twitter that said: I lost my insurance because I can't afford the 100 percent cost increase. For the first time in 47 years I will have to depend on the government for health insurance. Another gentleman said he will be dependent on the taxpayers as well for the first time in his life.

Mr. President, explain to the American people why the promises that you made, the promises you made to the American people, are simply not true.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Members are reminded to direct their remarks to the Chair and not to a perceived viewing audience.

CONTINUING RESOLUTION

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

Mr. CONNOLLY. Mr. Speaker, I was sorry to hear that our colleague from Colorado has had his insurance canceled or threatened with a 100 percent premium increase. That is precisely what ObamaCare was designed to stop—the capricious actions of cancellation of coverage, especially when

you get sick, by insurance companies. That's exactly what it's going to do. It's going to end that kind of practice and give you more choices.

Mr. Speaker, the majority of Americans object to House Republicans holding hostage the basic government services our citizens expect and need just so they can poke the President in the eye once again by trying to repeal the signature health insurance reform law.

In a recent poll, 8 out of 10 respondents said it is unacceptable for Members of Congress to threaten to shut down the government in order to achieve narrow ideological goals. After last week's House vote on the Republican hostage plan, another poll found more than half of Republican respondents want Congress to keep the government open rather than shut it down over the Affordable Care Act.

So why can't House Republicans accept the Affordable Care Act, which was adopted by Congress and reaffirmed by the Supreme Court and reaffirmed in an election just 10 months ago in this country? They have held 42 votes to chip away or outright repeal this signature law, and they have failed in every one of those attempts.

Senator JOHN MCCAIN, a prominent and respected Republican, tried to counsel his Republican friends on the futility of this effort on the floor of the Senate yesterday by reminding them that elections have consequences. The man who lost the 2008 election to President Obama noted that a majority of Americans reaffirmed their support of this President and his agenda, and by extension his signature initiative, in last year's election.

□ 1045

What is particularly disappointing in this protracted debate is this false narrative that the Affordable Care Act is not working, that it will somehow cause an economic calamity, as the majority leader claimed last week. What truly worries House Republicans, one suspects, isn't that the Affordable Care Act will fail, but precisely the opposite—they are frightened to death it will succeed.

Just this week, we received further confirmation that, in fact, it is delivering on its promise to reverse the skyrocketing costs of health care, unlike the narrative of my friend from Colorado. When the insurance exchanges open for enrollment next week, the Department of Health and Human Services says consumers will find an average of 53 health plans to choose from and premiums 16 percent lower—not higher—than expected, and that's before any tax credits are applied. In my district, for example, a family of four, earning \$50,000 a year, will be able to find a silver-rated insurance plan for less than \$300 a month, and they could pay a zero premium with that subsidy for a bronze-rated plan.

The Affordable Care Act is working for seniors. Premiums and deductibles for Medicare are lower, not higher, and

seniors have saved more than \$7 billion so far in prescription drug costs thanks to closing the doughnut hole of Medicare part D. Enrollment in Medicare Advantage plans has gone up 30 percent since 2010, and premiums have dropped 16 percent since that time. That's a far cry from the kind of demonizing and the "wolf's at the door" rhetoric of some of my friends on the other side.

Mr. Speaker, it is not the Affordable Care Act that puts America at risk of economic calamity, but the reckless actions of my friends on the other side of the aisle who are willing, once again, to hold the American people hostage because they don't like it. They have an ideological agenda that is going to create deep hardship in every one of those households my friend from Colorado just discussed and in every one of the households throughout America.

Let's get on with the business of America, and let's stop the practice of hostage-taking on the floor of the House.

MENTAL ILLNESS AND GUN VIOLENCE

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

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, with the tragic mass shooting last week at the Washington Navy Yard, our country has again been ravaged by preventable gun violence. America must confront these events and their causes to prevent future tragedies.

Since 2007, according to the FBI, there have been 146 reported mass shootings. Far too often, a large contributing factor to this recent surge in violence is untreated mental illness; and in far too many instances, the perpetrators are former members of our military. Our Nation must bridge the gaps in our current mental health system to avoid more tragedies.

The President recently unveiled his BRAIN Initiative. It calls for \$100 million in funding to advance our understanding of the human mind. Supporting this proposal will go a long way to furthering our understanding of the causes and conditions that afflict those who wish to harm others and themselves.

Further, Congressman MCKINLEY of West Virginia and I have introduced H.R. 1615, the Examining America's Mental Health Services Act of 2013. The bill requires the Secretary of Health and Human Services and the National Academies' Institute of Medicine to conduct a comprehensive study on the gaps in our Nation's mental health services and to explore how these gaps increase the risk of violent acts. Experts such as former Army Vice Chief of Staff Dr. Peter Chiarelli, Dr. Joseph Calabrese of Case Western Reserve University, U.S. Army Colonel Carl Castro, and Dr. E. Fuller Torrey, head of the Stanley Foundation, would be prime candidates to lead breakthrough national initiatives on mental health.

Part of our comprehensive effort should focus on (1) accelerating funding for brain research and neuropsychiatric treatment; (2), reforming military enlistment, discharge procedures and integrating the Department of Defense and Department of Veterans Affairs' medical records systems; (3), instituting early childhood behavioral screening in schools; and, (4), restricting gun and ammunition access to those who have serious behavioral disorders.

Additional focus on mental illness and gun access is imperative. The Navy Yard tragedy resulted in the deaths of 13 of our citizens with eight additional people injured. The perpetrator, Aaron Alexis, was aged 34, a Navy Reserve veteran and a contractor to the U.S. Navy. He joined the Naval Reserve and began experiencing conditions that many would describe as related to PTSD, with demonstrable neuro conditions such as schizophrenia or paranoid schizophrenia. However, he was allowed to purchase a Remington 870 pump action shotgun and two boxes of ammunition. Individuals who suffer from these types of ailments should not have access to weapons and stockpiles of ammunition.

Unaddressed mental illness continues to be prevalent in many of our Nation's traumatic mass shootings, and they involve perpetrators who are private citizens as well.

We recall so sadly in Tucson, Arizona, when our own former dear colleague, Rep. Gabby Giffords, and current colleague, Representative RON BARBER, miraculously survived a mass shooting in which six others lost their lives after a deranged gunman, Jared Lee Loughner, opened fire at a meeting at a local supermarket at which Giffords and constituents were gathering.

We saw it at nearby Virginia Tech on April 16, 2007, when Seung-Hui Cho took the lives of 32 people; and we saw it at Sandy Hook Elementary School in December of 2012, when 20-year-old Adam Lanza ended the lives of 20 children and seven adults after taking his own mother's life and then his own.

How many more calls for attention—for help—does America need to hear?

The killing of two Capitol Police Officers over a decade ago, here in our Capitol, was perpetrated by a man who had been diagnosed as a paranoid schizophrenic who was off his medication, alienated from his family and who got access to a gun.

Congress should be deeply concerned that civilians, as well as our brave men and women who serve or who have served in our Armed Forces, are not receiving the medical treatment required for diagnosing debilitating mental illness and trying to treat it better. An annual Department of Defense report on suicide has shown a precipitous increase in military suicides over the course of the last 5 years. In 2012, there were 349 suicides by military men and women from all branches of the Armed

Forces. That is more than all the combat deaths that same year in Afghanistan. This is an epidemic and requires more attention and investment, including the BRAIN Initiative put forward by the President.

In sum, the common denominator with many of these mass shootings is a mentally ill individual with access to deadly weapons who has not been treated properly or, many times, whose mental illness has not even been evaluated. America must address these deficiencies for the benefit of our entire society. We must accelerate research to unlock the mysteries of the human brain.

Mr. Speaker, the only question is: Do America's leaders on behalf of the American people have the courage and vision to embark on a serious national conversation about mental health and mental illness?

THE WHITE HOUSE,
OFFICE OF THE PRESS SECRETARY,
April 2, 2013.

FACT SHEET: BRAIN INITIATIVE

"If we want to make the best products, we also have to invest in the best ideas . . . Every dollar we invested to map the human genome returned \$140 to our economy . . . Today, our scientists are mapping the human brain to unlock the answers to Alzheimer's . . . Now is not the time to gut these job-creating investments in science and innovation. Now is the time to reach a level of research and development not seen since the height of the Space Race."—President Barack Obama, 2013 State of the Union.

In his State of the Union address, the President laid out his vision for creating jobs and building a growing, thriving middle class by making a historic investment in research and development.

Today, at a White House event, the President unveiled a bold new research initiative designed to revolutionize our understanding of the human brain. Launched with approximately \$100 million in the President's Fiscal Year 2014 Budget, the BRAIN (Brain Research through Advancing Innovative Neurotechnologies) Initiative ultimately aims to help researchers find new ways to treat, cure, and even prevent brain disorders, such as Alzheimer's disease, epilepsy, and traumatic brain injury.

The BRAIN Initiative will accelerate the development and application of new technologies that will enable researchers to produce dynamic pictures of the brain that show how individual brain cells and complex neural circuits interact at the speed of thought. These technologies will open new doors to explore how the brain records, processes, uses, stores, and retrieves vast quantities of information, and shed light on the complex links between brain function and behavior.

This initiative is one of the Administration's "Grand Challenges"—ambitious but achievable goals that require advances in science and technology. In his remarks today, the President called on companies, research universities, foundations, and philanthropists to join with him in identifying and pursuing the Grand Challenges of the 21st century.

The BRAIN Initiative includes:

Key investments to jumpstart the effort: The National Institutes of Health, the Defense Advanced Research Projects Agency, and the National Science Foundation will support approximately \$100 million in research beginning in FY 2014.

Strong academic leadership: The National Institutes of Health will establish a high-level working group co-chaired by Dr. Cornelia "Cori" Bargmann (The Rockefeller University) and Dr. William Newsome (Stanford University) to define detailed scientific goals for the NIH's investment, and to develop a multi-year scientific plan for achieving these goals, including timetables, milestones, and cost estimates.

Public-private partnerships: Federal research agencies will partner with companies, foundations, and private research institutions that are also investing in relevant neuroscience research, such as the Allen Institute, the Howard Hughes Medical Institute, the Kavli Foundation, and the Salk Institute for Biological Studies.

Maintaining our highest ethical standards: Pioneering research often has the potential to raise new ethical challenges. To ensure this new effort proceeds in ways that continue to adhere to our highest standards of research protections, the President will direct his Commission for the Study of Bioethical Issues to explore the ethical, legal, and societal implications raised by this research initiative and other recent advances in neuroscience.

BACKGROUND

In the last decade alone, scientists have made a number of landmark discoveries that now create the opportunity to unlock the mysteries of the brain, including the sequencing of the human genome, the development of new tools for mapping neuronal connections, the increasing resolution of imaging technologies, and the explosion of nanoscience. These breakthroughs have paved the way for unprecedented collaboration and discovery across scientific fields. For instance, by combining advanced genetic and optical techniques, scientists can now use pulses of light to determine how specific cell activities in the brain affect behavior. In addition, through the integration of neuroscience and physics, researchers can now use high-resolution imaging technologies to observe how the brain is structurally and functionally connected in living humans.

While these technological innovations have contributed substantially to our expanding knowledge of the brain, significant breakthroughs in how we treat neurological and psychiatric disease will require a new generation of tools to enable researchers to record signals from brain cells in much greater numbers and at even faster speeds. This cannot currently be achieved, but great promise for developing such technologies lies at the intersections of nanoscience, imaging, engineering, informatics, and other rapidly emerging fields of science and engineering.

KEY INVESTMENTS TO LAUNCH THIS EFFORT

To make the most of these opportunities, the National Institutes of Health, the Defense Advanced Research Projects Agency, and the National Science Foundation are launching this effort with funding in the President's FY 2014 budget.

National Institutes of Health: The NIH Blueprint for Neuroscience Research—an initiative that pools resources and expertise from across 15 NIH Institutes and Centers—will be a leading NIH contributor to the implementation of this initiative in FY 2014. The Blueprint program will contribute funding for the initiative, given that the Blueprint funds are specifically devoted to projects that support the development of new tools, training opportunities, and other resources. In total, NIH intends to allocate approximately \$40 million in FY 2014.

Defense Advanced Research Projects Agency: In FY 2014, DARPA plans to invest \$50 million in a set of programs with the goal of understanding the dynamic functions of the

brain and demonstrating breakthrough applications based on these insights. DARPA aims to develop a new set of tools to capture and process dynamic neural and synaptic activities. DARPA is interested in applications—such as a new generation of information processing systems and restoration mechanisms—that dramatically improve the way we diagnose and treat warfighters suffering from post-traumatic stress, brain injury, and memory loss. DARPA will engage a broad range of experts to explore the ethical, legal, and societal issues raised by advances in neurotechnology.

National Science Foundation: The National Science Foundation will play an important role in the BRAIN Initiative because of its ability to support research that spans biology, the physical sciences, engineering, computer science, and the social and behavioral sciences. The National Science Foundation intends to support approximately \$20 million in FY 2014 in research that will advance this initiative, such as the development of molecular-scale probes that can sense and record the activity of neural networks; advances in "Big Data" that are necessary to analyze the huge amounts of information that will be generated, and increased understanding of how thoughts, emotions, actions, and memories are represented in the brain.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Ms. Curtis, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate has passed a bill of the following title in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 252. An act to reduce preterm labor and delivery and the risk of pregnancy-related deaths and complications due to pregnancy, and to reduce infant mortality caused by prematurity.

The message also announced that the Senate concurs in the amendment of the House to bill (S. 793), "An Act to support revitalization and reform of the Organization of American States, and for other purposes."

RECESS

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

Accordingly (at 10 o'clock and 52 minutes a.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1200

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker at noon.

PRAYER

The Chaplain, the Reverend Patrick J. Conroy, offered the following prayer: Dear Lord, we give You thanks for giving us another day.

We come to You as a Nation in the midst of great uncertainty and worry. As people look for causes and solutions, the temptation is great to seek ideological position.

We ask that You might send Your Spirit of Peace and Reconciliation, that instead of ascendancy over opponents, the Members of this people's House, and all elected to represent our Nation, might work together, humbly, recognizing the best in each other's hopes, to bring stability and direction toward a strong future.

May all that is done this day be for Your greater honor and glory.
Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER. 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.

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to clause 1, rule I, I demand a vote on agreeing to the Speaker's approval of the Journal.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the Speaker's approval of the Journal.

The question was taken; and the Speaker announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

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

The point of no quorum is considered withdrawn.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER. Will the gentleman from Ohio (Ms. FUDGE) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Ms. FUDGE led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

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

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER

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

CALLING ON SENATE TO PASS CONTINUING RESOLUTION

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

Mr. LANCE. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the House-passed continuing resolution and I call for its passage in the United States Senate.

The House-passed resolution ensures that our government remains open and operational; it ensures that our military personnel will continue to receive protection in the field and pay at home; and it guarantees continued care for our veterans. It protects individ-

uals, families, and small businesses from the harmful effects of ObamaCare; and it holds the line on spending—the most critical fiscal issue currently facing Washington and the American people.

The United States Senate should join the House and pass this fiscally responsible measure and avert a government shutdown.

ACA ENROLLMENT

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

Ms. FUDGE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to celebrate the beginning of a new era in American health care. In less than a week, Americans across the country will be able to enroll in health insurance marketplaces, more commonly known as health exchanges. Americans will no longer be subjected to annual limits on their coverage or refused insurance because of a pre-existing condition. We as a Nation will be that much closer to ensuring that every American has access to high quality and affordable health care.

The United States is undoubtedly home to the world's best doctors, hospitals, and health care providers; and, starting January 1, more than 6 million children, seniors, women, and men will be able to access world-class care at less than \$100 a month. I certainly believe that's something worth celebrating.

HONORING A NEW JERSEY FALLEN SOLDIER—STAFF SERGEANT TIMOTHY RAYMOND MCGILL

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

Mr. GARRETT. Mr. Speaker, on Saturday, September 21, New Jersey and our Nation lost a true hero. Staff Sergeant Timothy Raymond McGill was killed in Afghanistan in support of Operation Enduring Freedom.

After graduating from Ramsey High School in 2001, Staff Sergeant McGill joined the Marines and later deployed to Iraq. In 2008, he joined the Rhode Island National Guard, basically to chase his dream of joining Special Forces. Then, in 2011, Staff Sergeant McGill was made a weapons sergeant and was most recently assigned to A Company, 2nd Battalion, 19th Special Forces Group, Army National Guard, in Middletown, Rhode Island.

In between these deployments, Staff Sergeant McGill volunteered at the Ramsey Fire Department back home in the State of New Jersey. You see, Staff Sergeant McGill was always committed to his community and to this country. He was truly one of the best and the brightest of the Fifth Congressional District.

My prayers are with the family of Staff Sergeant McGill.

SEQUESTRATION AND EDUCATION

(Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, a government shutdown will damage the economic recovery, slow our growth over the long term, and severely undermine our ability to extend our recovery and put people back to work.

As we debate the continuing resolution, I must emphasize investments in education, which are the wisest investments we can make for the long-term fiscal survival of our country. We are jeopardizing our future as a Nation by threatening educational services, as well as eliminating or reducing financial aid for millions of students attending pre-K, elementary, secondary, and postsecondary schools.

This week, I introduced a resolution to honor our Nation's Historically Black Colleges and Universities. I am concerned that these institutions will be disproportionately affected by any cuts. Each day, Historically Black Colleges and Universities help us bridge the achievement gap. The fact is that we cannot move forward as a country until all of our children have the opportunity to succeed academically.

OBAMACARE

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

Mr. LUETKEMEYER. Mr. Speaker, today I come to the House floor to speak on an issue that is on the minds of many of my constituents and Americans across the country, and that is ObamaCare.

Enrollment is set to begin in only 5 short days, yet there is far too much confusion about how hardworking Americans will purchase their health insurance through ObamaCare exchanges. One constituent from Missouri's Third District recently contacted my office in a panic about how ObamaCare is going to impact her personally as well as her small business. She has reached out to her accountant, insurance broker, and health care provider, and guess what, Mr. Speaker? Nobody has a clue how this is all going to play out.

Unlike the Federal Government, she is forced to balance both her family's and her business' budget. But when she has no idea how much health insurance is going to cost, she has a very large hole in both her budgets that makes it nearly impossible to plan for other things—whether it's new prescription glasses for her child to see the board at school or hiring a new employee for her small business she hopes to expand.

Mr. Speaker, this is not an isolated incident. I have received hundreds of emails and phone calls expressing real fears from folks about ObamaCare. From what I'm hearing and seeing

firsthand, the Affordable Care Act is neither affordable nor caring.

CONTINUING RESOLUTION

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

Ms. KELLY of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to urge my colleagues to put America first and pass a bipartisan spending plan to prevent a government shutdown.

As the daughter of a small business owner, I learned at an early age that it's impossible to succeed without smart planning and reliable funding. Let's keep this lesson in mind.

Millions of Americans will be left hanging if the government shuts down. Benefits for veterans could be delayed; approval of small business loans would be suspended; and the National Institutes of Health and Centers for Disease Control, which monitor disease, may be forced to scale back their services, leaving us vulnerable to a health crisis.

One of the last government shutdowns in this country cost taxpayers \$800 million, including \$400 million in lost revenue collected by the IRS. We can't afford to go through that again.

It is time to put an end to the partisan games. American citizens aren't chips to be gambled with. Our servicemen and -women, mom-and-pop business owners, and families who show up for America every day deserve a government that shows up for them.

Let's stop grandstanding and start standing up for the American people by passing a CR.

OBAMACARE HURTS AMERICAN FAMILIES

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

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, ObamaCare is unaffordable, unsustainable, and unreliable. An overwhelming majority of the American people agree that this disastrous \$1.2 trillion law must be replaced with a system that protects the doctor-patient relationship, as has been repeatedly introduced by Congressman TOM PRICE of Georgia.

The South Carolina Department of Insurance has estimated that health insurance rates in the Federal exchanges will increase up to 70 percent for South Carolinians. A majority of other States will have premium increases that will skyrocket, destroying jobs.

House Republicans have the best interests of Americans at heart. We know that hardworking families should not be forced to pay higher health care costs in addition to the financial burdens of everyday life.

The Senate should act and adopt bipartisan legislation as the House did last week.

We join with the American people to keep the government's doors open,

defund ObamaCare, and control government spending.

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

GOVERNMENT SHUTDOWN LOOMS

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

Mr. KILDEE. Mr. Speaker, once again, crucial deadlines loom, and here we are circling the drain, days away from another Republican-manufactured government shutdown due to the irresponsible lack of governing. Instead of forging—or even attempting to forge—a bipartisan compromise, we have another manufactured crisis, putting America on another roller-coaster ride.

Unfortunately, we have been here before, with the other party playing politics and pandering to their Tea Party base rather than doing what we were sent here to do, and that is to govern. It's enough. The American public is fed up with this.

It's time to drop the foolishness and stop pursuing—through threatening means that threaten the economy—what you can't achieve at the ballot box or through legislation.

The implications of this shutdown are real: it will hurt the American economy, and it threatens direct benefits that our veterans and people with disabilities receive. There's just too much at stake.

Republicans should drop this charade and do the job that we were elected to do, and that is govern, pass a budget, and protect the rights of the American people.

WE NEED LEADERSHIP

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

Mr. WALBERG. Mr. Speaker, we sincerely need true leadership at this time—great problems, great challenges, great divisions—and yet our President's first call last Friday to House leadership clearly indicated, in his own words, that he would not negotiate. How can this be leadership?

Sixty-one percent of citizens polled recently want spending cuts tied to the debt ceiling bill. Bill, in my town hall meeting yesterday morning, said:

My wife is very sick. I pay \$900 a month for my health insurance. I need that. But I want you to go to Washington and end the spending. Move our country forward. Shut down ObamaCare.

Mr. President, you won't negotiate? You negotiated with Mr. Putin and Mr. Assad. You've negotiated with the U.N. on an arms treaty threatening our Second Amendment liberty. Why would you not negotiate with the people's House and the people who sent us to restore fiscal sanity, economic opportunity, and liberty?

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. TERRY). The Chair will remind Mem-

bers that remarks in debate must be addressed to the Chair and not to others in the second person.

“GREAT YEAR FOR REPUBLICANS”

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

Ms. TITUS. This week, a leading Nevada Republican said that the 2014 elections will be a “great year for Republicans” because a lot of minorities and a lot of younger people will not turn out. Well, while the GOP plan for 2014 is focused on voter suppression, I'm here to deliver a different message:

Minorities and women are going to be turning out in droves next year because they see what the Republican leadership is doing in Washington. They see the dysfunction the Republicans have created and are apparently so proud of. They see the Republican agenda that's driven by an extremist ideology rather than what's best for Americans.

In fact, voters of all types are seeing—and will see over the next few days—just how out of step their House Republicans truly are. They grapple not with the needs of Americans, but with the two wings of their own caucus: the far right and the further right.

We need a new agenda.

□ 1215

PASTOR SAEED ABEDINI

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

Mr. PITTENGER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to share a letter from Dr. Billy Graham to Iranian President Rouhani, calling for the release of an American citizen currently imprisoned in Iran due to his faith. I quote from Dr. Graham:

The announcement on Monday that your country has freed 80 political prisoners is very encouraging. I fear, however, that the current publicity surrounding the continued imprisonment of Pastor Abedini, an American citizen, may further harm the already fragile relationship that presently exists between our two nations.

Today, thousands will attend prayer vigils in more than 70 U.S. cities, calling on your country to release this husband, father, and servant of God. I join them by respectfully asking you to release Pastor Saeed Abedini from prison. Such an action would, I believe, have a positive impact in our Nation, and might well be perceived by our leadership as a significant step in reducing tensions.

Respectfully yours, Billy Graham.

Today, I also wrote President Obama, with other House Members, asking that he call on Iran to free this American citizen and humanitarian. I urge you to join me in this effort.

CONTINUING RESOLUTION

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

minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. NOLAN. Mr. Speaker, it is time to put an end to the political stagecraft and the gridlock that's come to characterize this Chamber. It is time for a little common sense, some collaboration, and some compromise.

Two hundred and thirty-eight years ago, the Founders of our great Nation risked their lives to establish this government. Imagine their reaction today as this body contemplates actions that would shut it down.

I'm a business guy of 32 years. I've tried a lot of ways to fix problems over the years, but shutting down the store has never been one of them.

Mr. Speaker, this is not a game. This is real life to the kids on Head Start, to the National Guard and the men and women in our Armed Forces being furloughed, to the seniors, to the students, the families struggling to get by, and to the millions of hardworking public servants who go to work every day on our behalf.

Mr. Speaker, we need to put an end to this folly, pass a clean continuing resolution funding our government, and then get to work balancing our budget, ending the sequester, rebuilding America, rebuilding the middle class, and putting America back to work.

SHUTDOWN AND MILITARY PAY

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

Mr. PITTS. Mr. Speaker, over 3 months ago, the House passed a Defense appropriations bill with overwhelming bipartisan support.

As we approach the end of the fiscal year, I want to remind Senate Democrats and the President that our fighting men and women are counting on us. The leadership in the Senate failed to even bring a Defense funding measure to the floor this year.

Now, should they fail to work with the House to fund the government, pay for our soldiers, sailors, and airmen could be delayed. Cutbacks could reduce their readiness and delay the procurement of tools they need to defend our Nation and themselves.

At a time when fighting continues in Afghanistan and we face serious threats from terrorists, at a time when the President is threatening force in Syria, we cannot let our guard down. We should not use our military and wounded warriors as pawns in political partisanship.

The Senate needs to act without delay to pass funding and keep the government from shutting down. The safety of brave Americans around the world is at risk if we fail.

THE FARM BILL

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

minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. WALZ. Mr. Speaker, the one thing I hear from my constituents when I talk to them out in southern Minnesota: Is it so much to ask you folks just to do your job? As the drama swirls and the brinkmanship goes and it's *deja vu* all over again, certain things shouldn't be that difficult.

As we are doing this, my farmers and ranchers and millions of them across the country are going about their work, every day getting up before dawn, doing their work, feeding us, clothing us, and powering this country. They've asked us to pass a farm bill. Four months ago, the Senate did it. Four months ago, the House Ag Committee did it. That wasn't good enough. We came to the floor, we created drama, we tried to make being hungry a sin, and now you've got a monstrosity.

Do you know what? The Constitution makes it very clear: bring the two together, conference the bill, and pass something that's good for America.

I get it—you don't like the Senate bill. I get it—the Senate doesn't like this bill. But do you know what? Let's get together and get something we can both equally dislike, but at least it serves the people and moves something forward. The time is now. The farm bill is waiting. People are hungry and producers are going food. Pass the farm bill.

OBAMACARE

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

Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, the Republicans in the House compromised and voted to fund everything in the entire Federal Government but ObamaCare. Yet the President refuses to compromise on anything, even just that one bill.

If you think most of the national media is not biased, just consider the fact that they are not calling on the President to compromise at all. The national media apparently believes that House Republicans should be the only ones required to compromise.

Then look, too, at the different treatment given Texas State Senator Wendy Davis' filibuster and the filibuster-like speech by Senator TED CRUZ. The elite national media made Senator Davis an overnight sensation and treated her as courageous and even heroic. But Senator CRUZ has been blasted in every way by the liberals who control most of the media—a double standard that is both very unfair and very harmful to the Nation.

If the Federal Government shuts down, it will be in large part because the national media for some reason feels the President has no obligation to compromise or moderate his views in any way.

GOVERNMENT SHUTDOWN

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

Mr. BERA of California. Five more days, Mr. Speaker. In just 5 days, this body threatens to shut down the government. The public and the American citizens are fed up with these shenanigans. They want us to do our job.

If the government shuts down, we are going to send our military to work, but we are not going to pay them. If the government shuts down, veterans who have been waiting months for benefits are going to wait longer. Let's do our job. This is totally unacceptable.

The people expect us to come together and put together a real budget. We passed "No Budget, No Pay," but yet, we don't have a budget. The House has passed one budget; the Senate has passed another. Let's come together in a conference, agree on a single number, and move forward and set our priorities.

Enough kicking the can down the road. Let's keep the government open. Let's pass a budget. Let's start rebuilding the middle class for America and one that works, and let's get back on the right track. We can do this. We've done it before.

GOVERNMENT SHUTDOWN FAIRNESS ACT

(Mr. COLLINS of New York asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. COLLINS of New York. Mr. Speaker, I come to the House floor to speak in support of the Government Shutdown Fairness Act, which I introduced last Friday. This legislation would stop Members of Congress from receiving a salary in the event of a government shutdown.

As Members of Congress, it is our job to keep the government running, and it is wrong that we would continue to get paid while programs for veterans, seniors, and many others are adversely impacted and those in the military are not paid.

This legislation is consistent with the 27th Amendment and would hold Member salaries in escrow until the end of this Congress. Salary and job performance are often tied together, and it should be no different in the government.

The American people deserve more from their Congress. We must be willing to put ourselves at the back of the line and put our constituents first during a government shutdown.

CONTINUING RESOLUTION

(Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, compromise is a way of life in public policy. My way or

no way is the mindset of a 5-year-old, not the leading legislative body of the Western World.

This is a direct quote, Mr. Speaker, and I know it's accurate because it's from me over a decade ago. I was in Congress for the shutdowns of the Federal Government in 1995. They were as disastrous as they were unnecessary—a national disgrace. Today's funding debate is equally shameful.

Holding government funding hostage, and potentially following up with an act of blackmail over the debt limit is irresponsible and indifferent to the needs of millions across our country, particularly the military.

This debate is another manufactured crisis—a willful, needless, self-inflicted wound—that will have terrible effects on our economy, our fiscal outlook, and the American pocketbooks.

The Congress of the United States should never, ever bow down before the rigid dictates of a handful of ideological extremists. We should do what is right for the people of our country and pass a clean budget now.

CONGRATULATING THE ROSE-HULMAN INSTITUTE OF TECHNOLOGY

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

Mr. BUCSHON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate the Rose-Hulman Institute of Technology on their number one ranking as the top undergraduate engineering school in the Nation. This is the 15th consecutive year for this honor by the U.S. News and World Report in the category of engineering schools whose highest degree is a bachelor's or master's degree.

Founded in 1874 and located in Terre Haute, Indiana, Rose-Hulman successfully delivers the world's best undergraduate science, engineering, and mathematics education in an environment of individual attention and support.

I commend Rose-Hulman for their excellent leadership and dedication and thank them for the important role they play as a world leader in the education of the STEM workforce of the future.

GOVERNMENT SHUTDOWN

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

Mr. HORSFORD. Mr. Speaker, I rise to discuss a portion of our community in Nevada's Fourth Congressional District that is being negatively affected under the sequestration and would be under a government shutdown.

I am proud to speak on behalf of the Nellis Air Force Base in my district. Nellis Air Force Base employs over 3,000 civilian employees. They work as engineers, physicians, nurses, and administrators.

I recently spoke with the Commander about the negative effects that sequestration has already had on Nellis Air Force Base. For the past 3 years, the salaries of these civilian employees has been frozen. Positions are being eliminated, leaving remaining employees to pick up the slack.

The civilian employees of Nellis Air Force Base are undergoing increasingly heavy responsibilities at work, without any increase in pay, and for Nellis Air Force Base, sequestration has already meant a decrease of over 40,000 flights, which affects their readiness at a time of combat.

It is time for this Congress to reach a deal on the budget. A clean continuing resolution does not jeopardize personnel, a deal that I hope we will work together to accomplish on behalf of Nellis Air Force Base and all of our civilians.

I urge Members of Congress to end the legacy of deadlock in Congress and begin the legacy of doing what we must to help the dedicated and hardworking men and women of the United States.

HONORING COLONEL BERNARD FRANCIS "BERNIE" FISHER AND LIEUTENANT THOMAS ROLLAND NORRIS

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

Mr. LABRADOR. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the heroic efforts of Colonel Bernard Francis Fisher of the United States Air Force and Lieutenant Thomas Rolland Norris of the United States Navy, both of whom are Medal of Honor recipients from Idaho.

Colonel Fisher was with the 1st Air Commando Squadron and was awarded the Medal of Honor for his conspicuous gallantry on March 10, 1966, in the Republic of Vietnam.

A Special Forces camp was under attack and hostile troops had positioned themselves between the airstrip and the camp. Colonel Fisher observed a fellow airman crash on the airstrip. In the belief that the pilot was injured, Colonel Fisher decided to attempt a rescue. Directing his own cover, he landed and taxied the full length of the runway to rescue the pilot. In the face of fire, he applied power and took off at the overrun airstrip.

Lieutenant Norris was a SEAL Advisor and was awarded the Medal of Honor for supreme bravery in action from April 10 to April 13, 1972, in Vietnam.

During the 3-day period, Lieutenant Norris and a 5-man team established a forward operating base deep within heavily controlled enemy territory to conduct a rescue of several downed pilots.

It is for their outstanding display of leadership and courage that I am proud to honor and remember the actions of Colonel Bernard Francis Fisher and Lieutenant Thomas Rolland Norris.

□ 1230

A TRIBUTE TO JIM FINDLAY

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

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor a remarkable American, Mr. Jim Findlay, who has proudly served our Nation as an Air Force veteran and our Toledo community throughout his life as a successful entrepreneur, extraordinary philanthropist, and a true friend to so many.

Jim Findlay is the epitome of a gentleman. His influence and compassion have impacted the lives of thousands. He served as a coach to our youth, a mentor to our young adults. He is always there for those who seek a champion for their causes. His support of local initiatives is deep and legendary. He has been the fundraising chair for so many activities, a 70-year member of Glenwood Lutheran Church, and a founding board member of the House of Emmanuel.

Jim attended Scott High School, then the University of Toledo where he began his lifelong love affair with the UT Rockets, as well as with 1947 Homecoming Queen Celia Koontz Findlay. He and Celia were married for more than 50 years until her passing in 2004. His loving care for her during her prolonged illness inspired all who knew them. Jim is a dedicated family man to his children—Jim, Jr., Sarah, Jon—a beloved grandfather to Ally and Jonathon, and a wonderful companion to PJ Schaefer.

Jim founded Impact Products, and upon his retirement—in typical Jim Findlay fashion—he gave the company to his employees. The company's name, Impact, is a testament to the impact that one person can selflessly make on the lives of so many.

We, the family of Toledo and northwest Ohio, are blessed and honored to know and to pay tribute to our dear friend, Jim Findlay, who, in good times and in times of great struggle, teaches us by way of his courageous and generous example. May blessings flow to Jim now and to his loved ones.

We love you, Jim, now and always, and we thank you.

BUYER BEWARE

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

Mr. HULTGREN. Mr. Speaker, we are 5 days away from what the Chicago Tribune today called a "massively ambitious redesign of national health care," echoing what we've been saying here on the House floor since it was passed, but the details of Illinois' health exchange are still thin.

"Co-pays? Deductibles? Premiums? Still a mystery," the paper says. "Will your doctor and your hospital be included in the insurance networks? Still a mystery."

This past week, I tried to get answers for my concerned constituents. I tried to meet with one of Illinois' so-called "navigators," but he wasn't ready to show me how to sign up for health care. Their navigators were still getting trained up—with less than a week left.

The triple premiums we are seeing in other States aren't encouraging. We know that 6 million mostly middle class families may face a tax for not buying qualifying health plans. Middle class families may have to pay hundreds more in taxes each year. I urge Americans to explore how ObamaCare will affect them.

Call your exchange, and ask if you can keep your doctor. Ask them what personal information the navigators will collect. Be ready. Buyer beware.

A GOVERNMENT SHUTDOWN

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

Mr. LAMALFA. Mr. Speaker, it is kind of interesting to hear all the chatter about a government shutdown here, chatter that seems to be coming from the other side. I think they, maybe, protesteth too loudly, because Republicans have acted to give the Senate and the President the tools, the means, to avoid a government shutdown. We've acted on two occasions to pass the language of the Full Faith and Credit Act to ensure the government continues paying its bills in the event of an impasse in budget negotiations.

However, the Senate has failed to act on a commonsense proposal which would preserve our Nation's credit rating, continue paying the military, protect Social Security and other essential services.

Where is the Senate's action on this measure? What is the President doing to help? He is, instead, more willing to meet with foreign leaders and is unwilling to talk to us in the House.

Mr. Speaker, is this what the American people asked for—that we have an impasse amongst the three legs of the legislative process in this country, that we can't even talk to each other and we'd rather talk to foreign leaders first on the important, key issues like what we have coming up: the continuing resolution, the sequester, the debt limit, and the impending ObamaCare take-over of our health system?

OBAMACARE UNDEREMPLOYMENT

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

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, ObamaCare is dead weight on a stagnant job market.

Millions of Americans are out of work. Millions more are underemployed—crunching numbers around the kitchen tables, trying to make ends meet. Yet ObamaCare is undermining growth and is making it harder

for businesses, large and small, to hire more full-time workers or to even maintain part-time worker schedules. It is cited as a leading cause for why nearly three out of four people hired this year were offered only part-time jobs.

The stagnant economic report we received earlier this month is a continued reminder that ObamaCare is not the job creator or economic driver the President promised. It is a burden on employers, and it is translating into prolonged underemployment for working American families.

Republicans and Democrats need to work together to repeal, defund, delay, and replace ObamaCare for these families. Meaningful reform is worth the effort.

HEALTH CARE IS A CIVIL RIGHT

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

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I think the real message should be that the President should not negotiate against the civil rights of Americans. Sometimes it's important for those of us who have had life experiences to reflect on them.

I remember as a younger girl riding in a segregated railcar, isolated from others because of the color of my skin. Civil rights have expanded, but there are many who stood against them—the 1957 bill, the 1964 and 1965 bills. Americans will find out that health care is a civil right and that this is one of the most historic and life-changing bills ever passed—the Affordable Care Act.

Rather than stand in the way to defund ObamaCare, I want to stand with the young cancer victim who will now be able to get insurance. I want to stand with the young child who had leukemia and who was denied insurance and died. I want to stand with small businesses that will now be able to provide health insurance for their workers.

I want to stand with understanding that, in fact, this bill is going to work. That's the fear on the other side. They are willing to defund the government because they don't want America to know that one of their civil rights—good health care—is coming and going to work.

I ask everybody to go to HealthCare.gov because your civil rights are coming on October 1.

"MY WAY OR THE HIGHWAY"

(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, the President says he will negotiate with Syria over chemical weapons. He is negotiating with the Russians about negotiating with the Syrians over nuclear weapons. He has offered to talk

and compromise with Iran over nuclear weapons—but the President it seems says, I will not negotiate with those in the House of Representatives. No compromise on the debt. I will not negotiate with America.

Too bad the President is more interested with negotiation and compromise with Russia, Syria, Iran, and now the United Nations than he is in working with Members of the House of Representatives and the American people to keep the government from shutting down.

It has been mentioned today of this philosophy of "my way or the highway." Well, that's the President's philosophy. It's my way, says the President, or it's the highway.

He won't talk to us about it because he is out campaigning about how ObamaCare is really good for the Nation. He is driving the train wreck of stubbornness which will lead, and has led, to chaos in America.

Come home, Mr. President. Let's sit down and talk and negotiate about what we are going to do over the debt limit and the continuing resolution.

And that's just the way it is.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, proceedings will resume on questions previously postponed.

Votes will be taken in the following order:

H.R. 3095, by the yeas and nays;

H.R. 2600, by the yeas and nays;

Approval of the Journal, de novo.

The first electronic vote will be conducted as a 15-minute vote. Remaining electronic votes will be conducted as 5-minute votes.

COMMERCIAL MOTOR VEHICLE OPERATOR REQUIREMENTS RELATING TO SLEEP DISORDERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 3095) to ensure that any new or revised requirement providing for the screening, testing, or treatment of individuals operating commercial motor vehicles for sleep disorders is adopted pursuant to a rulemaking proceeding, 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 gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. PETRI) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 405, nays 0, not voting 27, as follows:

[Roll No. 486]

YEAS—405

Aderholt	Amodei	Barber
Alexander	Bachmann	Barletta
Amash	Bachus	Barr

Barrow (GA) Esty
 Barton Farenthold
 Bass Farr
 Beatty Fattah
 Becerra Fincher
 Benishkek Fitzpatrick
 Bentivolio Fleischmann
 Bera (CA) Fleming
 Bilirakis Flores
 Bishop (GA) Forbes
 Bishop (NY) Fortenberry
 Bishop (UT) Foster
 Black Foxx
 Blackburn Franks (AZ)
 BlumenaUER Frelinghuysen
 Bonamici Fudge
 Boustany Gabbard
 Brady (PA) Gallego
 Brady (TX) Garamendi
 Braley (IA) Garcia
 Bridenstine Gardner
 Brooks (AL) Garrett
 Brooks (IN) Gerlach
 Broun (GA) Gibbs
 Brown (FL) Gibson
 Brownley (CA) Goodlatte
 Bucshon Gosar
 Burgess Granger
 Bustos Graves (GA)
 Butterfield Graves (MO)
 Calvert Grayson
 Camp Green, Al
 Campbell Green, Gene
 Cantor Griffin (AR)
 Capito Griffith (VA)
 Capps Grijalva
 Cárdenas Grimm
 Carney Guthrie
 Carson (IN) Gutiérrez
 Carter Hahn
 Cartwright Hanabusa
 Cassidy Hanna
 Castor (FL) Harper
 Castro (TX) Harris
 Chabot Hartzler
 Chaffetz Hastings (FL)
 Chu Hastings (WA)
 Cicilline Heck (NV)
 Clarke Heck (WA)
 Clay Hensarling
 Cleaver Himes
 Clyburn Hinojosa
 Coble Holding
 Coffman Holt
 Cohen Honda
 Cole Horsford
 Collins (GA) Hoyer
 Collins (NY) Hudson
 Conaway Huelskamp
 Connolly Huffman
 Conyers Huizenga (MI)
 Cook Hultgren
 Cooper Hunter
 Cotton Hurt
 Courtney Israel
 Cramer Issa
 Crawford Jackson Lee
 Crenshaw Jeffries
 Crowley Jenkins
 Cuellar Johnson (GA)
 Culberson Johnson (OH)
 Cummings Johnson, E. B.
 Daines Johnson, Sam
 Davis (CA) Jones
 Davis, Danny Jordan
 Davis, Rodney Joyce
 DeFazio Kaptur
 DeGette Keating
 Delaney Kelly (IL)
 DeLauro Kelly (PA)
 DelBene Kennedy
 Denham Kildee
 Dent Kilmer
 DeSantis King (IA)
 DesJarlais King (NY)
 Deutch Kingston
 Diaz-Balart Kinzinger (IL)
 Doggett Kirkpatrick
 Doyle Kline
 Duckworth Kuster
 Duffy Labrador
 Duncan (SC) LaMalfa
 Duncan (TN) Lamborn
 Edwards Lance
 Ellison Langevin
 Ellmers Lankford
 Engel Larsen (WA)
 Enyart Larson (CT)
 Eshoo Latham

Latta
 Lee (CA)
 Levin
 Lewis
 Lipinski
 LoBiondo
 Loeb sack
 Lofgren
 Long
 Lowenthal
 Lowey
 Lucas
 Luetkemeyer
 Lujan Grisham (NM)
 Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
 Lummis
 Lynch
 Maffei
 Maloney
 Carolyn
 Maloney, Sean
 Marchant
 Marino
 Massie
 Matheson
 Matsui
 McCarthy (CA)
 McCaul
 McClintock
 McCollum
 McDermott
 McGovern
 McHenry
 McIntyre
 McKeon
 McKinley
 McMorris
 Rodgers
 McNeerney
 Meadows
 Meehan
 Meng
 Messer
 Mica
 Michaud
 Miller (FL)
 Miller (MI)
 Miller, Gary
 Miller, George
 Moore
 Moran
 Mullin
 Mulvaney
 Murphy (FL)
 Murphy (PA)
 Nadler
 Napolitano
 Neal
 Negrete McLeod
 Neugebauer
 Noem
 Nolan
 Nugent
 Nunes
 Nunnelee
 O'Rourke
 Olson
 Owens
 Palazzo
 Pallone
 Pascrell
 Pastor (AZ)
 Paulsen
 Payne
 Pearce
 Pelosi
 Perry
 Peters (CA)
 Peters (MI)
 Peterson
 Petri
 Pingree (ME)
 Pittenger
 Pitts
 Pocan
 Poe (TX)
 Polis
 Pompeo
 Posey
 Price (GA)
 Price (NC)
 Quigley
 Rahall
 Rangel
 Reed
 Reichert
 Aderholt
 Alexander
 Amash
 Amodei
 Bachmann
 Bachus
 Barber
 Barletta
 Barr
 Barrow (GA)
 Barton
 Bass
 Beatty
 Becerra
 Benishkek
 Bentivolio
 Bera (CA)
 Bilirakis
 Bishop (GA)
 Bishop (NY)
 Bishop (UT)
 Scott (VA)
 Scott, David
 Sensenbrenner
 Serrano
 Sessions
 Sewell (AL)
 Shea-Porter
 Sherman
 Shimkus
 Shuster
 Simpson
 Sinema
 Slaughter
 Smith (MO)
 Smith (NE)
 Smith (NJ)
 Smith (TX)
 Smith (WA)
 Southerland
 Speier
 Stewart
 Stivers
 Stockman
 Stutzman
 Swalwell (CA)
 Takano
 Terry
 Thompson (CA)
 Thompson (MS)
 Thompson (PA)
 Thornberry
 Tiberi
 Tipton
 Titus
 Tonko
 Hall
 Herrera Beutler
 Higgins
 Kind
 McCarthy (NY)
 Meeks
 Perlmutter
 Roby
 Rush
 Sanchez, Loretta
 Schwartz
 Scott, Austin
 Sires
 Tierney
 Tsongas
 Waxman
 Webster (FL)
 Young (AK)

Black
 Blackburn
 BlumenaUER
 Bonamici
 Boustany
 Brady (PA)
 Brady (TX)
 Braley (IA)
 Bridenstine
 Brooks (AL)
 Brooks (IN)
 Broun (GA)
 Brown (FL)
 Brownley (CA)
 Bucshon
 Burgess
 Bustos
 Butterfield
 Calvert
 Camp
 Campbell
 Cantor
 Capito
 Capps
 Capuano
 Cárdenas
 Carney
 Carson (IN)
 Carter
 Cartwright
 Cassidy
 Castor (FL)
 Castro (TX)
 Chabot
 Chaffetz
 Chu
 Cicilline
 Clarke
 Clay
 Cleaver
 Clyburn
 Coble
 Coffman
 Cohen
 Cole
 Collins (GA)
 Collins (NY)
 Conaway
 Connolly
 Conyers
 Cook
 Cooper
 Cotton
 Courtney
 Cramer
 Crawford
 Crenshaw
 Crowley
 Cuellar
 Culberson
 Cummings
 Daines
 Davis (CA)
 Davis, Danny
 Davis, Rodney
 DeFazio
 DeGette
 Delaney
 DeLauro
 DelBene
 Denham
 Dent
 DeSantis
 DesJarlais
 Deutch
 Diaz-Balart
 Doggett
 Doyle
 Duckworth
 Duffy
 Duncan (SC)
 Duncan (TN)
 Edwards
 Ellison
 Ellmers
 Engel
 Enyart
 Eshoo
 Esty
 Farenthold
 Farr
 Fattah
 Fincher
 Fitzpatrick
 Fleischmann
 Fleming
 Flores
 Forbes
 Fortenberry
 Foster
 Foxx
 Franks (AZ)
 Frelinghuysen
 Fudge
 Gabbard
 Gallego
 Garamendi
 Garcia
 Gardner
 Garrett
 Gerlach
 Gibbs
 Gibson
 Goodlatte
 Gosar
 Granger
 Graves (GA)
 Graves (MO)
 Grayson
 Green, Al
 Green, Gene
 Griffin (AR)
 Griffin (VA)
 Grijalva
 Grimm
 Guthrie
 Gutiérrez
 Hahn
 Hanabusa
 Hanna
 Harper
 Harris
 Hartzler
 Hastings (FL)
 Hastings (WA)
 Heck (NV)
 Heck (WA)
 Hensarling
 Himes
 Hinojosa
 Holding
 Holt
 Honda
 Horsford
 Hoyer
 Hudson
 Huelskamp
 Huffman
 Huizenga (MI)
 Hultgren
 Hunter
 Hurt
 Israel
 Issa
 Jackson Lee
 Jeffries
 O'Rourke
 Jenkins
 Johnson (GA)
 Johnson (OH)
 Johnson, E. B.
 Johnson, Sam
 Jones
 Jordan
 Joyce
 Kaptur
 Keating
 Kelly (IL)
 Kelly (PA)
 Kennedy
 Kildee
 Kilmer
 King (IA)
 King (NY)
 Kingston
 Kinzinger (IL)
 Kirkpatrick
 Kline
 Kuster
 Labrador
 LaMalfa
 Lamborn
 Lance
 Langevin
 Lankford
 Larsen (WA)
 Larson (CT)
 Latham
 Luetkemeyer
 Lucas
 Luetkemeyer
 Lujan Grisham (NM)
 Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
 Lummis
 Lynch
 Maffei
 Maloney
 Carolyn
 Maloney, Sean
 Marchant
 Marino
 Massie
 Matheson
 Matsui
 McCarthy (CA)
 McCaul
 McClintock
 McCollum
 McDermott
 McGovern
 McHenry
 McIntyre
 McKeon
 McKinley
 McMorris
 Rodgers
 McNeerney
 Meadows
 Meehan
 Meng
 Messer
 Mica
 Michaud
 Miller (FL)
 Miller (MI)
 Miller, Gary
 Miller, George
 Moore
 Moran
 Mullin
 Mulvaney
 Murphy (FL)
 Murphy (PA)
 Nadler
 Napolitano
 Neal
 Negrete McLeod
 Neugebauer
 Noem
 Nolan
 Nugent
 Nunes
 Nunnelee
 O'Rourke
 Olson
 Owens
 Palazzo
 Pallone
 Pascrell
 Pastor (AZ)
 Paulsen
 Payne
 Pearce
 Pelosi
 Perry
 Peters (CA)
 Peters (MI)
 Peterson
 Petri
 Pingree (ME)
 Pittenger
 Pitts
 Pocan
 Poe (TX)
 Polis
 Pompeo
 Posey
 Price (GA)
 Price (NC)
 Quigley
 Rahall
 Rangel
 Reed
 Reichert
 Lowey
 Lucas
 Luetkemeyer
 Lujan Grisham (NM)
 Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
 Lummis
 Lynch
 Maffei
 Maloney
 Carolyn
 Maloney, Sean
 Marchant
 Marino
 Massie
 Matheson
 Matsui
 McCarthy (CA)
 McCaul
 McClintock
 McCollum
 McDermott
 McGovern
 McHenry
 McIntyre
 McKeon
 McKinley
 McMorris
 Rodgers
 McNeerney
 Meadows
 Meehan
 Meng
 Messer
 Mica
 Michaud
 Miller (FL)
 Miller (MI)
 Miller, Gary
 Miller, George
 Moore
 Moran
 Mullin
 Mulvaney
 Murphy (FL)
 Murphy (PA)
 Nadler
 Napolitano
 Neal
 Negrete McLeod
 Neugebauer
 Noem
 Nolan
 Nugent
 Nunes
 Nunnelee
 O'Rourke
 Olson
 Owens
 Palazzo
 Pallone
 Pascrell
 Pastor (AZ)
 Paulsen
 Payne
 Pearce
 Pelosi
 Perry
 Peters (CA)
 Peters (MI)
 Peterson
 Petri
 Pingree (ME)
 Pittenger
 Pitts
 Pocan
 Poe (TX)
 Polis
 Pompeo
 Posey
 Price (GA)
 Price (NC)
 Quigley
 Rahall
 Rangel
 Reed
 Reichert

NOT VOTING—27

□ 1310

Mr. McDERMOTT changed his vote from “nay” to “yea.”

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.

INTERSTATE LAND SALES FULL DISCLOSURE 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. 2600) to amend the Interstate Land Sales Full Disclosure Act to clarify how the Act applies to condominiums, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the bill. The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. McHENRY) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill.

This is a 5-minute vote. The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 410, nays 0, not voting 22, as follows:

[Roll No. 487]
 YEAS—410

Aderholt
 Alexander
 Amash
 Amodei
 Bachmann
 Bachus
 Barber
 Barletta
 Barr
 Barrow (GA)
 Barton
 Bass
 Beatty
 Becerra
 Benishkek
 Bentivolio
 Bera (CA)
 Bilirakis
 Bishop (GA)
 Bishop (NY)
 Bishop (UT)
 Benishkek
 Bentivolio
 Bera (CA)
 Bilirakis
 Bishop (GA)
 Bishop (NY)
 Bishop (UT)

Black
 Blackburn
 BlumenaUER
 Bonamici
 Boustany
 Brady (PA)
 Brady (TX)
 Braley (IA)
 Bridenstine
 Brooks (AL)
 Brooks (IN)
 Broun (GA)
 Brown (FL)
 Brownley (CA)
 Bucshon
 Burgess
 Bustos
 Butterfield
 Calvert
 Camp
 Campbell
 Cantor
 Capito
 Capps
 Capuano
 Cárdenas
 Carney
 Carson (IN)
 Carter
 Cartwright
 Cassidy
 Castor (FL)
 Castro (TX)
 Chabot
 Chaffetz
 Chu
 Cicilline
 Clarke
 Clay
 Cleaver
 Clyburn
 Coble
 Coffman
 Cohen
 Cole
 Collins (GA)
 Collins (NY)
 Conaway
 Connolly
 Conyers
 Cook
 Cooper
 Cotton
 Courtney
 Cramer
 Crawford
 Crenshaw
 Crowley
 Cuellar
 Culberson
 Cummings
 Daines
 Davis (CA)
 Davis, Danny
 Davis, Rodney
 DeFazio
 DeGette
 Delaney
 DeLauro
 DelBene
 Denham
 Dent
 DeSantis
 DesJarlais
 Deutch
 Diaz-Balart
 Doggett
 Doyle
 Duckworth
 Duffy
 Duncan (SC)
 Duncan (TN)
 Edwards
 Ellison
 Ellmers
 Engel
 Enyart
 Eshoo
 Esty
 Farenthold
 Farr
 Fattah
 Fincher
 Fitzpatrick
 Fleischmann
 Fleming
 Flores
 Forbes
 Fortenberry
 Foster
 Foxx
 Franks (AZ)
 Frelinghuysen
 Fudge
 Gabbard
 Gallego
 Garamendi
 Garcia
 Gardner
 Garrett
 Gerlach
 Gibbs
 Gibson
 Goodlatte
 Gosar
 Granger
 Graves (GA)
 Graves (MO)
 Grayson
 Green, Al
 Green, Gene
 Griffin (AR)
 Griffin (VA)
 Grijalva
 Grimm
 Guthrie
 Gutiérrez
 Hahn
 Hanabusa
 Hanna
 Harper
 Harris
 Hartzler
 Hastings (FL)
 Hastings (WA)
 Heck (NV)
 Heck (WA)
 Hensarling
 Himes
 Hinojosa
 Holding
 Holt
 Honda
 Horsford
 Hoyer
 Hudson
 Huelskamp
 Huffman
 Huizenga (MI)
 Hultgren
 Hunter
 Hurt
 Israel
 Issa
 Jackson Lee
 Jeffries
 O'Rourke
 Jenkins
 Johnson (GA)
 Johnson (OH)
 Johnson, E. B.
 Johnson, Sam
 Jones
 Jordan
 Joyce
 Kaptur
 Keating
 Kelly (IL)
 Kelly (PA)
 Kennedy
 Kildee
 Kilmer
 King (IA)
 King (NY)
 Kingston
 Kinzinger (IL)
 Kirkpatrick
 Kline
 Kuster
 Labrador
 LaMalfa
 Lamborn
 Lance
 Langevin
 Lankford
 Larsen (WA)
 Larson (CT)
 Latham
 Luetkemeyer
 Lucas
 Luetkemeyer
 Lujan Grisham (NM)
 Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
 Lummis
 Lynch
 Maffei
 Maloney
 Carolyn
 Maloney, Sean
 Marchant
 Marino
 Massie
 Matheson
 Matsui
 McCarthy (CA)
 McCaul
 McClintock
 McCollum
 McDermott
 McGovern
 McHenry
 McIntyre
 McKeon
 McKinley
 McMorris
 Rodgers
 McNeerney
 Meadows
 Meehan
 Meng
 Messer
 Mica
 Michaud
 Miller (FL)
 Miller (MI)
 Miller, Gary
 Miller, George
 Moore
 Moran
 Mullin
 Mulvaney
 Murphy (FL)
 Murphy (PA)
 Nadler
 Napolitano
 Neal
 Negrete McLeod
 Neugebauer
 Noem
 Nolan
 Nugent
 Nunes
 Nunnelee
 O'Rourke
 Olson
 Owens
 Palazzo
 Pallone
 Pascrell
 Pastor (AZ)
 Paulsen
 Payne
 Pearce
 Pelosi
 Perry
 Peters (CA)
 Peters (MI)
 Peterson
 Petri
 Pingree (ME)
 Pittenger
 Pitts
 Pocan
 Poe (TX)
 Polis
 Pompeo
 Posey
 Price (GA)
 Price (NC)
 Quigley
 Rahall
 Rangel
 Reed
 Reichert

Rohrabacher	Sherman	Vargas	Brooks (AL)	Hensarling	Polis	Griffith (VA)	Marchant	Renacci
Rokita	Shimkus	Veasey	Brown (FL)	Himes	Pompeo	Hanna	Matheson	Rice (SC)
Rooney	Shuster	Vela	Brownley (CA)	Hinojosa	Posey	Harris	Matsui	Rigell
Ros-Lehtinen	Simpson	Velázquez	Bustos	Holt	Price (NC)	Hartzler	McDermott	Roe (TN)
Roskam	Sinema	Visclosky	Butterfield	Horsford	Quigley	Heck (NV)	McGovern	Ros-Lehtinen
Ross	Slaughter	Wagner	Calvert	Huelskamp	Rangel	Holding	Meeks	Ruppersberger
Rothfus	Smith (MO)	Walberg	Camp	Huffman	Ribble	Honda	Miller (FL)	Sánchez, Linda T.
Roybal-Allard	Smith (NE)	Walden	Campbell	Hultgren	Richmond	Hoyer	Miller, George T.	Schakowsky
Royce	Smith (NJ)	Walorski	Cantor	Hunter	Rogers (AL)	Hudson	Moore	Slaughter
Ruiz	Smith (TX)	Walz	Caputo	Hurt	Rogers (KY)	Huizenga (MI)	Mulvaney	Smith (MO)
Runyan	Smith (WA)	Wasserman	Capps	Issa	Rogers (MI)	Israel	Murphy (FL)	Neal
Ruppersberger	Southerland	Schultz	Carney	Jackson Lee	Rohrabacher	Jeffries	Negrete McLeod	Stivers
Ryan (OH)	Speier	Waters	Carter	Johnson (GA)	Rokita	Jenkins	Nolan	Stockman
Ryan (WI)	Stewart	Watt	Cartwright	Johnson, Sam	Rooney	Johnson (OH)	Nugent	Swalwell (CA)
Salmon	Stivers	Weber (TX)	Cassidy	Jones	Roskam	Johnson, E. B.	Palazzo	Terry
Sánchez, Linda T.	Stockman	Webster (FL)	Castor (FL)	Kaptur	Ross	Jordan	Pallone	Thompson (CA)
Sanford	Stutzman	Welch	Kelly (TX)	Kelly (IL)	Rothfus	Joyce	Pastor (AZ)	Thompson (MS)
Sarbanes	Swalwell (CA)	Wenstrup	Chabot	Kelly (PA)	Roybal-Allard	Keating	Paulsen	Thompson (PA)
Scalise	Takano	Westmoreland	Chaffetz	Kennedy	Royce	Kilmer	Pearce	Tiberi
Schakowsky	Terry	Whitfield	Clay	Kildee	Ruiz	Kinzinger (IL)	Perry	Tierney
Schiff	Thompson (CA)	Williams	Clyburn	King (IA)	Runyan	Kirkpatrick	Peters (CA)	Turner
Schneider	Thompson (MS)	Wilson (FL)	Coble	King (NY)	Ryan (OH)	Lance	Peters (MI)	Valadao
Schock	Thompson (PA)	Wilson (SC)	Coffman	Kingston	Ryan (WI)	Langevin	Peterson	Veasey
Schrader	Thornberry	Wittman	Cole	Kline	Salmon	Larson (CT)	Pittenger	Visclosky
Schweikert	Tiberi	Wolf	Collins (NY)	Kuster	Sanford	Latham	Pitts	Walberg
Scott (VA)	Tierney	Womack	Conyers	Labrador	Sarbanes	Lee (CA)	Poe (TX)	Walorski
Scott, David	Tipton	Woodall	Cook	LaMalfa	Scalise	Lewis	Price (GA)	Weber (TX)
Sensenbrenner	Titus	Yarmuth	Cooper	Lamborn	Schiff	LoBiondo	Radel	Wittman
Serrano	Tonko	Yoder	Courtney	Lankford	Schneider	Lynch	Rahall	Woodall
Sessions	Turner	Yoho	Cramer	Larsen (WA)	Schock	Maffei	Reed	Yoder
Sewell (AL)	Upton	Young (FL)	Crawford	Latta	Schrader	Maloney,	Carroll	
Shea-Porter	Valadao	Young (IN)	Crenshaw	Levin	Schweikert	Carlynn	Reichert	
	Van Hollen		Cuellar	Lipinski	Scott (VA)			
			Culberson	Loebsack	Scott, David			
			Cummings	Lofgren	Sensenbrenner			
			Daines	Long	Serrano	Gohmert	Owens	
			Davis (CA)	Lowenthal	Sessions			
			Davis, Danny	Lowey	Sewell (AL)			
			DeGette	Lucas	Shea-Porter	Alexander	Dingell	Perlmutter
			Delaney	Luetkemeyer	Sherman	Andrews	Frankel (FL)	Roby
			DeLauro	Lujan Grisham	Shimkus	Bachmann	Gingrey (GA)	Rush
			DelBene	(NM)	Shuster	Bass	Gowdy	Sanchez, Loretta
			Dent	Lujan, Ben Ray	Simpson	Bishop (GA)	Hall	Schwartz
			DesJarlais	(NM)	Sinema	Buchanan	Herrera Beutler	Scott, Austin
			Deutch	Lummis	Smith (NE)	Cárdenas	Higgins	Sires
			Diaz-Balart	Marino	Smith (NJ)	Cicilline	Kind	Tipton
			Doggett	Massie	Smith (TX)	Costa	Maloney, Sean	Tsongas
			Doyle	McCarthy (CA)	Smith (WA)	Cotton	McCarthy (NY)	Waxman
			Duncan (SC)	McClintock	Southerland	DeSantis	McCaul	Young (AK)
			Duncan (TN)	McCollum	Speier			
			Edwards	McHenry	Stewart			
			Ellison	McIntyre	Stutzman			
			Ellmers	McKeon	Takano			
			Engel	McKinley	Thornberry			
			Enyart	McMorris	Titus			
			Eshoo	Rodgers	Tonko			
			Esty	McNerney	Upton			
			Farr	Meadows	Van Hollen			
			Fattah	Meehan	Vargas			
			Fincher	Meng	Vela			
			Fleischmann	Messer	Velázquez			
			Forbes	Mica	Wagner			
			Fortenberry	Michaud	Walden			
			Foster	Miller (MI)	Walz			
			Franks (AZ)	Miller, Gary	Wasserman			
			Frelinghuysen	Moran	Schultz			
			Gabbard	Mullin	Waters			
			Gallego	Murphy (PA)	Watt			
			Goodlatte	Nadler	Webster (FL)			
			Gosar	Napolitano	Welch			
			Granger	Neugebauer	Wenstrup			
			Grayson	Noem	Westmoreland			
			Grijalva	Nunes	Whitfield			
			Grimm	Nunnelee	Williams			
			Guthrie	O'Rourke	Wilson (FL)			
			Gutiérrez	Olson	Wilson (SC)			
			Hahn	Pascrell	Wolf			
			Hanabusa	Payne	Womack			
			Harper	Pelosi	Yarmuth			
			Hastings (FL)	Petri	Yoho			
			Hastings (WA)	Pingree (ME)	Young (FL)			
			Heck (WA)	Pocan	Young (IN)			

NOT VOTING—22

Andrews	Herrera Beutler	Schwartz
Buchanan	Higgins	Scott, Austin
Costa	Kind	Sires
Dingell	McCarthy (NY)	Tsongas
Frankel (FL)	Perlmutter	Waxman
Gingrey (GA)	Roby	Young (AK)
Gowdy	Rush	
Hall	Sanchez, Loretta	

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). There are 2 minutes remaining.

□ 1323

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.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the question on agreeing to the Speaker's approval of the Journal, which the Chair will put de novo.

The question is on the Speaker's approval of the Journal.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 260, nays 137, answered "present" 2, not voting 33, as follows:

[Roll No. 488]

YEAS—260

Aderholt	Beatty	Blackburn
Amodi	Becerra	Blumenauer
Bachus	Bera (CA)	Bonamici
Barletta	Bilirakis	Boustany
Barr	Bishop (UT)	Brady (TX)
Barrow (GA)	Black	Bridenstine

Amash	Clarke	Flores
Barber	Cleaver	Foxx
Barton	Cohen	Fudge
Benishek	Collins (GA)	Garamendi
Bentivolio	Conaway	Garcia
Bishop (NY)	Connolly	Gardner
Brady (PA)	Crowley	Garrett
Braley (IA)	Davis, Rodney	Gerlach
Brooks (IN)	DeFazio	Gibbs
Broun (GA)	Denham	Gibson
Bucshon	Duckworth	Graves (GA)
Burgess	Duffy	Graves (MO)
Capuano	Farenthold	Green, Al
Carson (IN)	Fitzpatrick	Green, Gene
Chu	Fleming	Griffin (AR)

NAYS—137

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—2

Gohmert Owens

NOT VOTING—33

Alexander	Dingell	Perlmutter
Andrews	Frankel (FL)	Roby
Bachmann	Gingrey (GA)	Rush
Bass	Gowdy	Sanchez, Loretta
Bishop (GA)	Hall	Schwartz
Buchanan	Herrera Beutler	Scott, Austin
Cárdenas	Higgins	Sires
Cicilline	Kind	Tipton
Costa	Maloney, Sean	Tsongas
Cotton	McCarthy (NY)	Waxman
DeSantis	McCaul	Young (AK)

□ 1330

So the Journal was approved. The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

SOUTHEAST ARIZONA LAND EXCHANGE AND CONSERVATION ACT OF 2013

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on the bill H.R. 687.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. CONAWAY). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 351 and rule XVIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill, H.R. 687.

The Chair appoints the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. TERRY) to preside over the Committee of the Whole.

□ 1332

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 687) to facilitate the efficient extraction of mineral resources in southeast Arizona by authorizing and directing an exchange of Federal and non-Federal

land, and for other purposes, with Mr. TERRY in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIR. Pursuant to the rule, the bill is considered read the first time.

The gentleman from Washington (Mr. HASTINGS) and the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. GRIJALVA) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I rise today in strong support of H.R. 687, the Southeast Arizona Land Exchange and Conservation Act. As our Nation continues to suffer from high unemployment, a rising national debt, and annual deficits, Congress's top priority should be advancing solutions that put Americans back to work and help to strengthen and grow the economy. The bill before us does just that.

Mr. Chairman, the Southeast Arizona Land Exchange and Conservation Act, sponsored by our colleague and Natural Resources Committee member, Mr. GOSAR from Arizona, is a bipartisan measure that will create thousands of new American jobs and boost our economy through increased U.S. mineral production.

The bill authorizes an equal-value land exchange between Resolution Copper and the Federal Government that will open up the third largest undeveloped copper resource in the world. The bill requires that the cost of the land exchange be fully paid for by the mine developer—Copper Resolution, in this case—ensuring that there will be fair treatment for taxpayers.

This project will provide substantial benefits to the United States and the State of Arizona in the form of job creation, economic growth, and for increased national security for the United States. The mining project is estimated to support 3,700 new jobs. These are good-paying, family-wage American jobs that will equate to more than \$220 million in annual wages.

At a time when our economy continues to struggle, this mining project will provide a much-needed boost through private investment. This mining activity will have over a \$60 billion economic impact and will generate an estimated \$20 billion in total Federal, State, county, and local tax revenue through the life of the project. This bill is a perfect example of how safely and responsibly harnessing our resources will generate revenue and get our economy back on track.

The importance of increased U.S. copper production cannot be overstated. Our Nation has become increasingly reliant on foreign countries for our mineral resources—placing our economic competitiveness and national security at risk. The U.S. currently imports 30 percent of the copper we need, and we will continue to be dependent on foreign countries if we fail to develop our own resources here at home.

The copper produced from this single project is estimated to meet 25 percent

of the United States' entire copper demand. This copper could be used for a variety of items, ranging from medical devices, plumbing, computers, and even, Mr. Chairman, hybrid cars. It's also essential for our national defense equipment and technology, including satellites, space and aviation, and weapons guidance and communications systems.

The benefits and reasons to pass this bill are plentiful. However, we are likely to hear several inaccurate claims from those who are opposed to mining in the United States. I would like to take a moment to set the record straight right from the beginning.

First, this bill follows the standard Federal land appraisal process procedures issued by the Department of Justice, which has been in use for decades. The appraisal requires full market value to be paid for both the land and the minerals located within the land. If, by chance, there is copper production beyond the appraised value, the mine developer will be required to pay the United States the difference. This, Mr. Chairman, would be assessed annually. This is an added guarantee to ensure that taxpayers get a fair return for these copper resources.

Second, as I mentioned earlier, this bill is about creating nearly 3,700 American jobs. It's not about helping foreign mining interests at home, as some have charged. Opposing this mine and not producing copper in the U.S. is what truly benefits foreign nations, by sending American jobs overseas and making us increasingly reliant on foreign sources of critical minerals.

Finally, the bill requires full compliance with environmental laws and tribal consultation prior to constructing the mine. This bill provides more conservation and protection of culturally sensitive, riparian, and critical habitat than otherwise would occur. This bill does not, Mr. Chairman, waive any existing laws or protections for sacred sites under Federal law. It upholds the Native American Graves Preservation and Repatriation Act, or NAGPRA, and the American Indian Religious Freedom Act. It will not allow the desecration of any sacred area. It does, Mr. Chairman, specifically and permanently protect a site called Apache Leap that is well known and special to Arizonans and the area tribes.

H.R. 687 is about creating new American jobs, strengthening our economy, and decreasing our dependence on foreign minerals. The bill has broad support from over 50 local and national organizations and government entities, including Arizona Governor Jan Brewer, the Arizona Chamber of Commerce, the U.S. Chamber of Commerce, the National Association of Manufacturing, and the National Mining Association.

Furthermore, the Arizona Republic Editorial Board has endorsed this bill. They highlighted the bipartisan support from the Arizona congressional delegation and noted that "it has the

potential to be an economic bonanza for our State and a national security boon to our country."

I strongly urge my colleagues to support this bill to put Americans back to work and end our dependency on foreign minerals.

With that, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GRIJALVA. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I rise to oppose H.R. 687. At a time when the majority in this Congress has brought our Nation to the brink of potential shutdown, a looming hardship and economic crisis with regard to the debt ceiling, no progress on the jobs plan, no progress on immigration reform, here we are today, debating a sweetheart piece of legislation that hurts taxpayers and comforts, yes, foreign multinational mining corporations. One has to wonder about what the priorities for this Congress really are.

We have seen at least five different versions of this legislation over the past 10 years. Originally filed in the 109th Congress as H.R. 2681, sponsored by our former colleague from Arizona, Congressman Renzi, that version begat H.R. 3301 in the 110th Congress by our colleague, Congressman PASTOR. That begat H.R. 2509 in the 111th Congress by Congresswoman KIRKPATRICK. And then that begat the version in the 112th Congress, H.R. 1904, by my friend from Arizona, Congressman GOSAR, which begat this present version, H.R. 687 in the 113th, again sponsored by my colleague, Mr. GOSAR.

If the definition of insanity is doing the same thing over and over again and expecting different results, we all might need to spend some time getting our heads examined.

H.R. 687 facilitates a land exchange so that a subsidiary of two foreign-owned mining companies can build a massive block cave copper mine on Federal land set aside by President Eisenhower for recreation in 1955. The town of Superior has been torn apart by this legislation. The city attorney issued a legal opinion that section 9 of this bill, which was stripped during the markup process, was not something legally the town could approve. The opinion raised grave concerns about the financial obligations the town would be under if they accepted the arrangement with Resolution Copper as written.

The town was willing to negotiate with Resolution Copper, but the company demanded support for the legislation as a precondition to any further talks. They also stated rather flatly that there would be no additional money coming to Superior from Resolution Copper from these negotiations.

Resolution Copper continues to oppose any requirement of filing a mining plan of operation before this legislation is passed. It's been 10 years since this project was proposed—and we still have no mining plan. This community

has been driven by boom-and-bust promises of mining companies for decades. Retired miners have become accustomed to losing the pensions that they earned in contract negotiations from mining corporations, especially when dealing with foreign entities.

This is not an economic miracle waiting to happen. Even if the town were to reverse its position, the legal and political issues that have already been raised cannot be ignored. The town, climbing and environmental organizations and Native American nations will be severely impacted by this trade, particularly when the mine is built. Resolution Copper, after 10 years of pushing and pushing, has yet to acknowledge those impacts.

□ 1345

There are just too many unanswered questions and shortcuts. Opposition to this bill from the community that it will impact the most is a clear indication that the process needs to start over, but Superior's withdrawal of support is just one of many red flags.

All Native American nations in Arizona overwhelmingly oppose the bill. The Inter Tribal Council of Arizona and the National Congress of American Indians have both passed resolutions in opposition. Their strong opposition stems from the outright violation of the consultation protocol that mandates advanced, informed, and appropriate government-to-government consultation with Indian tribes, nations, and communities.

H.R. 687 trades away Federal lands that contain significant cultural resources without complying with NEPA. This means that there will be no environmental review or formal consultation with affiliated tribal governments before the land becomes private property.

The sponsor's insistence to postpone environmental review until after the land exchange is one of the main reasons local support for this bill has eroded. Once the land is exchanged, as mandated by the bill, there is no guarantee a full EIS under NEPA will occur. That means no independent hydrology study to assess the impacts to local water resources. That means no mining plan of operation and independent jobs and economics report. That means no objective appraisal of the lands to be exchanged. We're stuck relying on the company's numbers to guesstimate the value added for the American taxpayer. That doesn't seem like a good deal to me, no matter what way you look at it.

I was astounded that the majority decided to shield the company from testifying at the hearing held on this bill. We all would have benefited greatly from the ability to hear from Resolution Copper on the record about their support for the bill, the validity of their economic study, the lack of a mining plan of operations, the lack of an independent hydrology study associated with a real mining plan of oper-

ations, and the negligent disregard for NEPA standards and Native American tribal consultation processes.

How is the House expected to make an informed decision on this deeply controversial bill when the committee of jurisdiction didn't even bother to question the owners and proponents, Resolution Copper? This doesn't make sense to me and to a great deal of people.

All we know about the proposed mine is purely speculative and comes from data and reports produced by Resolution Copper, itself. And the common refrain from supporters to trust without validation—don't worry, it will all work out—those are not the due diligence requirements that this Congress has on a major land exchange as we are facing today.

The number of jobs they claim the project will create is a moving target. The number is always changing. At one point, the company claimed the mine would create 5,000 jobs. The last estimate on their Web site project the mine will support 1,400 direct jobs through the life of the mine.

Again, these numbers come from a study conducted by Resolution Copper and are not supported by a mining plan of operation. Until we have a plan, there is really no way to know. The numbers tossed around by the majority come from a study that assume the mine would produce the same amount of copper and support the same amount of jobs year after year for its entire 50-year life span. We know this won't be the case. Mining operations react to market demand.

One number not tossed around by the proponents of H.R. 687 is royalties for the extraction of this very valuable mineral on Federal land, royalties to deal with remediation, to deal with any mitigation likely to occur after the fact, and to deal with some level of return to the American taxpayer.

The boom and bust cycles of mining's history can't be washed away with a public relations document masquerading as an economic study that assumes the very best and brushes aside any reality.

Construction of this mine will benefit two large foreign corporations. It will not diversify the local economy or even guarantee any real jobs for the local people in the area. It will, on the other hand, diminish the recreation value of the area, jeopardize the availability of water, and threaten a sacred site, all for cents on the dollar.

H.R. 687 is not in the best interest of the American taxpayer, and I urge my colleagues to oppose this reckless, expedited land exchange. A wolf in sheep's clothing, regardless, is still a wolf.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I am very pleased to yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. GOSAR), the author of this legislation.

Mr. GOSAR. Thank you, Chairman HASTINGS. I appreciate the House

spending time to consider this important jobs legislation this week.

My home State of Arizona is known for its five Cs: cattle, citrus, climate, cotton, and, ultimately, copper. People have been digging in Arizona for precious metals like copper for centuries. In the 1850s, nearly one in every four people in Arizona were miners. Without a doubt, miners fueled the growth that makes Arizona the State it is today.

Today, the Arizona mining industry is alive, but it's not what it used to be. Nevertheless, a wide array of other minerals, such as copper, coal, uranium, lime, and potash, are mined throughout my district. These projects employ hundreds of my constituents with high-paying jobs, jobs that pay over \$50,000 to \$60,000 a year, plus benefits. In rural Arizona, those types of jobs are few and far between.

Rural Arizonans recognize the major benefits this project will bring to our region and our State, which is why it was one of the first initiatives brought to my attention when I came to Congress. The Southwest Arizona Land Exchange and Conservation Act is a bill that protects important, environmentally sensitive lands in the State and opens up over 3,700 jobs at Resolution Copper Mine.

My legislation is the result of years of negotiation and compromise that achieves a careful balance between conservation and resource utilizations, and Arizonans just want Congress to get it done. That is why my colleague on the other side of the aisle, Congresswoman ANN KIRKPATRICK, and I came together at the beginning of this Congress and jointly introduced this legislation.

In fact, just last week, the largest paper in the State of Arizona, The Arizona Republic, issued an op-ed on House consideration of our bill. In the column, entitled, "Stop Dawdling on Resolution Copper," the editorial board stated:

Congress needs to get this done. A copper mine proposed near Superior is a winner. It has bipartisan support from Arizona's congressional delegation. (How often does that happen?) It also has the potential to be an economic bonanza for our State and a national security boon to our country. The proposal has been around so long it has old-timer status in Arizona. Congressional approval is overdue for the land swap necessary to make this happen.

I guess that says it all. Our bill is a win-win for Arizona. That is why it has strong bipartisan support in Arizona and across the Nation. That support includes Arizona Governor Jan Brewer, four-fifths of the highly polarized Arizona Legislature, nearly every municipal government in central and southern Arizona, national business interests like the U.S. Chamber of Commerce, the general contractors, the truckers and the manufacturers, and conservation organizations like the Sonoran Institute and the Arizona Game and Fish Commission.

Why so much buzz about this project, you ask? It's called jobs, jobs, and jobs.

Upon passage of the bill, Resolution Copper estimates it will be able to employ nearly 3,000 workers during a 6-year construction period, and that's just the start. The mine, given the company's mine plan of operation when it complies with all environmental laws, will directly employ around 1,400 people. These are high-paying jobs ranging from \$40,000 to \$120,000 salaries per year in a region that is struggling economically.

As many people familiar with mining communities know, an influx of over 1,000 mining jobs will spur additional economic growth in a community. These mine workers need restaurants to eat at, convenience stores to shop at, and homes to live in. A recent economic study estimates an additional 2,300 jobs could be created due to these demands. That brings the estimated total number of permanent jobs resulting from this legislation to about 3,700.

Overall, independent analysis estimates that the total economic impact of the project will be around \$61 billion. That is over \$1 billion per year over the life of the mine, which equates to over \$19 billion in Federal, State, county, and local tax revenue—\$19 billion in tax revenue. In these tough fiscal times, I think we can all agree that local governments, and certainly the U.S. Treasury, could use those funds.

This legislation also has national security implications. The U.S. currently imports 30 percent of its copper, and its demand is skyrocketing. This critical mineral is used in virtually all modern-day technology, ranging from renewable energy and hybrid cars to your everyday electronics like cell phones and iPods. Our country must use domestic resources to meet this growing demand, and this project, as was said earlier, could yield enough copper to yield 25 percent of our current demand.

This legislation is not only a jobs bill, it's a conservation bill. The lands the Federal Government acquires in the exchange are highly coveted recreational and conservation lands. It protects one of the few remaining undammed rivers in Arizona, the San Pedro River. The Dripping Springs property is a superb hiking and climbing location. The Cave Creek property will protect a riparian corridor, as well as numerous archaeological sites.

The CHAIR. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. I yield the gentleman from Arizona an additional 1 minute.

Mr. GOSAR. And nearly 100 acres of private land adjacent to the culturally important Apache Leap is being placed into Federal stewardship.

This proposal truly has bipartisan support on the ground in our State and across the country. We can preserve lands that advance the public interests and objectives of protecting wildlife habitat, cultural and historical resources, while enabling development of a project that will generate significant economic and employment opportuni-

ties for State and local residents. I hope it will garner your support.

I urge my colleagues to vote "yes" on H.R. 687, the Southeast Arizona Land Exchange and Conservation Act.

Mr. GRIJALVA. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. DEFAZIO), the ranking member of the Resources Committee.

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Chairman, I thank my friend and colleague for yielding that time.

Well, another day, another giveaway. Pretty ironic: here we are, we're about to get into a massive fight over whether or not we should increase the debt limit of the United States or default on our obligations, which involves many trillions of dollars, and today we're going to give away a taxpayer asset that is worth billions of dollars. We're going to give it away. Oh, we're going to get some pretty land in exchange. That's valuable. That's nice. But, you know, for many billions of dollars, we could probably buy a lot more land if we wanted it, or we could have a little debt reduction.

I had a simple amendment. My amendment would have said that we would charge an 8 percent royalty. Eight percent of the value of the copper coming from these publicly-owned lands would be paid to the Treasury of the United States of America. And guess what? The Republicans didn't allow the amendment. What are they afraid of? They're afraid that maybe some of their Tea Party types over there might vote for it? You want to run government like a business, don't give away assets. That's what we're doing here. You would still get the jobs.

Now, you know, this bill contains sort of a bizarre—they're saying, oh, we're going to get some money maybe, sort of, kind of. Except Treasury—nobody can interpret the language of this bill. It's a rather unique and very speculative—potential, future, possible—payment scheme, which would be controlled entirely by the company using proprietary information. Of course they're going to volunteer to pay money. Yeah, I don't think so. It's not going to happen.

So we're going to trade away a multi-billion-dollar asset for a few thousand acres of recreation land. I would say on any other day I wouldn't hear from the Republican side of the aisle that that was a good idea—give away billions of dollars of Federal assets for some recreation lands.

Now, this isn't about the surface. It's just about the fact that Rio Tinto, a foreign corporation, is not going to pay anything, or very little, for the value of the minerals that are extracted from this land. In fact, I understand that they've pretty much stopped any other exploration around the world because this is the richest copper load in North America, one of the richest in the world. They don't want to go to these other piddly places where they've

been—Indonesia, Australia and all that. They're just focusing all their energy for copper right here.

And guess where the copper is going to go after it's mined and after they don't pay anything to us for taking it out of the ground? It's going to go to China. Foreign corporation, ship it to China. Yeah, we'll get some jobs. And if they paid a royalty, we would still get the jobs and we would make the taxpayers whole.

Now, the oil and gas industry pays 12.5 percent royalty to the government for the value of the resources they extract. Why shouldn't the mining industry pay? Well, they don't pay because we're operating under an 1872 law signed by Ulysses S. Grant. That's what governs mining here. Now, come on. It's time to update that law. And if they don't want to update the law, they could at least begin to charge some royalties for the extraction of these minerals.

We have given away billions of dollars of gold mines to foreign corporations—platinum, everything. Now we're going to give away our greatest copper resource to a foreign corporation with no royalties, no charge—and they will shelter most of their earnings overseas. They will pay little, if anything, in U.S. taxes. Yes, their employees will pay taxes—oh, they will pay taxes. Yeah, of course. We're going to extract that out of the employees, but the company isn't going to pay. They will find a way to shelter that overseas. It's a foreign corporation.

□ 1400

This is outrageous, absolutely outrageous. There are the issues regarding the environmental waivers and the other things that Mr. GRIJALVA talked about. We are going to evaluate this after the asset is transferred to the mining company. The mining company will some day go through this bizarre speculative scheme and they might pay us something in the future.

Let's have a plain and simple and fair 8 percent royalty, make the taxpayers whole and run this government a little bit more responsibly, guys.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I am very pleased to yield 3 minutes to another gentleman from Arizona (Mr. SALMON).

Mr. SALMON. Mr. Chairman, you've already heard that this is a very bipartisan measure that is supported by people on both sides of the aisle.

In fact, I would like to point out a little story that I think is kind of interesting. I think Mr. GOSAR might be a little embarrassed, and his partner on the other side of the aisle in getting this through, ANN KIRKPATRICK. But I think it's really interesting to note that Mr. GOSAR beat Mrs. KIRKPATRICK in a campaign a few years ago, yet they were able to put all differences aside to come together for what's best for the State and what's best ultimately for the Nation.

We are talking about 3,700 jobs. Every town hall meeting that I've held

this year—and I think the same thing could be said for most folks in this body on both sides of the aisle—the number one issue that keeps coming up is jobs, jobs, jobs. People want to get back to work again. Arizona was hit really hard by this Great Recession, and the prospect of getting 3,700 jobs in our State for this great project that's going to provide 25 percent of the copper for this country is phenomenal. That's why *The Arizona Republic*, our State's largest newspaper, came out and editorialized for it. That's why you see all these different entities that really are on both sides of the aisle coming out in support of this idea.

I really find it incredible that as we try to balance the budget, we try to start whittling down the deficit, stop having to pay a third of our debt to China, that we have folks on the other side of the aisle that are not willing to either cut spending or create jobs. I find that incredible.

This is a phenomenal opportunity. It's a win-win all the way across the board and what I think a lot of our young people would call a “no-brainer.”

I would like to really commend the other gentleman from Arizona, Representative PAUL GOSAR, for his undying support and his incredible hard work to get this done, and I commend his colleague on the other side of the aisle, ANN KIRKPATRICK, for her great work on this.

I also want to just say in closing that this is extremely important to the folks in Arizona. It's been going on since I left Congress the first time, and that was 12 years ago. It's time to put this to bed.

It has passed the House on several occasions and it gets all caught up in the Senate. I think we have the opportunity to get it done this year, I think common sense will prevail, and I would like to again compliment the gentleman from Arizona for his great work.

Mr. GRIJALVA. Mr. Chairman, I think the great Senator Moynihan once said that “people are entitled to their own opinions, but they're not entitled to their own facts.”

Allowing the immediate exploration on and under Oak Flat prior to NEPA review contemplated in section 4(j) of the act will constitute an irretrievable commitment of resources. That is part of what has already been the legislation.

What's also in the legislation is section 4(c) of H.R. 687 that requires consultation only after enactment of the act, making any consultation with Native communities a mere formality.

Secretary Vilsack said it in prior written comments:

It is important that this bill engage in a process of formal tribal consultation to ensure both tribal participation and the protection of the sacred sites.

This is his principal concern with regard to H.R. 687, and that's why it did not receive the support of the Department.

I mention those things because they're part of the legislation. This legislation was written for the convenience of the company and to facilitate a trade that at the end of the day doesn't offer not only any benefit but circumvents any protections we have to deal with intended and unintended consequences.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan, Congressman KILDEE, for his comments.

Mr. KILDEE. Mr. Chairman, I thank my friend, Mr. GRIJALVA, for his leadership and for yielding the time.

I rise in strong opposition to this bill. I have consulted with many Native American tribes, including the Saginaw Chippewa Tribe, which I represent. This bill simply does not rise to the standard that allows me to support it. I have talked to the tribes. Their concern is that this bill does not adequately support the protection of sacred lands, nor does it adequately confer with Native Americans on these critical issues.

The gentleman mentioned that the two cosponsors of this legislation have set aside their differences. I have great respect for both Members that offer this legislation. It is commendable that they have set aside their differences.

Unfortunately, what this bill does is also set aside the objections of the Native American tribes of this Nation—of this country—who object to the bill.

It's bad for a couple of reasons: First, it waives NEPA protections that require mining companies to publicly disclose the environmental impacts they will create, including on our water resources.

Second, basically this bill provides a multibillion dollar giveaway to a foreign mining conglomerate that is engaged in mining uranium in Iran.

Third, this bill would potentially destroy sacred and religious lands.

I know something firsthand about the importance of preserving sacred tribal sites. When I was the president of the Genesee County Land Bank back home in Flint, Michigan, we discovered sacred ancestral remains on a work-site. Instead of simply continuing on the project, as many would have had us do, we did the right thing. We stopped the development, worked with local and tribal officials, identified and protected the sacred remains and returned the land to the Saginaw Chippewa Tribe.

The Federal Government has a legal and trust responsibility to Indian tribes and to protect and preserve sacred tribal lands, and we should take that role very seriously.

I suggest and implore my colleagues to oppose this bill.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I am very pleased to yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. LAMBORN), the subcommittee chairman on the Natural Resources Committee that deals with this issue.

Mr. LAMBORN. Mr. Chairman, I want to thank the chairman of the full

committee, Representative HASTINGS, for his leadership on this and many other resources issues. I want to thank the sponsors of the bill, and particularly point out to the American people that Representative PAUL GOSAR has been working night and day on this issue for years. It is amazing to me, and a sign of his dedication to his district and the people of Arizona that brought this bill to where it's at right now. It's taken a lot of work and dedication, and I admire that as I witness it.

A lot has been said about the good that will come to Arizona, the 3,700 well-paying jobs. But I want to talk about the good that's going to come to America.

Copper is the second-most-needed defense material that the Department of Defense has. I'm on the Armed Services Committee, and I'm sensitive to making sure that our men and women in uniform have the best weapons and supplies that they can have. The DOD says that copper is the second-most-necessary mineral to meeting the needs of the military. The first happens to be aluminum.

Also, this is the third-most-rich site of copper in the entire world, in my understanding. It would supply up to one-quarter of this Nation's copper needs. We are right now importing 30 percent of our needs, so it almost wipes out our trade deficit in copper. Copper is a critical metal. If you want to have a growing economy, you've got to have copper. I just want to say this is good for America, it's good to have this resource, and it's good for the jobs that it produces in Arizona.

Finally, I'm just going to conclude by saying it amazes me when I hear people who profess to be for the working families—the working men and women of this country—stumble over a golden opportunity like this that would create thousands of great jobs and they just throw it away.

I would urge that we not listen to them, we look at the good that comes from this bill and the resources and the jobs that this would produce and the good that it does to our national economy, including our defense industry.

Mr. GRIJALVA. Mr. Chairman, before I yield to my colleague from Utah, it should be noted that 1/14th of 1 percent is the impact copper has on the Arizona economy. It used to be 4 percent about 10 or 15 years ago.

Conversely, \$421 million annually is spent in Pinal County and the surrounding area around Oak Flat and Apache Leap in terms of ecotourism and visitorship revenue.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Utah (Mr. MATHESON).

Mr. MATHESON. Mr. Chairman, I thank Mr. GRIJALVA for his generosity in yielding me the time.

I rise in support of H.R. 687, the Southeast Arizona Land Exchange and Conservation Act.

Copper is such a critical part of our economy. It is used in electronics,

plumbing, cars, renewable energy. Yet, according to the latest data from the U.S. Geological Survey, the United States remains a net importer of copper, with over a third of copper consumed in this country coming from foreign sources.

This piece of bipartisan legislation offers a chance to develop one of the largest undeveloped copper resources in the world. It is estimated that once fully developed, this project will produce enough copper annually to meet 25 percent of U.S. demand. It will create 3,500 high-paying jobs. The average income in this industry is over \$65,000.

This has been the product of a lengthy stakeholder negotiation process. It has been supported by local elected officials of both parties.

I commend Mr. GOSAR for his leadership on this issue and for working with Congresswoman KIRKPATRICK as well. I urge passage of this bill.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GRIJALVA. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Let me, if I may, talk a little bit about the proponent's claim that H.R. 687 will boost the U.S. economy.

The copper will likely benefit China more than the United States. Nine percent of the parent company of Resolution Copper, Rio Tinto, is owned by the state-controlled Aluminum Corporation of China. Rio Tinto has a long-established partnership to supply copper to China—they repeatedly stated—and at a hearing refused to say what percentage of the copper generated from Federal lands would be retained and processed in the United States.

They will continue to market and supply their mine copper and other ores to meet the greatest needs. At this point, Rio Tinto's own international copper study group forecast a 377-ton global shortage this year alone, driven not by U.S. demand but by that of China. The bill does not even require that the ore extracted from this mine be processed in the United States, much less marketed or sold here.

Our time and our focus should be on supporting U.S. industries maintaining jobs. We should not trade away billions and billions of dollars and tonnage of copper to supply China's ever-growing need.

I also would like to point out another issue that my friend, Congressman KILDEE, pointed out. At one point, we continued a very important inquiry that has not been finalized or formalized, and that is the parent company is in violation of the resolution by this Congress and by previous Congresses on sanctions against Iran because of their development of potential weapons, nuclear weapons. Any company doing business with Iran was not to be able to do business with the United States.

Rio Tinto co-manages in partnership a mine—a uranium mine of all things—

in Namibia in Africa. I think that merits we look into it before we are in violation of our own resolution and, more importantly, that we are not violating a resolution that we passed. It is an issue of asking Commerce and Treasury, who are responsible for that sanction enforcement, to do so. I think it would satisfy many of us to know the results of that, and it would satisfy the American people to know that their resource, a shared taxpayer resource, copper on Federal land, is not in violation of a sanctions resolution by this Congress against Iran.

With that, I reserve the balance of my time.

□ 1415

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for time on general debate and would ask my friend from Arizona if he is prepared to yield back his time on general debate, as I am prepared to close?

Mr. GRIJALVA. At this point, I don't have any further speakers.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GRIJALVA. I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, let me summarize three important points from this debate.

H.R. 687 reflects all five of the previous variations of this legislation. You are doing a post-NEPA with no enforcement. You are turning the regulatory process and the oversight process to the State of Arizona, which has weak mining laws and which is also not in a position to meet the requirements that have to be part of this prior to any land exchange: that would be hydrology; that would be sacred-site consultation; that would be a NEPA review as to water issues that could occur and subsurface damage. To the area around Apache Leap and Oak Flat, those become important issues.

The sanctions issue is important to resolve against Iran—that we are not in violation by creating a partnership in an exchange with a foreign corporation that is doing business with Iran.

I think the most important issue is the taxpayer issue. We here in this Congress—certainly many of my colleagues on the other side of the aisle and on this side of the aisle as well—talk so much about the taxpayer; talk so much about budget cuts and how to relieve the taxpayer; talk so much about deficits and how we need to reduce those deficits to the benefit of the taxpayer. We have no jobs bill, but we talk about helping the taxpayer.

Then here we have before us our trading away of Federal land in an exchange, not knowing what the real value is, because that's proprietary, not knowing what the real production is going to be by the company because that's proprietary, not requiring the same regulatory NEPA process required of any other land exchange because this is a special deal.

At the end of the day, as to exported copper that is processed outside the

United States—one, no gain to the taxpayer; no royalty requirement—lost to the taxpayer; no real understanding of the full value of what's underneath that ground and what protections and mitigations would have to be put in place in order to make sure that those areas are taken care of—not a problem; violation of the government-to-government consultation on sacred sites and cultural sites—we ignore that, too.

I think this is a rush to judgment, and it has been 10 years of a rush to judgment. If the company 10 years ago would have agreed to do a post-NEPA, we would have had all the information this Congress needed in order to make an informed, due diligence decision. If 10 years ago they would have sat down with the tribes and honestly and forthrightly and equally done a government-to-government consultation, we could have been on our way. If 10 years ago they would have made the guarantees about a fair return to the taxpayer—how much ore is going to be domestically marketed and remain in the United States and how much is going to be processed—we could have been on our way. That was 10 years ago.

This is the same piece of legislation, the same insistence on the company. I think it is a bad deal for the taxpayers, and it is a bad deal for the State of Arizona. We would be the poster child for one of the worst expedited, sweetheart deals at the expense of the American taxpayer and at the expense of the people of Arizona, of the tribes of Arizona, and of the revenue that that County of Pinal enjoys.

Mr. Chairman, how much time do I have remaining?

The Acting CHAIR (Mr. MEADOWS). The gentleman from Arizona has 5 minutes remaining.

Mr. GRIJALVA. I yield 2 minutes to the gentledady from Arizona (Mrs. KIRKPATRICK).

Mrs. KIRKPATRICK. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this legislation.

I thank my colleague, Mr. GRIJALVA, for yielding time to me, and I thank him for his work and his comments. I also want to thank my colleague from across the aisle, Congressman GOSAR, for working with me in a bipartisan way on this legislation.

I just want people to know that the town of Superior is a small town. It's in the Copper Corridor of Arizona. Arizona's unemployment is higher than the national unemployment; but in our rural communities, it's even higher. This is an area in which people have been miners for generations, and they want these jobs.

If the folks in a small town like Superior can come together, we as Members of Congress can come together. I urge my colleagues to vote for this legislation. It's an opportunity for us as Members of Congress to show the American people that, yes, we can work together and get things done. Let's make sure that this gets done.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GRIJALVA. Mr. Chairman, with this, I will close.

At some point, we as Members of this august body have to really define what “bipartisanship” is. The last time that this bill was before us and passed the House, seven Members from this side of the aisle—Democrats—voted for it, and eight Members on the other side of the aisle voted against it.

I mention that because this bill is about precedence. It is about the kind of precedence that we are going to set as Members of this body—ignoring our due diligence, ignoring the fact that we have before us a piece of legislation that has failed to get out of the Senate and, more importantly, that on two occasions the administration has strongly indicated it does not support it. So we will go on with this exercise of futility at the expense of real business that this Congress should be doing for the American people.

I yield back the balance of my time. Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, I just want to make a few comments here in response to what my colleagues on the other side of the aisle have been saying regarding this legislation. Certainly, there is a great deal of hyperbole going on that, I think, simply doesn't meet the “straight face” test in many respects.

First of all, it has been implied—and maybe said specifically—by one of my colleagues that this legislation waives environmental laws. Mr. Chairman, I want to say very specifically that this does not waive any environmental laws. Let me walk back to how this works, because my friends on the other side of the aisle are talking about the NEPA review. NEPA is a pretty important environmental law—I certainly understand that—but let's put this in context.

This legislation is a land exchange legislation—you exchange this piece of land for this piece of land. Now, that is a policy decision that we are debating and making here on the floor of the House. We are making a policy decision on exchanging this piece of land for another piece of land. If that exchange is done and if this becomes law, then, yes, there will be a copper mine on that land that's exchanged—we acknowledge that—but my friends on the other side of the aisle suggest that we should have a NEPA review before we make a law.

How absurd is that? Are we going to have a NEPA review on every law? Mr. Chairman, don't we make the policy here in this country? Their criticism is that we are not allowing a NEPA review before we make a law. I did not know that the NEPA policy said that, before there is a land exchange or before Congress passes a statute, you have to have a NEPA review. Yet, that's what their argument is in this case. After the land exchange, the process starts of developing a mine, and then you go through all of those envi-

ronmental hoops that you normally go through in this sort of activity.

So I just wanted to clarify that. I hope that my friends on the other side of the aisle aren't suggesting by their argument of a NEPA review that we should have a NEPA review on Congress' action. A NEPA review on a statute? That doesn't make sense.

Mr. Chairman, this is a good piece of legislation. It has been worked on very hard, on a bipartisan basis, by Mr. GOSAR and others from the Arizona delegation. Obviously, Arizonans broadly support this, at least by the evidence that we see in the media and so forth. I think it's a good bill. We have several amendments. We will debate those, and we will address those issues during that debate; but I urge my colleagues to vote for this legislation.

I yield back the balance of my time. The Acting CHAIR. All time for general debate has expired.

Pursuant to the rule, the amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on Natural Resources, printed in the bill, shall be considered as an original bill for the purpose of amendment under the 5-minute rule and shall be considered read.

The text of the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute is as follows:

H.R. 687

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 “Southeast Arizona Land Exchange and Conservation Act of 2013”.

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

Sec. 1. Short title; table of contents.

Sec. 2. Findings and purpose.

Sec. 3. Definitions.

Sec. 4. Land exchange.

Sec. 5. Conveyance and management of non-Federal land.

Sec. 6. Value adjustment payment to United States.

Sec. 7. Withdrawal.

Sec. 8. Apache leap.

Sec. 9. Miscellaneous provisions.

SEC. 2. FINDINGS AND PURPOSE.

(a) *FINDINGS.*—Congress finds that—

(1) the land exchange furthers public objectives referenced in section 206 of the Federal Land Policy and Management Act of 1976 (43 U.S.C. 1716) including—

(A) promoting significant job and other economic opportunities in a part of the State of Arizona that has a long history of mining, but is currently experiencing high unemployment rates and economic difficulties;

(B) facilitating the development of a world-class domestic copper deposit capable of meeting a significant portion of the annual United States demand for this strategic and important mineral, in an area which has already been subject to mining operations;

(C) significantly enhancing Federal, State, and local revenue collections in a time of severe governmental budget shortfalls;

(D) securing Federal ownership and protection of land with significant fish and wildlife, recreational, scenic, water, riparian, cultural, and other public values;

(E) assisting more efficient Federal land management via Federal acquisition of land for ad-

dition to the Las Cienegas and San Pedro National Conservation Areas, and to the Tonto and Coconino National Forests;

(F) providing opportunity for community expansion and economic diversification adjacent to the towns of Superior, Miami, and Globe, Arizona; and

(G) protecting the cultural resources and other values of the Apache Leap escarpment located near Superior, Arizona; and

(2) the land exchange is, therefore, in the public interest.

(b) *PURPOSE.*—It is the purpose of this Act to authorize, direct, facilitate, and expedite the exchange of land between Resolution Copper and the United States.

SEC. 3. DEFINITIONS.

In this Act:

(1) *APACHE LEAP.*—The term “Apache Leap” means the approximately 807 acres of land depicted on the map entitled “Southeast Arizona Land Exchange and Conservation Act of 2013—Apache Leap” and dated February 2013.

(2) *FEDERAL LAND.*—The term “Federal land” means the approximately 2,422 acres of land located in Pinal County, Arizona, depicted on the map entitled “Southeast Arizona Land Exchange and Conservation Act of 2013—Federal Parcel—Oak Flat” and dated February 2013.

(3) *INDIAN TRIBE.*—The term “Indian tribe” has the meaning given the term in section 4 of the Indian Self-Determination and Education Assistance Act (25 U.S.C. 450b).

(4) *NON-FEDERAL LAND.*—The term “non-Federal land” means the parcels of land owned by Resolution Copper that are described in section 5(a) and, if necessary to equalize the land exchange under section 4, section 4(e)(2)(A)(i).

(5) *OAK FLAT CAMPGROUND.*—The term “Oak Flat Campground” means the approximately 50 acres of land comprising approximately 16 developed campsites depicted on the map entitled “Southeast Arizona Land Exchange and Conservation Act of 2013—Oak Flat Campground” and dated February 2013.

(6) *OAK FLAT WITHDRAWAL AREA.*—The term “Oak Flat Withdrawal Area” means the approximately 760 acres of land depicted on the map entitled “Southeast Arizona Land Exchange and Conservation Act of 2013—Oak Flat Withdrawal Area” and dated February 2013.

(7) *RESOLUTION COPPER.*—The term “Resolution Copper” means Resolution Copper Mining, LLC, a Delaware limited liability company, including any successor, assign, affiliate, member, or joint venturer of Resolution Copper Mining, LLC.

(8) *SECRETARY.*—The term “Secretary” means the Secretary of Agriculture.

(9) *STATE.*—The term “State” means the State of Arizona.

(10) *TOWN.*—The term “Town” means the incorporated town of Superior, Arizona.

SEC. 4. LAND EXCHANGE.

(a) *IN GENERAL.*—Subject to the provisions of this Act, if Resolution Copper offers to convey to the United States all right, title, and interest of Resolution Copper in and to the non-Federal land, the Secretary is authorized and directed to convey to Resolution Copper, all right, title, and interest of the United States in and to the Federal land.

(b) *CONDITIONS ON ACCEPTANCE.*—Title to any non-Federal land conveyed by Resolution Copper to the United States under this Act shall be in a form that—

(1) is acceptable to the Secretary, for land to be administered by the Forest Service and the Secretary of the Interior, for land to be administered by the Bureau of Land Management; and

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

(c) *CONSULTATION WITH INDIAN TRIBES.*—If not undertaken prior to enactment of this Act, within 30 days of the date of enactment of this

Act, the Secretary shall engage in government-to-government consultation with affected Indian tribes concerning issues related to the land exchange, in accordance with applicable laws (including regulations).

(d) APPRAISALS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—As soon as practicable after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary and Resolution Copper shall select an appraiser to conduct appraisals of the Federal land and non-Federal land in compliance with the requirements of section 254.9 of title 36, Code of Federal Regulations.

(2) REQUIREMENTS.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in subparagraph (B), an appraisal prepared under this subsection shall be conducted in accordance with nationally recognized appraisal standards, including—

- (i) the Uniform Appraisal Standards for Federal Land Acquisitions; and
- (ii) the Uniform Standards of Professional Appraisal Practice.

(B) FINAL APPRAISED VALUE.—After the final appraised values of the Federal land and non-Federal land are determined and approved by the Secretary, the Secretary shall not be required to reappraise or update the final appraised value—

(i) for a period of 3 years beginning on the date of the approval by the Secretary of the final appraised value; or

(ii) at all, in accordance with section 254.14 of title 36, Code of Federal Regulations (or a successor regulation), after an exchange agreement is entered into by Resolution Copper and the Secretary.

(C) IMPROVEMENTS.—Any improvements made by Resolution Copper prior to entering into an exchange agreement shall not be included in the appraised value of the Federal land.

(D) PUBLIC REVIEW.—Before consummating the land exchange under this Act, the Secretary shall make the appraisals of the land to be exchanged (or a summary thereof) available for public review.

(3) APPRAISAL INFORMATION.—The appraisal prepared under this subsection shall include a detailed income capitalization approach analysis of the market value of the Federal land which may be utilized, as appropriate, to determine the value of the Federal land, and shall be the basis for calculation of any payment under section 6.

(e) EQUAL VALUE LAND EXCHANGE.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The value of the Federal land and non-Federal land to be exchanged under this Act shall be equal or shall be equalized in accordance with this subsection.

(2) SURPLUS OF FEDERAL LAND VALUE.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—If the final appraised value of the Federal land exceeds the value of the non-Federal land, Resolution Copper shall—

(i) convey additional non-Federal land in the State to the Secretary or the Secretary of the Interior, consistent with the requirements of this Act and subject to the approval of the applicable Secretary;

(ii) make a cash payment to the United States; or

(iii) use a combination of the methods described in clauses (i) and (ii), as agreed to by Resolution Copper, the Secretary, and the Secretary of the Interior.

(B) AMOUNT OF PAYMENT.—The Secretary may accept a payment in excess of 25 percent of the total value of the land or interests conveyed, notwithstanding section 206(b) of the Federal Land Policy and Management Act of 1976 (42 U.S.C. 1716(b)).

(C) DISPOSITION AND USE OF PROCEEDS.—Any amounts received by the United States under this subparagraph shall be deposited in the fund established under Public Law 90-171 (commonly known as the “Sisk Act”; 16 U.S.C. 484a) and shall be made available, in such amounts as are provided in advance in appropriation Acts, to the Secretary for the acquisition of land for addition to the National Forest System.

(3) SURPLUS OF NON-FEDERAL LAND.—If the final appraised value of the non-Federal land exceeds the value of the Federal land—

(A) the United States shall not make a payment to Resolution Copper to equalize the value; and

(B) the surplus value of the non-Federal land shall be considered to be a donation by Resolution Copper to the United States.

(f) OAK FLAT WITHDRAWAL AREA.—

(1) PERMITS.—Subject to the provisions of this subsection and notwithstanding any withdrawal of the Oak Flat Withdrawal Area from the mining, mineral leasing, or public land laws, the Secretary, upon enactment of this Act, shall issue to Resolution Copper—

(A) if so requested by Resolution Copper, within 30 days of such request, a special use permit to carry out mineral exploration activities under the Oak Flat Withdrawal Area from existing drill pads located outside the Area, if the activities would not disturb the surface of the Area; and

(B) if so requested by Resolution Copper, within 90 days of such request, a special use permit to carry out mineral exploration activities within the Oak Flat Withdrawal Area (but not within the Oak Flat Campground), if the activities are conducted from a single exploratory drill pad which is located to reasonably minimize visual and noise impacts on the Campground.

(2) CONDITIONS.—Any activities undertaken in accordance with this subsection shall be subject to such reasonable terms and conditions as the Secretary may require.

(3) TERMINATION.—The authorization for Resolution Copper to undertake mineral exploration activities under this subsection shall remain in effect until the Oak Flat Withdrawal Area land is conveyed to Resolution Copper in accordance with this Act.

(g) COSTS.—As a condition of the land exchange under this Act, Resolution Copper shall agree to pay, without compensation, all costs that are—

(1) associated with the land exchange and any environmental review document under subsection (f); and

(2) agreed to by the Secretary.

(h) USE OF FEDERAL LAND.—The Federal land to be conveyed to Resolution Copper under this Act shall be available to Resolution Copper for mining and related activities subject to and in accordance with applicable Federal, State, and local laws pertaining to mining and related activities on land in private ownership.

(i) INTENT OF CONGRESS.—It is the intent of Congress that the land exchange directed by this Act shall be consummated not later than one year after the date of enactment of this Act.

(j) ENVIRONMENTAL COMPLIANCE.—Compliance with the requirements of the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (42 U.S.C. 4321 et seq.) under this Act shall be as follows:

(1) Prior to commencing production in commercial quantities of any valuable mineral from the Federal land conveyed to Resolution Copper under this Act (except for any production from exploration and mine development shafts, adits, and tunnels needed to determine feasibility and pilot plant testing of commercial production or to access the ore body and tailing deposition areas), Resolution Copper shall submit to the Secretary a proposed mine plan of operations.

(2) The Secretary shall, within 3 years of such submission, complete preparation of an environmental review document in accordance with section 102(2) of the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (42 U.S.C. 4322(2)) which shall be used as the basis for all decisions under applicable Federal laws, rules and regulations regarding any Federal actions or authorizations related to the proposed mine and mine plan of operations of Resolution Copper, including the construction of associated power, water, transportation, processing, tailings, waste dump, and other ancillary facilities.

SEC. 5. CONVEYANCE AND MANAGEMENT OF NON-FEDERAL LAND.

(a) CONVEYANCE.—On receipt of title to the Federal land, Resolution Copper shall simultaneously convey—

(1) to the Secretary, all right, title, and interest that the Secretary determines to be acceptable in and to—

(A) the approximately 147 acres of land located in Gila County, Arizona, depicted on the map entitled “Southeast Arizona Land Exchange and Conservation Act of 2013–Non-Federal Parcel–Turkey Creek” and dated February 2013;

(B) the approximately 148 acres of land located in Yavapai County, Arizona, depicted on the map entitled “Southeast Arizona Land Exchange and Conservation Act of 2013–Non-Federal Parcel–Tangle Creek” and dated February 2013;

(C) the approximately 149 acres of land located in Maricopa County, Arizona, depicted on the map entitled “Southeast Arizona Land Exchange and Conservation Act of 2013–Non-Federal Parcel–Cave Creek” and dated February 2013;

(D) the approximately 640 acres of land located in Coconino County, Arizona, depicted on the map entitled “Southeast Arizona Land Exchange and Conservation Act of 2013–Non-Federal Parcel–East Clear Creek” and dated February 2013; and

(E) the approximately 110 acres of land located in Pinal County, Arizona, depicted on the map entitled “Southeast Arizona Land Exchange and Conservation Act of 2013–Apache Leap South End” and dated February 2013; and

(2) to the Secretary of the Interior, all right, title, and interest that the Secretary of the Interior determines to be acceptable in and to—

(A) the approximately 3,050 acres of land located in Pinal County, Arizona, identified as “Lands to DOI” as generally depicted on the map entitled “Southeast Arizona Land Exchange and Conservation Act of 2013–Non-Federal Parcel–Lower San Pedro River” and dated February 2013;

(B) the approximately 160 acres of land located in Gila and Pinal Counties, Arizona, identified as “Lands to DOI” as generally depicted on the map entitled “Southeast Arizona Land Exchange and Conservation Act of 2013–Non-Federal Parcel–Dripping Springs” and dated February 2013; and

(C) the approximately 940 acres of land located in Santa Cruz County, Arizona, identified as “Lands to DOI” as generally depicted on the map entitled “Southeast Arizona Land Exchange and Conservation Act of 2013–Non-Federal Parcel–Appleton Ranch” and dated February 2013.

(b) MANAGEMENT OF ACQUIRED LAND.—

(1) LAND ACQUIRED BY THE SECRETARY.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Land acquired by the Secretary under this Act shall—

(i) become part of the national forest in which the land is located; and

(ii) be administered in accordance with the laws applicable to the National Forest System.

(B) BOUNDARY REVISION.—On the acquisition of land by the Secretary under this Act, the boundaries of the national forest shall be modified to reflect the inclusion of the acquired land.

(C) LAND AND WATER CONSERVATION FUND.—For purposes of section 7 of the Land and Water Conservation Fund Act of 1965 (16 U.S.C. 4601–9), the boundaries of a national forest in which land acquired by the Secretary is located shall be deemed to be the boundaries of that forest as in existence on January 1, 1965.

(2) LAND ACQUIRED BY THE SECRETARY OF THE INTERIOR.—

(A) SAN PEDRO NATIONAL CONSERVATION AREA.—

(i) IN GENERAL.—The land acquired by the Secretary of the Interior under subsection (a)(2)(A) shall be added to, and administered as part of, the San Pedro National Conservation

Area in accordance with the laws (including regulations) applicable to the Conservation Area.

(ii) **MANAGEMENT PLAN.**—Not later than 2 years after the date on which the land is acquired, the Secretary of the Interior shall update the management plan for the San Pedro National Conservation Area to reflect the management requirements of the acquired land.

(B) **DRIPPING SPRINGS.**—Land acquired by the Secretary of the Interior under subsection (a)(2)(B) shall be managed in accordance with the Federal Land Policy and Management Act of 1976 (43 U.S.C. 1701 et seq.) and applicable land use plans.

(C) **LAS CIENEGAS NATIONAL CONSERVATION AREA.**—Land acquired by the Secretary of the Interior under subsection (a)(2)(C) shall be added to, and administered as part of, the Las Cienegas National Conservation Area in accordance with the laws (including regulations) applicable to the Conservation Area.

(c) **SURRENDER OF RIGHTS.**—In addition to the conveyance of the non-Federal land to the United States under this Act, and as a condition of the land exchange, Resolution Copper shall surrender to the United States, without compensation, the rights held by Resolution Copper under the mining laws and other laws of the United States to commercially extract minerals under Apache Leap.

SEC. 6. VALUE ADJUSTMENT PAYMENT TO UNITED STATES.

(a) **ANNUAL PRODUCTION REPORTING.**—

(1) **REPORT REQUIRED.**—As a condition of the land exchange under this Act, Resolution Copper shall submit to the Secretary of the Interior an annual report indicating the quantity of locatable minerals produced during the preceding calendar year in commercial quantities from the Federal land conveyed to Resolution Copper under section 4. The first report is required to be submitted not later than February 15 of the first calendar year beginning after the date of commencement of production of valuable locatable minerals in commercial quantities from such Federal land. The reports shall be submitted February 15 of each calendar year thereafter.

(2) **SHARING REPORTS WITH STATE.**—The Secretary shall make each report received under paragraph (1) available to the State.

(3) **REPORT CONTENTS.**—The reports under paragraph (1) shall comply with any record-keeping and reporting requirements prescribed by the Secretary or required by applicable Federal laws in effect at the time of production.

(b) **PAYMENT ON PRODUCTION.**—If the cumulative production of valuable locatable minerals produced in commercial quantities from the Federal land conveyed to Resolution Copper under section 4 exceeds the quantity of production of locatable minerals from the Federal land used in the income capitalization approach analysis prepared under section 4(d), Resolution Copper shall pay to the United States, by not later than March 15 of each applicable calendar year, a value adjustment payment for the quantity of excess production at the same rate assumed for the income capitalization approach analysis prepared under section 4(d).

(c) **STATE LAW UNAFFECTED.**—Nothing in this section modifies, expands, diminishes, amends, or otherwise affects any State law relating to the imposition, application, timing, or collection of a State excise or severance tax.

(d) **USE OF FUNDS.**—

(1) **SEPARATE FUND.**—All funds paid to the United States under this section shall be deposited in a special fund established in the Treasury and shall be available, in such amounts as are provided in advance in appropriation Acts, to the Secretary and the Secretary of the Interior only for the purposes authorized by paragraph (2).

(2) **AUTHORIZED USE.**—Amounts in the special fund established pursuant to paragraph (1) shall be used for maintenance, repair, and reha-

bilitation projects for Forest Service and Bureau of Land Management assets.

SEC. 7. WITHDRAWAL.

Subject to valid existing rights, Apache Leap and any land acquired by the United States under this Act are withdrawn from all forms of—

(1) entry, appropriation, or disposal under the public land laws;

(2) location, entry, and patent under the mining laws; and

(3) disposition under the mineral leasing, mineral materials, and geothermal leasing laws.

SEC. 8. APACHE LEAP.

(a) **MANAGEMENT.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—The Secretary shall manage Apache Leap to preserve the natural character of Apache Leap and to protect archeological and cultural resources located on Apache Leap.

(2) **SPECIAL USE PERMITS.**—The Secretary may issue to Resolution Copper special use permits allowing Resolution Copper to carry out underground activities (other than the commercial extraction of minerals) under the surface of Apache Leap that the Secretary determines would not disturb the surface of the land, subject to any terms and conditions that the Secretary may require.

(3) **FENCES; SIGNAGE.**—The Secretary may allow use of the surface of Apache Leap for installation of fences, signs, monitoring devices, or other measures necessary to protect the health and safety of the public, protect resources located on Apache Leap, or to ensure that activities conducted under paragraph (2) do not affect the surface of Apache Leap.

(b) **PLAN.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Not later than 3 years after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary, in consultation with affected Indian tribes, the Town, Resolution Copper, and other interested members of the public, shall prepare a management plan for Apache Leap.

(2) **CONSIDERATIONS.**—In preparing the plan under paragraph (1), the Secretary shall consider whether additional measures are necessary to—

(A) protect the cultural, archaeological, or historical resources of Apache Leap, including permanent or seasonal closures of all or a portion of Apache Leap; and

(B) provide access for recreation.

(c) **MINING ACTIVITIES.**—The provisions of this section shall not impose additional restrictions on mining activities carried out by Resolution Copper adjacent to, or outside of, the Apache Leap area beyond those otherwise applicable to mining activities on privately owned land under Federal, State, and local laws, rules and regulations.

SEC. 9. MISCELLANEOUS PROVISIONS.

(a) **REVOCATION OF ORDERS; WITHDRAWAL.**—

(1) **REVOCATION OF ORDERS.**—Any public land order that withdraws the Federal land from appropriation or disposal under a public land law shall be revoked to the extent necessary to permit disposal of the land.

(2) **WITHDRAWAL.**—On the date of enactment of this Act, if the Federal land or any Federal interest in the non-Federal land to be exchanged under section 4 is not withdrawn or segregated from entry and appropriation under a public land law (including mining and mineral leasing laws and the Geothermal Steam Act of 1970 (30 U.S.C. 1001 et seq.)), the land or interest shall be withdrawn, without further action required by the Secretary concerned, from entry and appropriation. The withdrawal shall be terminated—

(A) on the date of consummation of the land exchange; or

(B) if Resolution Copper notifies the Secretary in writing that it has elected to withdraw from the land exchange pursuant to section 206(d) of the Federal Land Policy and Management Act of 1976, as amended (43 U.S.C. 1716(d)).

(3) **RIGHTS OF RESOLUTION COPPER.**—Nothing in this Act shall interfere with, limit, or other-

wise impair, the unpatented mining claims or rights currently held by Resolution Copper on the Federal land, nor in any way change, diminish, qualify, or otherwise impact Resolution Copper's rights and ability to conduct activities on the Federal land under such unpatented mining claims and the general mining laws of the United States, including the permitting or authorization of such activities.

(b) **MAPS, ESTIMATES, AND DESCRIPTIONS.**—

(1) **MINOR ERRORS.**—The Secretary concerned and Resolution Copper may correct, by mutual agreement, any minor errors in any map, acreage estimate, or description of any land conveyed or exchanged under this Act.

(2) **CONFLICT.**—If there is a conflict between a map, an acreage estimate, or a description of land in this Act, the map shall control unless the Secretary concerned and Resolution Copper mutually agree otherwise.

(3) **AVAILABILITY.**—On the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall file and make available for public inspection in the Office of the Supervisor, Tonto National Forest, each map referred to in this Act.

The Acting CHAIR. No amendment to the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute shall be in order except those printed in part A of House Report 113-215. Each such amendment may be offered only in the order printed in the report, shall be considered read, shall be debatable for the time specified in the report, equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question.

AMENDMENT NO. 1 OFFERED BY MR. GRIJALVA

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 1 printed in part A of House Report 113-215.

Mr. GRIJALVA. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of section 4 (page 14, after line 14), add the following new subsection:

(k) **REQUIRING MINING PLAN FOR CONVEYED FEDERAL LANDS TO SUPPORT LOCAL WORKFORCE.**—As an additional condition of the land exchange under this Act, and to ensure compliance with the findings and purpose of this Act specified in section 2, Resolution Copper shall agree—

(1) to locate in the town of Superior, Arizona, or a contiguous, neighboring mining community the remote operation center for mining operations on the Federal land; and

(2) to maintain such remote operation center for the duration of the mining operations on the Federal land.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 351, the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. GRIJALVA) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. GRIJALVA. Mr. Chairman, repeatedly we have heard this bill is about jobs. We've heard it a lot, and we continue to hear it. We have to pass this bill, so goes the refrain, because it's about jobs in a part of Arizona that really needs jobs.

I understand how important it is to help rural parts of the State. I understand how important it is to help rural

communities across the country. I talk about this all the time—trying to work to advance a policy agenda that translates into real, meaningful opportunities for all Americans and for those sectors of our State, as was previously pointed out by my colleague, Congresswoman KIRKPATRICK, in which unemployment is very, very severe. That's why I think it's important to make sure this bill translates into real and meaningful jobs for the communities that will bear the biggest burden of the proposed mine.

My amendment would require that the Remote Operations Center for the mine be located in the town of Superior, Arizona, or adjacent to another mining community within the Copper Triangle. Modern blockade mines use a range of automation technology, and most of the human labor is done off site at the Remote Operations Center. Like other mines operated by Rio Tinto, which is Resolution Copper's parent company, the Remote Operations Center will likely be in a metro area. Rio Tinto is presently operating its Pilbara, Australia, mine from 800 miles away in a large metro center. Our amendment will ensure that this is not the case in Superior.

If this legislation is really about jobs and lifting up the local economy, it is important to guarantee that local residents will have access to the jobs that were promised and the jobs that were created. My amendment guarantees that the jobs this mine does create will benefit the local community. This amendment, at the very minimum, will realize some real jobs if this legislation is to ever be implemented.

When one reads and hears Rio Tinto brag about automation and technology and the progress in mining, where less labor is needed, and when one listens to the wild variations about jobs from 3,700 to 5,000 to 1,200 to 1,400—and the recent one from the company's own Web site is 1,400—one asks: What is the real number?

□ 1430

Since no mining plan of operation has been submitted, it's impossible to analyze or estimate. So how do we know?

There is nothing in H.R. 687 that guarantees jobs for Superior, Arizona, or any other nearby mining community. With my amendment, we can at least make sure the remote operating center isn't in Utah, where Resolution Copper is headquartered, or some other far-flung place. As part of this legislation, my amendment would require that that center be located in Superior and that the opportunities promised and the jobs created would go into that area.

I urge adoption of my amendment, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Washington is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

The fundamental purpose of H.R. 687 is to facilitate a land exchange; then after that land exchange was done, there would be a production and mining of copper, which of course would create thousands of American jobs.

Mr. Chairman, I have to say that the way this amendment is written, it would make it impossible by creating mandates that just simply couldn't be achieved.

I have to give my friend from Arizona credit. He has made no bones about the fact that he does not like this bill. He said that very well. I don't agree with him, but he has said it very well.

Generally, when you offer an amendment to a bill, however, you offer an amendment to improve the bill. Believe me, Mr. Chairman, this will not improve the bill. In all likelihood, if adopted, it would probably kill the bill because it dictates a precise town where the mine operations should be.

I suspect that the company will have some offices in those areas. That stands to reason if you're going to invest some money. But the Federal Government should not be dictating specifically what town somebody should set up an enterprise.

Mr. Chairman, if you want to go to the absurd, if the idea is to help a distressed area by dictating where you should locate some facility or manufacturing or some company, one could say, Gee, whiz, what city in the United States is really hurting? The first city that comes to mind, of course, is Detroit, Michigan. Are we going to suggest, for example, that the Federal Government dictate that Apple from Cupertino, California, should be relocated to Detroit? Of course that's absurd. Yet, when you start this precedent here that is suggested in this amendment, one could lead to that conclusion in the future.

I urge my colleagues to reject this amendment, pass the underlying bill, and reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GRIJALVA. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Interestingly enough, H.R. 687 does mandate that the Federal Government decide when and how NEPA is applied, that the Federal Government mandate what the valuation of the exchange is— independent of a process driven by the company—and it mandates that we deal with water issues after the fact, who gets water protection and who doesn't. Whether it is 10 jobs or 1,000 jobs, all my bill does is hold the company's feet to the fire. You have talked about jobs; you have talked about providing them, saving that community, and rebounding the Arizona economy. Here's an opportunity by guaranteeing that that claim will indeed be a reality if this bill is implemented. I think my amendment actually improves it because it takes some of the rhetoric of promoting the mine and makes it language and legislation that makes the company back it up.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I am very pleased to yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. GOSAR), the sponsor of this legislation.

Mr. GOSAR. Mr. Chairman, I want to reiterate that this isn't a new mine. This mine of operations exists currently there today.

The modern-day practices Resolution Copper plans to implement at the Pinal County site are not new. Many mines across the world implement them. In fact, there is a similar project, albeit half the size of our proposed project, that uses the same strategy and technology and employs nearly 1,000 people. That is real-life proof that humans will work at this mine at the site in Arizona.

I thank the chairman for yielding me time.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. GRIJALVA).

The question was taken; and the Acting Chair announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. GRIJALVA. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Arizona will be postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 2 OFFERED BY MR. BEN RAY
LUJÁN OF NEW MEXICO

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 2 printed in part A of House Report 113-215.

Mr. BEN RAY LUJÁN of New Mexico. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 14, after line 14, insert the following new subsection:

(k) EXCLUSION OF NATIVE AMERICAN SACRED AND CULTURAL SITES.—The Federal land to be conveyed under this section shall not include any Native American sacred or cultural site, whether surface or subsurface, and the Secretary shall modify the map referred to in section 3(2) to exclude all such sacred and cultural sites, as identified by the Secretary in consultation with affected Indian tribes to determine appropriate measures necessary to protect and preserve sacred and cultural sites. Nothing in this Act shall limit access of affected tribes to these sacred and cultural sites.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 351, the gentleman from New Mexico (Mr. BEN RAY LUJÁN) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New Mexico.

Mr. BEN RAY LUJÁN of New Mexico. Mr. Chairman, I rise today to offer an amendment that would protect Native

American sacred and cultural sites associated with the land conveyance outlined in the bill. This bill transfers land out of the public domain and into the hands of a private mining company with no guarantee of protecting sacred sites.

Currently, the cultural and sacred sites of Apache Leap and Oak Flat are located on public land and not on an Indian reservation. Although these sites are not on an Indian reservation, they're still sacred to the San Carlos Apache, Yavapai Indian Tribe, and other tribes in Arizona, just as a Catholic church, where I practice my faith, is considered a holy place even though it's not located in Vatican City.

Because these sacred and cultural sites are currently on public land, they are protected under certain Federal laws. This bill would transfer the lands that contain these sacred sites to a private company for private ownership, effectively taking away any protections under Federal law.

Additionally, it is important to protect the subsurface area of these sacred sites, which this bill does not do. Native American sacred sites, just as a church or temple, have both surface and subsurface religious quantities. Would we allow subsurface mining below the National Cathedral? I would say not.

I have heard from my colleagues the mining would take place below the ground and therefore leave the sacred sites undisturbed, but this is a rather absurd argument and, quite honestly, not factual.

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Washington is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. GOSAR), the sponsor of the bill.

Mr. GOSAR. I thank the chairman for allowing me to briefly address this amendment.

Mr. Chairman, the Lujan amendment is well-intentioned but misguided. It would put forth a policy that would undermine existing law that ensures tribal consultation and protection of sacred sites. By giving the Secretary of the Interior unilateral discretion to determine what a sacred site is, Congress would unwittingly undermine a variety of public laws Congress put in place to protect verified sacred sites.

Let me be clear that this land exchange is crafted in such a way as to protect relevant Native American historical and cultural sites. Section 4(i) and 4(j) explicitly require compliance with Federal environmental laws and regulations pertaining to conveyances of Federal land and approval of mine plan of operation. That includes the National Historic Preservation Act, Endangered Species Act, and executive

orders pertaining to wetlands, floodplains, and hazardous material surveys.

I see my colleague may have a picture of Apache Leap. My bill explicitly protects Apache Leap. The bill protects Apache Leap by the following:

It conveys 110 acres of Apache Leap currently owned by Resolution Copper to the U.S. Forest Service, section 5(a)(e); it explicitly prohibits any type of extraction activity at Apache Leap, section 5(c); withdrawing Apache Leap and any land acquired by the U.S. under this act, section 7; requiring the Secretary to develop a management plan for Apache Leap that preserves the natural character of the site and protects agricultural and cultural resources, section 8.

Before I conclude, I want to underscore, H.R. 687 does not exchange any reservation lands. The next Federal parcel is located over 20 miles from the boundaries of the San Carlos Apache Tribe's reservation. While well-intentioned, the Lujan amendment actually undermines that very mission.

Please join me in opposing the amendment.

Mr. BEN RAY LUJÁN of New Mexico. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the very distinguished gentlewoman from Minnesota (Ms. MCCOLLUM), one of the cochairs of the Native American Caucus.

Ms. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of this amendment.

The United States has an obligation to protect and preserve Native American sacred sites located on Federal lands. It is a responsibility we have established through Federal laws, including the American Indian Religious Freedom Act, the National Historic Preservation Act, and the Native American Graves Protection and Repatriation Act.

Mr. LUJÁN's amendment would make sure that we follow these laws. That's what his amendment does; it protects these laws. That's why over 80 tribal organizations support our amendment. My colleagues who oppose this amendment, they claim that all sacred spaces have been protected in this bill. Those claims are simply false.

The San Carlos Apache Tribe is currently working with the Tonto National Forest to conduct a survey of their sacred sites. They have found artifacts and cultural materials and may still discover burial sites in areas that are proposed for exchange in this bill.

I urge my colleagues to support this amendment so that the survey process and tribal consultation can continue.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. I inform my friend from New Mexico that I am prepared to close on this amendment if the gentleman is prepared to close, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BEN RAY LUJÁN of New Mexico. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself the balance of my time.

I don't know where to begin with the comments suggested by one of my col-

leagues whom I respect, Mr. GOSAR. I don't know how to be more clear.

These sacred sites are on public land. I think it would be a new low for this Congress to go and tell tribes across America that sacred sites that are not located on a reservation are no longer sacred. I'm surprised. I'm appalled. I think tribes across the country would be, as well.

With regard to sections 4(i) and 4(j), I ask the author of the legislation to come back and read it with me. The way that I read this, there's only one section of law that is referred to that can't be enforced because this is on private lands, not on public lands; and the area that's identified in the law is the National Environmental Policy Act.

What happens when this land is given from a public perspective back to a private perspective is we lose the opportunity and ability to enforce the National Historic Preservation Act, the Native American Graves Protection and Repatriation Act, the American Indian Religious Freedom Act, and the administration's December 2012 memorandum of understanding to protect sacred sites.

Mr. Chairman, I submit into the RECORD all the organizations across America, including all the tribes from Arizona, that are opposed to this underlying legislation.

Mr. Chairman, I have here not a picture of Apache Leap, but a picture of what happens with blockade mining. So even in the poor attempt that talks about trying to address Apache Leap, the author of the legislation failed to include Oak Flat, which is a sacred site that would be covered here.

This is what happens with blockade mining. Don't take my word for it, as I will submit into the RECORD a presentation by Resolution Copper Mining. In this, which I wish I would have blown up, Resolution Copper shows pictures of how this starts to cave in. It will eventually look like this.

Mr. Chairman, this is a commonsense piece of legislation. In your words, this will improve the law. This will improve what we're trying to do here. This doesn't give the Secretary blanket authority to do anything.

Let's just protect sacred sites and work together. The Congress has always done this. There's a reason why Democrats and Republicans have come together to create a Native American Caucus and to advocate for tribes across America. The Congress has always stood strong.

Mr. Chairman, I ask my colleagues to please give due consideration and support this amendment. I hope to work with the majority and Chairman HASTINGS, whom I respect very much, to try to get this addressed.

I yield back the balance of my time.

TRIBES AND ORGANIZATIONS OPPOSED TO H.R. 687, SE AZ LAND EXCHANGE

TRIBAL ORGANIZATIONS

National Congress of American Indians—the oldest and largest organization representing tribes across the country

National Indian Gaming Association—represents 184 tribes across the country

Inter-Tribal Council of Arizona—represents 20 tribes in Arizona

Inter-Tribal Council of Nevada—represents 27 tribes in Nevada

United South and Eastern Tribes—represents 26 tribes in Maine, New York, Connecticut, Massachusetts, Rhode Island, North Carolina, South Carolina, Alabama, Mississippi, Louisiana, Florida, and Texas and based in Tennessee

California Association of Tribal Governments—represents tribal governments in California

Midwest Alliance of Sovereign Tribes—represents 35 tribes in Minnesota, Michigan, Wisconsin, and Iowa

Affiliated Tribes of the Northwest Indians—represents 57 tribes located in Washington, Oregon, Idaho, Southeast Alaska, Northern California, and Western Montana

All Indian Pueblo Council—represents 20 pueblos located in New Mexico and Texas

Eight Northern Indian Pueblos of New Mexico

Great Plains Tribal Chairman's Association—represents 16 tribes in North Dakota, South Dakota, and Nebraska

Coalition of Large Tribes—represents 14 tribes in North Dakota, South Dakota, Montana, Idaho, Arizona, New Mexico, Utah, Washington

Alaska Inter-Tribal Council

ALABAMA

Poarch Band of Creek Indians, Alabama

ARIZONA

San Carlos Apache Tribe, Arizona

Hopi Tribe, Arizona

Ak-Chin Indian Community, Arizona

Ft. McDowell Yavapai Nation, Arizona

White Mountain Apache Tribe, Arizona

Colorado River Indian Tribes, Arizona

Cocopah Indian Tribe, Arizona

Hualapai Tribe, Arizona

Tohono O'odham Nation, Arizona

Quechan Indian Tribe, Arizona

Tonto Apache Tribe, Arizona

Ft. Mojave Indian Tribe, Arizona, California, and Nevada

Navajo Nation Council, Arizona, New Mexico, and Utah

CALIFORNIA

Susanville Indian Rancheria, California

Coyote Valley Band of Pomo Indians, California

Hopland Band of Pomo Indians, California

Soboba Band of Luiseno Indians, California

California Valley Miwok Tribe, California

Santa Rosa Band of Cahuilla Indians, California

CONNECTICUT

Mohegan Tribe, Connecticut

FLORIDA

Miccosukee Tribe of Indians of Florida

IDAHO

Shoshone-Bannock Tribes, Idaho

KANSAS

Kickapoo Indian Nation, Kansas

LOUISIANA

Jena Band of Choctaw Indians, Louisiana

Tunica-Biloxi Tribe, Louisiana

MAINE

Penobscot Indian Nation, Maine

MASSACHUSETTS

Aquinnah Wampanoag Tribe of Gay Head, MA

MICHIGAN

Saginaw Chippewa Tribe, Michigan

Sault Ste. Marie Tribe, Michigan

MINNESOTA

Leech Lake Band of Ojibwe, Minnesota

Shakopee Mdewakanton Sioux Indian Community, Minnesota

NEVADA

Shoshone-Paiute Tribe, Nevada

Walker River Paiute Tribe, Nevada

NEW MEXICO

Jicarilla Apache Nation, New Mexico

Mescalero Apache Tribe, New Mexico

Pueblo of Zuni, New Mexico

Pueblo of Tesuque, New Mexico

Pueblo of Santa Clara, New Mexico

OKLAHOMA

Cherokee Nation, Oklahoma

Osage Nation, Oklahoma

RHODE ISLAND

Narragansett Tribe

SOUTH CAROLINA

Catawba Indian Nation, South Carolina

SOUTH DAKOTA

Oglala Sioux Tribe, South Dakota

WASHINGTON

Confederated Tribes of the Colville Reservation, Washington

Puyallup Tribe of Indians, Washington

Quinault Indian Nation, Washington

Hoh Indian Nation, Washington

Samish Indian Nation, Washington

WISCONSIN

Lac du Flambeau Band of Lake Superior Chippewa Indians

Oneida Nation, Wisconsin

Sokaogan Chippewa Community, Wisconsin

Stockbridge-Munsee Community, Band of Mohican Indians, Wisconsin

ENVIRONMENTAL AND RELIGIOUS GROUPS OPPOSING H.R. 687/S. 339, SE AZ LAND EXCHANGE

Town of Superior

Queen Valley Golf Association, Queen Valley, Arizona

Queen Valley Homeowners Association, Queen Valley, Arizona

Arizona Mining Reform Coalition

American Lands

Access Fund

Arizona Mountaineering Club

Arizona Native Plant Society

Arizona Wildlife Federation

The American Alpine Club—Golden, CO

Center for Biological Diversity

Chiricahua-Dragoon Conservation Alliance

Comstock Residents Association—Virginia City, NV

Concerned Citizens and Retired Miners Coalition—Superior, AZ

Concerned Climbers of Arizona, LLC

Earthworks

Endangered Species Coalition

Environment America

Environment Arizona

Friends Committee' on National Legislation

Friends of Ironwood Forest—Tucson, AZ

Friends of the Boundary Waters Wilderness

Friends of The Cloquet Valley State Forest

Friends of the Kalmiopsis—Grants Pass, OR

Friends of Queen Creek

Gila Resources Information Project

Grand Canyon Chapter—Sierra Club

Great Basin Mine Watch

Groundwater Awareness League—Green Valley, AZ

High Country Citizens' Alliance—Crested Butte, CO

Information Network for Responsible Mining—Telluride, CO

Keepers of the Water—Manistee, MI

League of Conservation Voters

Maricopa Audubon Society—Phoenix, AZ

Ministers' Conference of Winston-Salem, North Carolina & Vicinity

The Morning Star Institute—Washington, D.C.

Mount Graham Coalition—Arizona

Natural Resources Defense Council

National Wildlife Federation

Progressive National Baptist Convention

Religion and Human Rights Forum for the Preservation of Native American Sacred Sites and Rights

Rock Creek Alliance—Sandpoint, ID

San Juan Citizens Alliance—Durango, CO

Save Our Cabinets—Heron, MT

Save Our Sky Blue Waters—Minnesota

Save the Scenic Santa Ritas

Sierra Club

Sky Island Alliance

The Lands Council—Spokane, WA

Tucson Audubon Society

Water More Precious Than Gold

Western Lands Exchange Project—Seattle, WA

Wilderness Workshop

Wisconsin Resources Protection Council—Tomahawk, WI

Yuma Audubon Society

BLOCK CAVE MINING

Block caving is an efficient technique that uses gravity to extract ore. A series of tunnels is developed below the orebody to ensure that rock will fall by gravity into a series of collection points. Loaders then collect the ore and transport it to an underground crusher, and the crushed ore is conveyed through shafts for processing. The orebody at the Resolution Copper project is very deep, approximately 7,000 feet underground, and the ore is dispersed in nature (1%-2% copper). Because of this, we have determined that the block caving method is the most practical and environmentally sensitive approach to our mine. Please read on to learn more about block caving—the mining method of choice for the Resolution Copper project.

BLOCK CAVING AND SUBSIDENCE

The positive aspects of a block cave mine include no overburden waste piles on surface, and no large open pits. One consequence of block cave mines, however, is the potential for surface subsidence or settling. Surface subsidence is caused as the material above the orebody gradually moves downward to replace the ore that has been mined.

Using industry standard engineering practices, we are able to predict both the cave and subsidence zones based on orebody knowledge gained during our pre-feasibility drilling work. However, the best understanding of caving and subsidence will come once mining begins.

PROTECTING APACHE LEAP

Our commitment to protecting Apache Leap is absolute, and we are taking a variety of steps to ensure that the area is not harmed as a result of our mining activities.

KEEPING A CLOSE WATCH ON SUBSIDENCE

Mining will start at a point away from Apache Leap. This will allow us to gather technical information over a period of years to reassess the cave and subsidence angles. This data will be used to ensure the Apache Leap easement is not impacted as mining progresses to the west.

This information will allow us to identify any possible threat to Apache Leap as a result of our mining activities. If a threat is identified, we will change our mining practices to ensure the Leap is protected.

WHY THE MINE WOULD BE AFFECTED BEFORE APACHE LEAP

It is important to note that the way the mine will be constructed adds to the protection of Apache Leap. Here's why:

A series of three shafts is required to provide fresh air to the underground workers and equipment. This will include the existing #9 Shaft and two new shafts in the same

area. These shafts will be the main lifeline to the mine and will cost in excess of \$500 million to build. The mine could not operate without these shafts.

The way we plan to mine means that the subsidence zone would approach the boundary of the shaft complex after 15 years of mining. At that point in time, the subsidence zone would still be more than 3,000 feet from the boundary of the Apache Leap easement and would take another 25 years to reach the boundary of the conservation easement that will protect the Leap. In simple terms, subsidence would jeopardize the mining operation long before it affected Apache Leap or Queen Creek Canyon.

SUMMARY

Subsidence evaluations and predictions will be regularly updated as more geological information is gathered and more powerful predictive tools are developed. Once caving commences, a comprehensive continuous monitoring system will be used to track the progression of the cave, validate subsidence predictions and check the suitability of the mine plan.

For more information on our block caving approach please visit our website at www.resolutioncopper.com, email info@resolutioncopper.com, or call our Resolution project hotline at 520-689-3409.

AN OVERVIEW OF BLOCK CAVING

While block caving is not a new concept, it is gaining popularity as a safe and cost-effective method of mining deep orebodies. Resolution Copper's goal is to not only create a profitable and thriving mining operation in Superior, but also to meet or exceed today's environmental and social standards. Block caving helps us achieve this by keeping the mining footprint small and reducing the amount of waste rock.

HOW IT WORKS

Block cave mining in its simplest form operates in the same way sand falls through an hourglass.

Block caving involves a three phase process of blasting and tunneling to form the shape of an hourglass out of rock.

Phase A involves blasting an upper cavern of broken rock.

Phase B involves drilling a tunnel underneath the broken rock cavern.

Phase C involves blasting a narrow neck (drawbell) that allows broken cavern rock to fall through the drawbell down into the underlying tunnel.

In block caving where the base of the hourglass shape is a confined tunnel, the speed of rock falling through the hourglass neck (drawbell) is controlled by the speed at which rock is removed from the tunnel.

As broken rock in the upper cavern falls through the neck or drawbell, the roof of the cavern gradually collapses further to create more broken rock within the cavern. This process is continued until all the rock ore is removed via the tunnel.

The end result? Block caving could allow a valuable natural resource to be developed using a proven mining method that is safe, financially viable and minimizes impact to the environment. At the same time, the mine and the businesses that support it would bring social and economic benefits to the region for generations.

□ 1445

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself the balance of my time.

It is critical that the Congress listen to and show respect to Indian tribes and their elected leaders. And, Mr. Chairman, it's for that reason that

when I had the privilege of becoming chairman of the Natural Resources Committee, a new Subcommittee on Indian and Alaska Native Affairs was established. That hadn't been the case prior to my assuming the chairmanship of that committee. And the purpose was to ensure a special forum for issues and concerns important to Indian tribes and to native people.

It's important that Indian tribes have a role and are consulted on decisions that affect their land and their reservation lands.

But I just want to make a couple of points: this bill does not waive any existing laws dealing with Native Americans, none whatsoever.

Mr. BEN RAY LUJÁN of New Mexico. Will the chairman yield?

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. If I have time, I will be more than happy to yield.

But probably more specific on this, this area that we're talking about in Arizona known as the Copper Triangle has been mined for—well, a long time. And this particular land exchange is right kind of in the middle of this Copper Triangle. And the closest Indian reservation is some 20 miles away.

Now I understand that, as in my area in central Washington, I know that Native Americans moved around, and that's certainly the case in Arizona. I understand that. But the effect of this amendment, the effect of this amendment would undermine our responsibility in Congress by giving total authority, total authority to the Secretary of the Interior to make determinations on whether sacred sites or other things important to Native Americans are violated. I think that's contrary to what our role is here.

And again, this law does not waive any—any—existing laws. None at all. In fact, we specifically, notwithstanding the fact that the nearest reservation is 20 miles away, we specifically say there should be consultation before this project goes forward. So I think this amendment is unnecessary.

I would be happy to yield to my friend from New Mexico.

Mr. BEN RAY LUJÁN of New Mexico. I thank the chairman.

Mr. Chairman, I don't believe that anyone is suggesting that items are being waived.

The fact of the matter is, when land is transferred from a public domain to a private domain, it goes away. And that's the problem here. And I am glad to hear—and I know the profound respect that Chairman HASTINGS has for tribes across the country and the sacred sites, protections—

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Reclaiming my time, just to make the point that the gentleman's amendment, the intent is to address Native American issues. That's what we should be debating.

And I am just simply saying, if you affect Native American issues by implication, you would be waiving them. We are not waiving anything. We are re-

specting the laws that are in place right now.

I urge rejection of the amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New Mexico (Mr. BEN RAY LUJÁN).

The question was taken; and the Acting Chair announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. BEN RAY LUJÁN of New Mexico. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New Mexico will be postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 3 OFFERED BY MRS. NAPOLITANO

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 3 printed in part A of House Report 113-215.

Mrs. NAPOLITANO. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of the bill (page 25, after line 12), add the following new section:

SEC. 10. SAVINGS CLAUSE.

Nothing in this Act shall be construed to affect any other provision of law protecting water quality and availability.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 351, the gentlewoman from California (Mrs. NAPOLITANO) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from California.

Mrs. NAPOLITANO. Mr. Chairman, my amendment is very simple. On page 25, after line 12, it adds a new section. Section 10, the savings clause, would require that there be no adverse impacts on water quantity and water quality in the development of this project.

This year, over half of our Nation is experiencing moderate to severe drought. As of last week, 75 percent of the State of Arizona is in moderate to severe drought.

The lifeblood of any nation, of any country, is water. We must do everything we can to protect this precious resource. The mining activities of Resolution Copper, a joint subsidiary of Australian BHP Billiton and of Anglo Australian Rio Tinto Group, would require an enormous amount of water, estimated to be more than 20,000 to 40,000 acre-feet per year. In fact, the Forest Service testified that understanding the impact of this mine on the water supplies of local communities is still "outstanding." On average, 1 acre-foot of water is enough water for a family of four for a year. Resolution Copper's water could be equivalent to at least 20,000 households' water supply for a year.

They also erroneously suggest that their own water demands could be

solved by the use of Central Arizona Project water, called the CAP. However, as with most of the West, demand often exceeds supply, and the bulk of the Central Arizona Project water is already dedicated and committed to other uses and users in Arizona. This includes for use in future Arizona Indian water rights settlements.

The proposed mining operation would also require significant excavation thousands of feet below the surface. H.R. 687 does not require an environmental review, does not include consideration of mitigation measures to the mining project before the land exchange is completed. And I repeat: it does not require an environmental review, consideration of mitigation measures of the mining project before the land exchange is completed.

The mining company is also not required to submit a plan of operations until 3 years—3 years—after the land exchange is codified. Absent the NEPA process, the impacts to water would not be known prior to the land exchange. Neighboring communities have already seen an impact to their water resources from other mining activities.

Chairman Rambler of the San Carlos Apache tribe testified in March of this year, right here in Washington, D.C., that a neighboring community's water supply had been significantly depleted since Resolution Copper began pumping groundwater to de-water parts of the Magma Mine. H.R. 687's permitting of the mine at Oak Flat brings up similar concerns for the tribe.

We should not be considering this legislation now since we do not know the impacts to water resources for area tribes. At the very least, we should ensure that we do not violate existing laws to protect water quantity and

water quality. That is what my amendment does. It protects water quality and water quantity.

My amendment seeks to protect our most precious resource, water. And I urge my colleagues to vote "yes" on this amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I rise to claim the time in opposition to this amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Washington is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to reject this amendment because this amendment in no way risks water supply or safety. In fact, it upholds existing laws that protect water quality and availability. And probably the best way to illustrate that is to simply look at the support for this bill, especially from those that reside in the State of Arizona and represent people in the State of Arizona.

We all know that Arizona is a very diverse State. I have a very diverse State in Washington. And certainly California is diverse geographically. But there are certain areas in that State that are very dry. Water is very, very important.

Now, I daresay that no Member from Arizona would support a bill that would jeopardize water in Arizona. Yet we have heard on the floor here the bipartisan support of those from Arizona, representing Arizonans that support this bill. So I think that that issue, frankly, is simply not valid at all.

This amendment may sound like it's well intended. But what it really will

do, there would be red tape involved with this because of the vagueness of the language in this amendment. And I think really what this amendment is, in deference to my good friend from California, it's an open invitation. In fact, Mr. Chairman, you might call it an ambulance siren for lawyers to start filing lawsuits in this issue. One more area. Goodness knows, there are going to be lawsuits anyway. This would be one more, in my view, if this amendment is passed.

And finally, I would just say this: 100 percent of the water needs of this mine will be secured before production commences.

So with that, I urge rejection of the amendment, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mrs. NAPOLITANO. Mr. Chairman, I might add that the town near the mine, Superior, opposes this bill, and I believe the mayor was recently recalled because he also opposed it.

We have businesses and other entities supporting it. But the residents in the nearby areas, especially tribal areas, are opposed to it for a majority of reasons, which have been brought up before, but also, especially because they are in drought conditions, and they are not assured that their water will be protected or that they will be able to have enough water for their own needs. So I request that this amendment be included.

I include in the RECORD the current Drought Monitor dated September 24, including the areas which indicate the current drought conditions.

I do not have any further speakers, and I yield back the balance of my time.

U.S. DROUGHT MONITOR—ARIZONA
(Drought Conditions (Percent Area))

	None	D0-D4	D1-D4	D2-D4	D3-D4	D4-D4
Current (09/17/2013 map)	14.80	85.17	61.91	25.28	0.00	0.00
Last Week (09/17/2013 map)	12.81	87.19	66.82	30.35	1.94	0.00
3 Months Ago (06/25/2013 map)	0.00	100.00	92.49	74.44	23.48	0.00
Start of Calendar Year (01/01/2013 map)	0.00	100.00	97.91	37.78	8.68	0.00
Start of Water Year (09/25/2012 map)	0.00	100.00	100.00	31.93	5.67	0.00
One Year Ago (09/18/2012 map)	0.00	100.00	100.00	31.93	5.67	0.00

Intensity:
D0 Abnormally Dry
D1 Drought—Moderate
D2 Drought—Severe
D3 Drought—Extreme
D4 Drought—Exceptional

The Drought Monitor focuses on broad-scale conditions. Local conditions may vary. See accompanying text summary for forecast statements. <http://droughtmonitor.unl.edu>.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I am very pleased to yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. GOSAR), the sponsor of this legislation.

Mr. GOSAR. Mr. Chairman, this is another amendment that's well-intentioned but misguided. An amendment to include a savings clause assumes that my legislation circumvents existing laws protecting water quality and availability. That is simply not the case.

The NEPA process on the mine plan of operation required by my legislation will be managed by the United States Forest Service, where they oversee an independent third-party consultant to assess all environmental impacts of the proposed resolution project, including impacts to groundwater and surface water.

The NEPA process allows for considerable public as well as other Federal EPA, State, county, and local input all along the way. Any issues pertaining to water will be addressed once Resolution Copper files a mine plan of operation and the subsequent State and Federal and environmental analysis is

conducted, in accordance with existing law. This is like government over-seeing government. That's ludicrous.

And I ask my colleagues to vote "no" on this amendment.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to reject this amendment and yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from California (Mrs. NAPOLITANO).

The question was taken; and the Acting Chair announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mrs. NAPOLITANO. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from California will be postponed.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, proceedings will now resume on those amendments printed in part A of House Report 113-215 on which further proceedings were postponed, in the following order.

Amendment No. 1 by Mr. GRIJALVA of Arizona.

Amendment No. 3 by Mrs. NAPOLITANO of California.

The Chair will reduce to 2 minutes the minimum time for any electronic vote after the first vote in this series.

AMENDMENT NO. 1 OFFERED BY MR. GRIJALVA

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. GRIJALVA) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 180, noes 227, not voting 25, as follows:

[Roll No. 489]

AYES—180

Andrews	Duckworth	Larson (CT)
Barber	Edwards	Lee (CA)
Barrow (GA)	Ellison	Levin
Bass	Engel	Lewis
Beatty	Enyart	Lipinski
Bera (CA)	Eshoo	Loebsack
Bishop (GA)	Esty	Lofgren
Bishop (NY)	Farr	Lowenthal
Blumenauer	Fattah	Lowe
Bonamici	Fudge	Lujan Grisham (NM)
Brady (PA)	Gabbard	Lujan, Ben Ray (NM)
Brale (IA)	Gallego	Lynch
Brown (FL)	Garamendi	Maloney, Carolyn
Brownley (CA)	Garcia	Matsui
Bustos	Gibson	McCollum
Butterfield	Grayson	McDermott
Capps	Green, Al	McGovern
Capuano	Green, Gene	McIntyre
Cárdenas	Grijalva	McNerney
Carney	Gutiérrez	Meeks
Carson (IN)	Hahn	Meng
Cartwright	Hanabusa	Michaud
Castor (FL)	Hastings (FL)	Miller, George
Castro (TX)	Heck (WA)	Moore
Chu	Hinojosa	Moran
Cicilline	Holt	Morán
Clarke	Honda	Nadler
Clay	Horsford	Napolitano
Cleaver	Hoyer	Nolan
Clyburn	Huffman	O'Rourke
Cohen	Israel	Owens
Connolly	Jackson Lee	Pallone
Conyers	Jeffries	Pascarell
Courtney	Johnson (GA)	Pastor (AZ)
Crowley	Johnson, E. B.	Payne
Cuellar	Jones	Pelosi
Cummings	Kaptur	Peters (MI)
Davis (CA)	Keating	Peterson
Davis, Danny	Kelly (IL)	Pingree (ME)
DeFazio	Kennedy	Price (NC)
DeGette	Kildee	Quigley
DeLauro	Kilmer	
DelBene	Kirkpatrick	
Deutch	Kuster	
Doggett	Langevin	
Doyle	Larsen (WA)	

Rahall	Serrano
Rangel	Sewell (AL)
Richmond	Shea-Porter
Roybal-Allard	Sherman
Ruiz	Sinema
Ruppersberger	Sires
Ryan (OH)	Slaughter
Sánchez, Linda T.	Smith (WA)
Sarbanes	Speier
Schakowsky	Swalwell (CA)
Schiff	Takano
Schneider	Thompson (CA)
Schrader	Thompson (MS)
Scott (VA)	Tierney
Scott, David	Titus
	Tonko

NOES—227

Aderholt	Graves (GA)
Amash	Graves (MO)
Amodei	Griffin (AR)
Bachmann	Griffith (VA)
Bachus	Grimm
Barletta	Guthrie
Barr	Hanna
Barton	Harper
Benishek	Harris
Bentivolio	Hartzler
Bilirakis	Hastings (WA)
Bishop (UT)	Heck (NV)
Black	Hensarling
Blackburn	Himes
Boustany	Holding
Brady (TX)	Hudson
Bridenstine	Huelskamp
Brooks (AL)	Huizenga (MI)
Brooks (IN)	Hultgren
Broun (GA)	Hunter
Bucshon	Hurt
Burgess	Issa
Calvert	Jenkins
Camp	Johnson (OH)
Campbell	Johnson, Sam
Cantor	Jordan
Capito	Joyce
Carter	Kelly (PA)
Cassidy	King (IA)
Chabot	King (NY)
Chaffetz	Kingston
Coble	Kinzinger (IL)
Coffman	Kline
Cole	LaMalfa
Collins (GA)	Lamborn
Collins (NY)	Lance
Conaway	Lankford
Cook	Latham
Cooper	Latta
Cotton	LoBiondo
Cramer	Long
Crawford	Lucas
Crenshaw	Luetkemeyer
Culberson	Lummis
Daines	Maffei
Davis, Rodney	Marchant
Delaney	Marino
Denham	Massie
Dent	Matheson
DeSantis	McCarthy (CA)
DesJarlais	McCauley
Diaz-Balart	McClintock
Duffy	McHenry
Duncan (SC)	McKeon
Duncan (TN)	McKinley
Ellmers	McMorris
Farenthold	Rodgers
Fincher	Meadows
Fitzpatrick	Meehan
Fleischmann	Messer
Fleming	Mica
Flores	Miller (FL)
Forbes	Miller (MI)
Fortenberry	Miller, Gary
Foster	Mullin
Fox	Mulvaney
Franks (AZ)	Murphy (FL)
Frelinghuysen	Murphy (PA)
Gardner	Neugebauer
Garrett	Noem
Gerlach	Nugent
Gibbs	Nunes
Gohmert	Nunnelee
Goddette	Olson
Gosar	Palazzo
Granger	Pearce
Alexander	Costa
Becerra	Dingell
Buchanan	Frankel (FL)

NOT VOTING—25

Tsongas
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz
Wasserman
Schultz
Waters
Watt
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

Herrera Beutler	Paulsen	Scott, Austin
Higgins	Perlmutter	Waxman
Kind	Roby	Yoder
Labrador	Rush	Young (AK)
Maloney, Sean	Sanchez, Loretta	
McCarthy (NY)	Schwartz	

□ 1524

Messrs. STOCKMAN, ISSA, CASIDY, GOHMERT, GARDNER, and Mrs. BACHMANN changed their vote from “aye” to “no.”

Mr. ELLISON changed his vote from “no” to “aye.”

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated against:

Mr. PAULSEN. Mr. Chair, on rollcall No. 489, had I been present, I would have voted “no.”

AMENDMENT NO. 3 OFFERED BY MRS. NAPOLITANO

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from California (Mrs. NAPOLITANO) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This will be a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 191, noes 217, not voting 24, as follows:

[Roll No. 490]

AYES—191

Amash	DeFazio	Johnson (GA)
Andrews	DeGette	Johnson, E. B.
Barber	Delaney	Jones
Barrow (GA)	DeLauro	Kaptur
Bass	DelBene	Keating
Beatty	Deutch	Kelly (IL)
Becerra	Doggett	Kennedy
Bera (CA)	Doyle	Kildee
Bishop (GA)	Duckworth	Kilmer
Bishop (NY)	Edwards	Kirkpatrick
Blumenauer	Ellison	Kuster
Bonamici	Engel	Langevin
Brady (PA)	Enyart	Larsen (WA)
Brale (IA)	Eshoo	Larson (CT)
Brown (FL)	Esty	Lee (CA)
Brownley (CA)	Farr	Levin
Bustos	Foster	Lewis
Butterfield	Fudge	Lipinski
Capps	Gabbard	Loebsack
Capuano	Gallego	Lofgren
Cárdenas	Garamendi	Lowenthal
Carney	Garcia	Lowe
Carson (IN)	Gibson	Lujan Grisham (NM)
Cartwright	Grayson	Lujan, Ben Ray (NM)
Castor (FL)	Green, Al	Lujan, Ben Ray (NM)
Castro (TX)	Green, Gene	Lynch
Chu	Grijalva	Maffei
Clarke	Gutiérrez	Maloney
Clay	Hahn	Malone
Cleaver	Hanabusa	Carolyn
Clyburn	Hastings (FL)	Matsui
Coffman	Heck (WA)	McCollum
Cohen	Himes	McDermott
Connolly	Hinojosa	McGovern
Conyers	Holt	McIntyre
Cooper	Honda	McNerney
Courtney	Horsford	Meeks
Crowley	Hoyer	Meng
Cuellar	Huffman	Michaud
Cummings	Israel	Miller, George
Davis (CA)	Jackson Lee	Moore
Davis, Danny	Jeffries	

Moran
Murphy (FL)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Negrete McLeod
Nolan
O'Rourke
Owens
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Payne
Pelosi
Peters (CA)
Peters (MI)
Peterson
Pingree (ME)
Pocan
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rahall
Rangel

Richmond
Roybal-Allard
Ruppersberger
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda
T.
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Schrader
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Sinema
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Speier
Swalwell (CA)

NOES—217

Aderholt
Amodel
Bachmann
Bachus
Barletta
Barr
Barton
Benishke
Bentivolio
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Broun (GA)
Bucshon
Burgess
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Cantor
Capito
Carter
Cassidy
Chabot
Chaffetz
Coble
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Conaway
Cook
Cotton
Cramer
Crawford
Crenshaw
Culberson
Daines
Davis, Rodney
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellmers
Farenthold
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxy
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gardner
Garrett
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)

Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Grimm
Guthrie
Hanna
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings (WA)
Heck (NV)
Hensarling
Holding
Hudson
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt
Issa
Jenkins
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jordan
Joyce
Kelly (PA)
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kinzinger (IL)
Kline
Labrador
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Lankford
Latham
Latta
LoBiondo
Long
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
Marchant
Marino
Massie
Matheson
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul
McClintock
McHenry
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris
Rodgers
Meadows
Messer
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Mullin
Mulvaney
Murphy (PA)
Neugebauer
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Nunnelee
Olson
Palazzo
Paulsen
Pearce
Perry

Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Tipton
Titus
Tonko
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz
Wasserman
Schultz
Waters
Watt
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—24

Alexander
Buchanan
Cicilline
Costa
Dingell
Fattah
Frankel (FL)
Gingrey (GA)

Gowdy
Hall
Herrera Beutler
Higgins
Kind
Maloney, Sean
McCarthy (NY)
Perlmutter

Roby
Rush
Sanchez, Loretta
Schwartz
Scott, Austin
Waxman
Yoder
Young (AK)

□ 1533

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. MCHENRY) having assumed the chair, Mr. MEADOWS, Acting Chair of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 687) to facilitate the efficient extraction of mineral resources in southeast Arizona by authorizing and directing an exchange of Federal and non-Federal land, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

REMOVAL OF NAMES OF MEMBERS AS COSPONSORS OF H.R. 2914

Ms. SPEIER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that Mr. BACHUS and Ms. JACKSON LEE be removed as cosponsors of H.R. 2914.

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

There was no objection.

HEALTH CARE COSTS

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

Mr. FORTENBERRY. Mr. Speaker, many Americans are bewildered as to what is happening in Washington, and understandably so. But really the goal is pretty simple: we do need to keep this government running, while also protecting Americans from the harmful effects of the new health care law known as ObamaCare.

Until now, the debate over health care has been largely in the abstract, but now many Americans are recognizing just how hurtful this is. Mr. Speaker, we need the right type of health care reform, but we don't need skyrocketing premiums or plans that erode health care liberties.

Mr. Speaker, Yvonne just wrote to me from Nebraska. She said that, for her family of five, their monthly insurance premiums are going to nearly double. She asked: "How can we call this the Affordable Care Act?"

Rodney just wrote to me. He's a self-employed truck driver. He told me he may have to sell his truck just to afford the insurance.

Mr. Speaker, since parts of this law have already been delayed, isn't it only fair that we delay the entire implementation for at least a year, giving us time to create the right type of health care reform, one that reduces costs and improves health care outcomes while also protecting the vulnerable in our society? That's what Americans deserve.

PANCREATIC CANCER RESEARCH

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

Mr. LANGEVIN. Mr. Speaker, I recently met with a passionate group of constituents from Rhode Island who told me of their family's struggle with pancreatic cancer. In particular, Katie Boucher recently recounted the story of her mother, Marie Boucher, who was diagnosed in 2008 and passed away just a year later in 2009 at the age of 59.

Her story resonated with me not only because my own grandfather battled pancreatic cancer and ultimately passed away from the disease, but because an estimated 45,000 people were diagnosed with this illness in 2013 alone.

Despite great advances in medical science, we are still woefully behind the mark when it comes to pancreatic cancer. To make matters worse, the budgetary impacts of sequestration are forcing cutbacks at the National Institutes of Health, which is responsible for funding much of the biomedical research across the country. Mr. Speaker, we can achieve deficit reduction without sacrificing the vital research that not only drives better health outcomes, but also drives our local economy.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in urging stronger funding for NIH and a stronger focus on biomedical research, not just for Marie Boucher and her daughter, but for the thousands of people who are fighting for their lives in every single district across the country.

RECOGNIZING PUERTO RICAN BAR ASSOCIATION OF FLORIDA

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

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take a minute today to recognize a remarkable south Florida organization, the Puerto Rican Bar Association of Florida, that will soon be celebrating its 10th-year anniversary in Miami.

Over the past 10 years, the association has been dedicated to public service in my home State of Florida, preserving the civil rights, the political rights and responsibilities of Puerto Ricans as Americans, as well as Floridians.

The Puerto Rican Bar Association of Florida also serves as an educational

tool for undergraduate, graduate, and law students through a Moot Court Competition, which will be held this year in conjunction with the association's historic anniversary.

I congratulate its president, Richard Robles, for his impressive work and wish everyone in the association continued success on behalf of the Puerto Rican community of Florida.

KOCHCARE

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

Mr. POCAN. Mr. Speaker, the American people have been bombarded on their TV screens by this creepy image of Uncle Sam appearing between a young woman's legs. This ad is funded by the idealistic-sounding Generation Opportunity, but guess who's really behind this ad? The not-so-idealistic Koch brothers, who are spending a share of their wealth to tell people not to get health insurance. Their sole purpose is to keep young people from getting quality, affordable care; and, in doing so, they hope to destroy the Affordable Care Act.

But what would KochCare look like? Insurance companies could deny you coverage because of a preexisting condition. You could be thrown into bankruptcy because of lifetime caps. Insurance companies would be able to charge women more than men. And tens of millions of Americans would be without health insurance. Oh, and Uncle Sam would be standing between a woman and her doctor when it comes to reproductive health, just like you see the GOP trying to do across the country.

That's what the GOP and the Koch brothers want: fewer options, less health care, and higher costs. That certainly doesn't seem like an opportunity for a generation to me.

□ 1545

AUDIT THE PENTAGON ACT

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

Mr. COFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, we in Congress have a responsibility to ensure taxpayer dollars are used wisely. No Federal department should get a free pass, especially one responsible for managing over 50 percent of all annual discretionary spending.

The law requires all Federal agencies, including the Department of Defense, to present auditable financial statements to Congress. Unfortunately, it has been over 16 years and the Pentagon has yet to comply with this law.

How can we be expected to oversee the Pentagon's spending habits when we have no confidence in the numbers that DOD has presented?

My "Audit the Pentagon Act" presents a "carrot and stick" approach to

addressing this issue. It gives the DOD additional transfer authority if it receives a clean audit, allowing it greater flexibility to reprogram funds among accounts. Failure to achieve a clean audit results in serious consequences.

I urge my colleagues to support this bill which improves fiscal accountability and oversight of the Pentagon's budget process.

SAFE CLIMATE CAUCUS

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

Mr. HUFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, we are seeing significant natural disasters this month, from the historic floods that are wreaking havoc across Colorado to the third-largest wildfire in California's history—the Rim fire in and around Yosemite National Park.

These disasters have taken lives, they have driven families from their homes, and it will take years—and many, many millions of dollars—to clean up and repair all of the damage. Yes, these are "natural" disasters, but that doesn't mean that we aren't culpable.

The National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration as well as the British meteorological office found in a recent study that for at least half of last year's worst weather events, human activities made them more likely and more severe. Specifically, human-influenced climate change had an effect on Superstorm Sandy, heat waves in the United States, and drought in Europe.

But the climate deniers in Congress continue to ignore what's happening right in front of our eyes. We must get beyond extreme politics and start addressing the extreme damage of climate change.

BENGHAZI

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

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Speaker, yesterday, FOX News reported that "massive amounts of highly sensitive U.S. military equipment" has been stolen in Libya by militia groups aligned with terrorists.

These new developments, along with earlier reports that hundreds of surface-to-air missiles may have been stolen around the time of the Benghazi attack, beg the question: Just what has the U.S. been doing in Benghazi and around Libya over the last year?

Today, the State Department inspector general issued a new report criticizing the Department for failing to take any meaningful steps to improve diplomatic security at high-risk posts, like the facility attacked in Benghazi, over the last year.

That is why, Mr. Speaker, a select committee is needed now more than

ever—not just to investigate the attack in Benghazi but also to answer the question about U.S. operations in Libya involving stolen weapons and arms transfers over the last year.

One hundred and seventy-seven Members have cosponsored H. Res. 36 to create a select committee. Without a select committee, we are never going to know what happened in Benghazi.

OBAMACARE

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

Mr. KINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, ObamaCare, as it has been affectionately called, was intended to do two things:

Number one, make health care more affordable.

Number two, make it more accessible, pure and simple.

Let's talk about that. Does anyone know anybody whose premium has gone down? My daughter is 30 years old, very healthy. Her premium went up from \$170 a month to \$270 a month.

I speak to businesses all the time who have had 25, 35, 40 percent premium increases. Now, my telephone number in my office is 202-225-5831. If your premium has gone down, I would like to know about it.

The second thing ObamaCare was meant to do is make health care more accessible. In Georgia, we have two Fortune 500 companies. One has announced that it will no longer be covering the spouses of 15,000 employees. The other one announced that 20,000 part-time employees would no longer be covered under their health care.

So I don't know of any example of where accessibility has increased for the average person. Zero for two. Higher costs and less access. Let's repeal ObamaCare.

OBAMACARE

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

Mrs. BACHMANN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to talk about a very important issue that isn't one that is just typical for my district or any other Member's district. This is a very unique time in American history because next week, every American in the United States will be subject to the new requirements, the new mandates, of ObamaCare. This is a time that is very important, and we need to focus on what's about to happen next week.

We have an opportunity in the next few days to keep misery and suffering from millions of Americans. The Republicans have been ridiculed by the Democrats, saying that we want to somehow shut down government. We don't.

It is curious to note that since the 1970s the Federal Government has been

shut down—it has been shut down 17 times—and numerous times because the Democratic Party sought to shut it down. If you go back to the 1970s, the Democrats repeatedly tried to shut down the government over the issue of abortion.

What we are talking about is the issue of preventing suffering and misery for Americans. Surely that's worth a conversation.

OBAMACARE

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

Mr. CULBERSON. Mr. Speaker, the Founding Fathers created this magnificent institution to protect our liberty. The purpose of the House, the Senate, the entire Federal Government was created to protect our liberty.

House Republicans are united in our opposition to ObamaCare because it is one of the most massive intrusions into the individual privacy of Americans that the Federal Government has ever attempted. It is an attempt to socialize the greatest health care system the world has ever seen, and we will see intrusions into the private lives of Americans on a scale never seen before.

So I just want to reassure the American people that we are united as conservatives, as constitutional conservatives, to do everything in our power to repeal, defund, delay, do whatever it takes to stop the socialization of American medicine and the destruction of the most important right we have as Americans—to be left alone.

OBAMACARE

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

Mr. McDERMOTT. Mr. Speaker, as we approach the 1st of October when everyone in this country is going to have an opportunity to have health insurance, you know that there are some people who always like the status quo and they will say anything and do anything.

The public is today being subjected to a propaganda campaign, the likes of which we have never seen in this country, against ObamaCare. Somehow it is the worst thing that has ever happened—the sky is going to fall, the world is going to end as we have known it, we should run and pray that in the latter days we will be saved.

The fact is that ObamaCare is going to go into effect. The Supreme Court has looked at it and said it is constitutional. It is going to happen, folks.

Will there be a few problems? Of course. You can't make the change and bring 30 million people into a program without having a problem here and there. Some of the complaints I hear on the other side are from people saying: Oh, it's going to do this, it's going

to do that, it's going to do this, it's going to do that—but they didn't want to make one single change to make it better. We should just be calm.

HONORING LINDA LUNSFORD

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

Mr. GRAVES of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Linda Lunsford, a lifelong resident of Murray County, Georgia.

Ms. Lunsford has been a dedicated teacher to the students of Murray County, helping to enrich the lives of the young people both inside and outside of her classroom.

It was in 1968 that Ms. Lunsford returned to Murray County High School as an English teacher. Over those next 30 years, and for many years after her retirement in 1998, she devoted herself to teaching young Georgians, helping them value their education and succeed in life.

During her teaching career, she served as a drama sponsor, scholars bowl sponsor, yearbook advisor, cheerleading sponsor, newspaper advisor, and much, much more.

Ms. Lunsford has made such an impact on her community that Murray County is declaring October 5, 2013, the first Linda Lunsford Day.

Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the 14th Congressional District of Georgia, I join in celebrating October 5 as Linda Lunsford Day and thank her for her many contributions to our community in Georgia.

SUICIDE PREVENTION MONTH

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. PITTENGER). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2013, the gentlewoman from Arizona (Ms. SINEMA) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Ms. SINEMA. Mr. Speaker, September is Suicide Prevention Month, a time for our Nation to raise awareness about the persistent scourge of suicide.

Tens of thousands of Americans die each year purposefully by their own actions. They are our neighbors and our friends, they are our sons and our daughters, and too often they are the men and women who have served our country honorably in the United States military. An estimated 22 veterans commit suicide every day in our country. That is one life lost every 65 minutes.

We have assembled today's Special Order to accomplish three things:

First, we seek to demonstrate our continuing support for the individuals, organizations, and agencies whose efforts in addressing this preventable epidemic continue in the face of difficulty.

Second, we are here to challenge the VA, the Department of Defense, and our fellow lawmakers to do more. The

number of veteran deaths by suicide is increasing, despite current efforts. Clearly, what we are doing now isn't working. We are failing in our obligation to do right by those who have served so honorably.

And finally, we send a message to military families who have experienced this tragedy. To grieving families across America, know that your family's loss isn't forgotten. We are working to stop this epidemic and prevent future suicides. We work for the memory of your loved ones and for the prevention of future losses.

My colleagues here today believe, as I believe, that no one who comes home after serving our country should ever feel they have nowhere to turn. Sadly, many of our young vets feel just that.

Earlier this year, a young veteran in my district committed suicide. Daniel Somers was an Army veteran of two tours in Iraq. He served on Task Force Lightning, an intelligence unit. He ran over 400 combat missions as a machine gunner in the turret of a Humvee. Part of his role required him to interrogate dozens of terror suspects, and his work was deemed classified.

Like many veterans, Daniel was haunted by the war when he returned. He suffered from flashbacks, nightmares, depression, and additional symptoms of posttraumatic stress disorder, made worse by a traumatic brain injury. Daniel needed help. He and his family asked for help the best way they knew how.

Unfortunately, the VA enrolled Daniel in group therapy sessions instead of connecting him with a private counselor or therapist where he would be able to talk confidentially about his experiences. He attended the VA group sessions even though he knew—due to the classified nature of his work—that he could not fully share what gave him nightmares.

Like many, Daniel's isolation got worse when he transitioned home to civilian life. He tried to provide for his family, but he was unable to work due to his disability.

□ 1600

Daniel struggled with the VA bureaucracy. His disability appeal had been pending for over 2 years in the system without any resolution. Daniel didn't get the help he needed in time. On June 10 of 2013, Daniel wrote a letter to his family.

It begins:

I am sorry that it has come to this. The fact is, for as long as I can remember, my motivation for getting up every day has been so that you would not have to bury me. As things have continued to get worse, it has become clear that this alone is not a sufficient reason to carry on. The fact is, I am not getting better; I am not going to get better; and I will most certainly deteriorate further as time goes on. From a logical standpoint, it is better to simply end things quickly and let any repercussions from that play out in the short term rather than to drag things out into the long term.

He goes on to say:

I am left with basically nothing. Too trapped in a war to be at peace, too damaged to be at war, abandoned by those who would take the easy route and a liability to those who stick it out—and, thus, deserve better. So, you see, not only am I better off dead, but the world is better without me in it.

This is what brought me to my actual final mission.

Daniel's parents, Howard and Jean, were devastated; but in the midst of their pain, they bravely shared Daniel's story and created a mission of their own. Their mission is to ensure that Daniel's story brings to light America's deadliest war—the 22 veterans that we lose every day to suicide.

I am grateful to Howard and Jean for their courage and their strength, but we cannot leave this great task to Howard and Jean alone. The rest of the country must stand and join Howard and Jean in their work to prevent suicide. Each of us can do something to raise awareness, to be that light for a struggling veteran in our communities. Businesses can display signs like this one to let veterans know that help is always available, and mental health professionals can volunteer with organizations like Give an Hour to provide free counseling to veterans and their families. We can all learn to recognize the signs of crisis by visiting veteranscrisisline.net and then reaching out to the vets in our lives.

Here in Congress, we, too, can do more. We need a VA that provides real and meaningful help to veterans in need. We who enjoy freedom every day, thanks to the sacrifices of our military servicemembers, must all step up to end the epidemic of veterans' suicide.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Michigan, Congressman DAN BENISHEK.

Mr. BENISHEK. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank my colleague from Arizona for organizing this Special Order.

This is an issue that is very close to me as well, and I want to join the rest of my colleagues here today in recognizing September as Veterans' Suicide Prevention Month.

As my colleague mentioned, a veteran in this country commits suicide every 65 minutes. That's 22 lives extinguished every day. As a father of a veteran, as a doctor who has worked at the VA hospital in northern Michigan for over 20 years, and as the chairman of the Health Subcommittee on Veterans' Affairs, I know that the challenges of military life do not end once our servicemembers retire from active duty. The mental wounds of war may be invisible, but no less real to the young men and women suffering from them.

Facing high unemployment rates, the stigma of post-traumatic stress disorder and a loss of military fellowship, returning veterans often face a crisis of confidence at the very moment they should feel nothing but relief and rest. This year, we will bring 34,000 troops home from Afghanistan. The President has indicated he may withdraw all of the 63,000 member strong force by the

end of 2014. The time to act to address this epidemic of veteran suicide is now.

I am pleased that VA leadership has made veteran suicide a priority. New programs putting researchers to work on reviewing health records for suicide risk factors is one example of the important steps that are being taken, but more—much more—needs to be done. We cannot and we will not allow 22 suicides a day to become the “new normal.”

As friends and families of our veterans and those serving our country, there are some things we all can do. We can work to recognize the symptoms that could indicate serious problems and identify where and how to get assistance when we need it.

To all veterans who are struggling as to whether to take their own lives, know that there is no shame in asking for help. You are not broken, and God has not forgotten you. You volunteered to go to war for us, and we have failed to provide you adequate support when you returned home. That is changing, and I beg you to reach out to your local VA, veterans center, veterans service organization, or local Member of Congress for help.

Together, we can begin to turn the tide on veteran suicide. Everyone can help fight this epidemic and be there for those who were there for us.

Ms. SINEMA. Thank you, Congressman BENISHEK. I appreciate your words very much.

Our next speaker who will join us this afternoon is my colleague from Florida, Congressman PATRICK MURPHY. I yield to him.

Mr. MURPHY of Florida. First of all, I would like to thank the gentlelady from Arizona for bringing us all together for this very important issue.

Mr. Speaker, I stand in support of my colleagues who are here today who support our brave men and women of the United States military—those who were willing to give life and limb in service of our great Nation. Those who fought for our freedom have earned America's gratitude and support as they reenter society after the trauma of serving in prolonged war zones. Our Nation must remain focused on the health and well-being of the brave men and women who have served. This means treating even the wounds that are not visible.

September is Suicide Prevention Month, and it is incumbent that every one of us take the time to reach out to servicemembers and veterans who may be struggling. It should shake every Member of this body to know that we lose 22 heroes every day to suicide.

Yesterday, I was honored to join with local veterans groups to bring attention to this troubling issue. I want to take this opportunity to thank Mary Hinton with the Renewal Coalition, Dr. Deepak Mandi with the West Palm Beach VA Medical Center, and Dr. Raul Diaz with the Jupiter Veterans Center for not only joining me at this important event yesterday but for the impor-

tant work they are doing to assist the veterans and their families in our community every day.

I want to recognize the great work of the Veterans Crisis Line, which has fielded over 890,000 calls since 2007 and provides important, comprehensive mental health care at VA medical centers across the Nation.

I also want to thank Lynn Szymoniak for her hard work and dedication with Angel Fire, another organization in my district which helps our wounded veterans transition back to civilian life.

For Suicide Prevention Month, let's recommit ourselves to providing our heroes, who have sacrificed so much for our Nation, with the respect, the benefits and the care that they have earned through their service by raising awareness, ending the stigma, and treating their invisible wounds.

Ms. SINEMA. Thank you, Mr. MURPHY.

I yield to another colleague from the great State of Florida, Mr. TED YOHO.

Mr. YOHO. I thank my colleague from Arizona for putting this together.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to speak about the epidemic of veterans who not only commit, but consider, suicide.

I again want to address what my colleague talked about, the quote of “too trapped in a war to be at peace, too damaged to be at war.” These are the words left behind by the soldier, Daniel, who tragically took his own life a few months ago. Daniel was one of many who had been affected by PTSD and who had come back from war with suicidal thoughts. This is an epidemic among our servicemen and -women, and it must be stopped.

Again, it is estimated that more than 22 veterans take their lives each day. That's 30 percent of all veterans who have considered suicide. In Florida's Third Congressional District alone, there are over 120,000 veterans, which means, according to current data, about 36,000 veterans in my district have thought about suicide. This is unacceptable, and we must remedy this.

We need to do all we can for those who have sacrificed the most for our Nation, and that cannot just extend to the battlefield. We must continue to take care of our soldiers when they come back home. That includes setting up programs to help veterans deal with PTSD and other psychological issues so they can get the proper help they need. We have to make veteran suicide prevention a priority, and I, along with my colleagues, will work tirelessly towards that end.

George Washington said:

To judge a nation's future military force and loyalty to that nation's military will be determined by how well that nation takes care of its veterans.

Before our Nation engages in another war, I hope we look at the true cost of that war. If we look at the cost of the wars in Afghanistan and Iraq, it's not just the trillions of dollars or the thousands of lives that have been lost. The

true cost of that war will be felt by this Nation for the next 60, 70, 80 years; and we need to make sure that we take care of those veterans and that we think long and hard before we ever do that again.

Ms. SINEMA. Thank you, Mr. YOHO.

Next, I yield to the distinguished Congresswoman from Illinois, a proud veteran herself, Representative TAMMY DUCKWORTH.

Ms. DUCKWORTH. I thank the gentlelady from Arizona for bringing us together on this incredibly important issue.

Mr. Speaker, our veterans, throughout their military careers, are taught to be physically tough and mentally strong; and just because they suffer from post-traumatic stress, it does not negate that. They deserve every opportunity to achieve the same American Dream that they defended for the rest of us. Yet, unfortunately, too many of our veterans suffer from post-traumatic stress or from other mental injuries resulting from their service.

Post-traumatic stress and mental injuries are not always the result of combat; they can also include such trauma as that of sexual assault. Regardless of how the trauma is suffered, we still must take care of our veterans. We cannot allow these injuries to prevent them from living the lives that they deserve; and in some cases, these injuries have led these brave men and women to take their own lives. It has been almost 8 years since my own injury; and in that time, if the 22-suicides-a-day rate is to be counted, there have been at least 24,000 veteran suicides. This is simply unacceptable.

When I was director of the Illinois Department of Veterans' Affairs, one of the very first things that I did was to create a 24/7 hotline for mental health available for vets. We have one now across the Nation, and that telephone number is 1 (888) 273-TALK. Please put that on your refrigerator doors. You never know when that number could save a life. We started that hotline because caring for our veterans and their mental well-being is not a secondary priority; it is a mission that we must pursue each and every day.

We cannot rest until we end veterans suicide in our Nation. We need to care for these warriors' invisible wounds with as much dedication and as many resources as we do their other combat injuries. Yet, because they are invisible, we often overlook these wounds.

I am asking all levels of government, business and ordinary citizens to make preventing veteran suicides our mission. We must come together and reduce the stigma of post-traumatic stress. We must provide the funding and the support that our heroes need. They fought for us. Now it is time for us to fight for them.

Ms. SINEMA. Thank you, Representative DUCKWORTH.

I yield to another fine colleague from the great State of Illinois, Representative RODNEY DAVIS.

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Thank you to the gentlelady from Arizona for putting this Special Order together. It is a true privilege to stand here to highlight an issue that needs to be dealt with here in America.

Mr. Speaker, our veterans are those who have protected our freedoms that allow us to stand on this floor and debate the issues of the day. Without their sacrifices, we wouldn't have the America that we know today.

I am surprised when I read the statistics about veteran suicides. The number that dies by his own hand each year is greater than the official number of all U.S. war deaths in more than a decade of fighting in Iraq and Afghanistan.

□ 1615

Between 2005 and 2011, over 49,000 veterans have taken their lives, and more than 69 percent of all veteran suicides were among those 50 and older; and nearly one in five suicides nationally is a veteran, even though veterans only make up 10 percent of the U.S. population.

We need to take steps to ensure that our veterans have the mental health sources they need. We need to make sure that we raise awareness and do away with the stigma of suicide so that veterans feel comfortable finally reaching out for help. When soldiers are scared to come forward about their mental health problems because they think they will be labeled a "coward," they continue down a dark and lonely path that eventually could lead to suicide. Instead, we need to ask our struggling veterans to ask for help.

As my colleague from Illinois just mentioned, the Department of Veterans Affairs launched a crisis line that since 2007 has answered more than 890,000 calls and has made over 30,000 rescues. In 2009, they added a chat line for text, and over 108,000 texts have been sent. These are the types of resources that we need to provide those who have provided so much protection and freedom for us here in America, and I stand here today to work with my colleagues across the aisle to make things happen.

Thank you again to the gentlelady from Arizona.

Ms. SINEMA. Mr. Speaker, I yield to my colleague from the great State of California, SUSAN DAVIS.

Mrs. DAVIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I'm very pleased to have an opportunity to join with my colleague from Arizona, Congresswoman SINEMA, to talk about the issue of veteran suicide today and to do it from a personal perspective here, as well.

Daniel Somers, as the Congresswoman noted, was a talented young man, a decorated war hero, and a proud soldier. He asked for help. He did. He reached out to the VA in hopes of being admitted to their suicide prevention unit, but he was informed at that time that there was no inpatient availability, no appointments that he could get right away. We now know that

Daniel took his life just a few days later.

His case was brought home to me because his parents, Jean and Howard Somers, live in my former district and actually were friends of mine and friends of people that I knew. When I first heard the story, I was taken, as anybody would be, by their grief, by what had happened, and the fact that we just cannot let that happen again.

I think they asked the question that we all ask: How could a young man like that fall through the cracks? How was it that people did not respond to him? How can we make a promise to care for him who shall have borne the battle and for his widow and his orphan when we cannot guarantee placement in a suicide prevention treatment center?

One thing I think that we all learn from this is that we have to listen to our constituents. What I have found to be so rewarding is that parents with this kind of grief can work through that and use their son's words to become strong advocates for what is needed in the system.

Having served on the Personnel Committee, I know it was very important to me to work through this issue for a number years as we know of the many causes of suicide among those who have served in the military. We know that, in fact, the major reasons are not necessarily combat stress. Recent reports have shown us that financial hardship and relationship strife are major causes of suicide among the military. It points out to us how critically important this discussion of mental health is in our country.

Sometimes I feel like we've arrived a bit and we plan. I know agencies throughout our country and throughout the VA plan so hard so that these kinds of tragedies do not occur; but they do occur, no matter how hard the effort is. We have got to redouble those efforts, we have got to listen, and we have got to encourage our families to do what they can and what they think is right.

I actually think that one of the reasons that the Somers family has become such strong advocates is because people did respond to them. They didn't push them aside and say, Well, this is a terrible story, and we're sad that it happened. We're not sure we can do anything about it.

We can do something about it, and we will.

I thank my colleague for bringing this forward, and I thank the Somers family, as well.

Ms. SINEMA. Thank you so much, Congresswoman DAVIS.

I yield to my colleague from Washington State, Congressman JIM McDERMOTT.

Mr. McDERMOTT. Mr. Speaker, I applaud my colleague from Arizona for bringing this issue to the floor.

Forty-five years ago, I was a part of another era when there was a draft, and everybody was subject to that draft. In 1975, we stopped that draft,

and we changed the nature of our military. We made it an all-voluntary military.

What we've done in this country is we've taken 1 percent of the people and said, You volunteered for this. You go and do this for us.

We buy the guns, the bullets, and everything else and send them out there. When they come back, we don't know them.

There's a fascinating book, called, "Breach of Trust," by a man named Andrew Bacevich. He is a colonel in the United States Army. He lost a son in Iraq, and he has written an incisive account of what the problem today is. The subtitle is "How Americans Failed Their Soldiers and Their Country."

I know about PTSD because I dealt with it as a psychiatrist with people coming back from Vietnam. The kids that were in "Apocalypse Now" are the kids that came to my clinic. So I saw what people who went through tough war was all about. What is happening today that we do here on this floor—and I'm always uneasy when we do it—is we stand up and we have a moment of silence. It's nice. We should do it, and we do it. We thank people for their service.

Every veteran finds that as hollow, because they didn't go and get us a cup of coffee; they were under orders to go and kill people. They did it on our behalf.

We bear the responsibility for sending them out there to do it. Every one of us on this floor, all 435 of us, bear the responsibility, as does the American public.

When we receive them back, what do they get—homelessness? joblessness? They get PTSD that may or may not be treated.

We say, Oh, well. The Veterans Administration will take care of that.

You can't put it off on the Veterans Administration. It is all our responsibility.

There is a movie, called, "The Invisible War," about what happens to women who are now serving in the military. You can look at brain injuries of kids who could do all kinds of things and come back and can't remember their phone number, can't remember what their house address is, and they are suffering from things that have happened to them because of the war that they've been involved with, and what happens to them is they get isolated. They get isolated, feeling that nobody really understands what's going on with them. For some, suicide seems like the only way.

Now, Native American tribes, more ancient people, understood this, that when they sent warriors out to war, they received them back into the tribe. The samurai did it. There was a whole process by which we brought people back in and cleansed them of the guilt of what they've done on our behalf. That collateral damage you read about or hear about is our responsibility as well as theirs for having actually

pulled the trigger. We sent them, and they did it on our behalf. They cannot get away from that.

We have put a provision in the National Defense Authorization Act that will create a commission for high-level people to look at how we bring these people back, and it's more than just fixing the process at the VA. That's not enough. There is a much larger process of getting us to accept what we're sending people to do. This recent brush we had with Syria, we were about to send people down there to kill people all over the place and say, Well, it was the Air Force that did it. I didn't direct the smart bomb to go in there.

Yes, you did. Yes, I did. Yes, all of us did.

So when we talk about suicide and these isolated young men and women who come back and feel there's no other hope, it is a much bigger issue. It's an issue of getting them to come and talk to us and tell us what they've done and accept, as we accept, the grief from that kind of event.

I thank you for the time, and I encourage you to read the book, "Breach of Trust."

Ms. SINEMA. Thank you, Congressman.

I yield to my distinguished colleague from California, Congressman TONY CÁRDENAS.

Mr. CÁRDENAS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to first thank Congresswoman SINEMA for bringing us together so we can speak for at least an hour on this very critical and important issue of supporting our veterans now that they're home.

This is something that I shouldn't have to talk about. This is something that none of us should have to bring up, but here we are. Too many of our veterans are taking their own lives.

Our soldiers and veterans, who are all volunteers, should not be killing themselves. Too many are, and it is at an epidemic rate. This is entirely unacceptable.

While veteran suicide is frequently reported in the press and focused on by the VA, it is rarely mentioned that last year 349 Active Duty service men and women killed themselves. That is more Active Duty deaths by suicide than in all combat deaths combined during the same year, 2012, including the deaths in Afghanistan.

Alongside our Active Duty forces, nearly two dozen veterans kill themselves every day. That is almost one every hour. That number is going up, not down.

A survey by the Iraq and Afghanistan Veterans of America showed that 30 percent of servicemembers have considered taking their own life, and 45 percent said they know an Iraq or Afghanistan veteran who has attempted suicide.

The Department of Veterans Affairs has devoted some resources to this effort, but more can be done, and it starts right here in Congress. We fund the VA; the VA does not fund itself.

It is important that we let military families of those who have experienced these tragedies know that their experiences matter. We need to provide resources, real support for our veterans and their families. We owe this to the men and women who kept their promise to protect and serve our Nation, because we now know and we can see that constant mobilization and combat does not just impact our Nation as a whole, but it forever impacts our men and women to whom we owe so much.

This Suicide Prevention Month, let us make a true effort to provide mental health support for our veterans and their families. Over \$1 trillion has been provided and spent on two wars over the last decade, yet we have dedicated too little—very little—to help our veterans when they return home. A trillion dollars sounds like a lot of money. Almost one veteran an hour in this country takes his or her life. What's that price, ladies and gentlemen? What's that value?

I believe that we have a backwards system in our country where we can pop off \$25 billion, \$50 billion, \$100 billion, and it keeps going and going and going, and we're creating more and more veterans who come back and who love their country. They would like to come back and feel normal, but they don't feel right. Because of that, they take their life.

We should be ashamed of ourselves because we have the answers, we know the answers, and one of those answers is for Congress to dedicate more money to our veterans so that when they come home they won't take their life. We have the answers, ladies and gentlemen, but we're not willing to heed the call. We need to do so.

Perhaps what we should consider doing in these Chambers from now on is, every time we spend a dollar to go to war, maybe we should dedicate \$1 for our veterans when they come back. Fair enough?

□ 1630

We lose count of the money we send to war. But we count every penny that we send to the VA. And we squeeze them, and we tell them there's no more. There's always more money for war, for some reason. Somehow, there's always more money for war, regardless of what the economy is, regardless of how much revenue we have. There's always more money for war. But there's never enough money for us to dedicate to the veterans who need us, who didn't question us, who we—we helped them change their lives forever. And for some, they took their life once they came back home and realized that we are not there for them. I hope that we're all listening, Mr. Speaker. I hope that we're all listening.

And I thank you, Congresswoman SINEMA, for this opportunity.

Ms. SINEMA. Thank you, Representative CÁRDENAS.

I now yield to my friend and colleague from southern Arizona, Congressman RON BARBER.

Mr. BARBER. I want to thank my colleague from Arizona, Congresswoman SINEMA, for bringing us together this evening on this truly critical issue in our country.

Mr. Speaker, I want to speak directly to the men and women who have served this country. To those of you who have borne a decade of war and to those of you who have endured the psychological scars that these wars have brought, scars from traumatic brain injury and post-traumatic stress, I know that your wounds and you know that your wounds cannot always be seen. But you also know and I know too that they're real.

I implore you to consider the grief and loss, the sadness that your families will feel if you are no longer with them. They love you. They want you to live. I implore you, suicide is not the answer.

For 32 years, I worked in the field of mental health services. I know from the many, the thousands of success stories that mental illness, post-traumatic stress, and emotional issues are treatable. You can recover.

If you are hurting and need help, it is there for you. It is there in your friends, in your family members, and it is there in the professional services offered in your community and at the Veterans Administration.

If you learn that someone is contemplating suicide, you have a responsibility to intervene. Let them know how much they mean to you. Help them get the services they need. It is everyone's responsibility to stop this terrible tragedy that is occurring every single day. As has been said already, 22 men and women who have served us in uniform are committing suicide when they return home to civilian life.

You each deserve the full resources of this government and of your communities and of your friends, and it is there for you.

Here in Congress, I am very pleased to say that while we talk a lot about gridlock and we talk a lot about not getting things done and the lack of bipartisanship, this is one issue on which we are truly in a bipartisan coalition. We are fighting for you to make sure that you get the support and the help and the gratitude that you deserve after serving our country so bravely.

Just this week, I was deeply honored to welcome Congresswoman TAMMY DUCKWORTH to my district. When I think about the greeting that she received when we went to the University of Arizona from the veterans who saw her courage, I knew that she was an inspiration not only to them but to veterans all over the country, a great model of someone who has been through so much and yet has found a reason to live and to serve our country.

We went to the Veterans Center at the University of Arizona, where veterans were helping other veterans not only deal with the transition back into civilian life and into school life but also to deal with the emotional issues

that they have as they make that transition.

Help is there. It is there for each and every one of you who have served us so well. And I implore you, look for the help. Give the help.

This is everyone's responsibility to reach out to the men and women who have served us and to extend a helping hand and to get them to the services that they need. They can and will be treated. And treatment will, in fact, help them succeed. And they will, in fact, go through this terrible time that they're dealing with when they contemplate suicide.

I want to thank the gentlelady from Arizona once again for bringing us together to talk about this very important topic to all Americans.

Ms. SINEMA. Thank you so much, Congressman BARBER.

I now yield to my colleague from Nevada, Congresswoman DINA TITUS.

Ms. TITUS. Well, I too would like to thank my friend from the southwest, Congresswoman SINEMA, for hosting this special hour to draw attention to Suicide Prevention Month, which we recognize here in September.

Suicide within any population is a traumatic thing to deal with. But we are learning that it is increasingly important and increasingly a problem among our military and our veterans. It's critical that we work to address, to recognize, to prevent, and to eliminate military suicides. And I hope that today's Special Order will help to shine a bright light on this very important topic.

Suicide within the military is a national problem. You have heard my colleagues speak about it in their districts and their State and across the country. But it is especially acute in my home State of Nevada. A recent study done by the State of Nevada found that veterans in the Silver State commit suicide at a rate of more than 2½ times higher than nonveterans and quadruple the national rate. The study further reported that Nevada's female veterans, those often hidden veterans, commit suicide at more than triple the overall rate for females statewide and nearly six times—six times—the national rate for females. The study also found that in 2010, suicide accounted for more than a quarter of the deaths among young veterans—those between 24 years and younger—throughout the State of Nevada. This is a trend we just cannot allow to continue.

As other speakers have noted, every day, 22 veterans take their own lives. Almost every hour, one of our Nation's heroes takes his or her life. Nearly one in five suicides nationally is a veteran, even though veterans make up only about 10 percent of the U.S. population.

As ranking member of the House Veterans' Affairs Subcommittee on Disability Assistance, I'm working every day with my colleagues to ensure that veterans receive all the benefits that they've earned and the care that they need. So if you are a veteran who is

struggling with thoughts of suicide or you are the friend or family member of a veteran who needs help, please contact us. Reach out to us because we need to know what the VA can do to better support and serve you.

I would also encourage my colleagues to cosponsor H.R. 2527, which is the National Guard Military Sexual Trauma Parity Act. This would ensure that members of the Guard receive all the care they need if they're a victim of military sexual trauma while on training missions. We know that if you are a victim and you suffer such trauma, that can often lead to suicide.

On our committee, we're constantly working to ensure that the VA is providing care for our veterans struggling with the thought of suicide. But it's also important that we reach out and assure veterans that they know that receiving help is not a sign of weakness. Instead, it's a sign of strength.

When Army Staff Sergeant Ty Carter received a Medal of Honor, he encouraged his fellow soldiers to reach out and for the civilian community to support them. He said to the public, "Know that they are not damaged. They are simply burdened with living with what others do not. We are resilient and will emerge even stronger over time." Sergeant Carter, we know that because of leaders like you and the support of a grateful Nation, we can win the battle against military suicide.

So, again, let us hear from you. And let me remind veterans and those who love them that the VA operates a confidential support center that's open 365 days a year, 7 days a week, 24 hours a day. And please call if you need support. Their phone number is 1-800-273-8255, and then just press number 1. You can also send a text message to 838255.

So don't hesitate to reach out. Someone will be there to hear you. Just as you never leave a fellow soldier on the battlefield, we can't leave anyone behind when they come home. When they come home with wounds that are both visible and hidden, we should be there.

So thank you to my colleagues and to the Congresswoman from Arizona for giving us an opportunity to send this message loud and clear.

Ms. SINEMA. Thank you so much, Congresswoman TITUS.

I now yield to my colleague from Pennsylvania, Congressman MATTHEW CARTWRIGHT.

Mr. CARTWRIGHT. I thank the gentlewoman from Arizona for yielding. And I also want to join Congresswoman DINA TITUS in thanking Congresswoman SINEMA for arranging this Special Order hour and taking the leadership to put these people together and speak out on this topic.

Congresswoman SINEMA, I say to you that you bring honor and credit to the Ninth District of Arizona in taking a leadership position in this role.

I also, Mr. Speaker, want to point out that Congresswoman SINEMA has brought the House together on these issues. She has brought Democrats and

Republicans together in this Special Order hour. In case that fact has escaped your notice, we speak as one voice on behalf of American veterans. And I'm happy to lend my voice to that today.

I come from Pennsylvania, which is home to nearly 1 million American veterans. These brave men and women served our country, and unfortunately, we are here to say we have not always served them.

The United States Department of Housing and Urban Development estimates that nationwide, 62,619 veterans are homeless on any given night. And many of these veterans do suffer from mental illness.

A recently released study from the Department of Veterans Affairs found that 22 veterans commit suicide every day. Now I heard that several months ago, Mr. Speaker, and at first, I shrugged it off. I mean, we're sort of callous around here. We're used to numbers. We're used to statistics being bandied about. So when somebody said, "Be shocked: it's 22 American veterans committing suicide every day," I thought, "Well, what's that, out of 400, 500 suicides nationwide every day?" No, it wasn't that. It was somewhere between 80 and 110 American suicides every day.

So we're not talking about a small proportion. We're talking about, ladies and gentlemen, Mr. Speaker, we're talking about upwards of 20 percent of the suicides every day are American veterans committing suicide. And we heard earlier this hour that it's something like less than 10 percent of Americans are veterans. So it's hugely disproportionate. The number of people committing suicide in this country is hugely, disproportionately veterans in this country, and that is a national embarrassment.

As someone who cares deeply about veterans' issues, I'm here to tell you, I have introduced two bills after I heard that statistic. First, the Veterans Mental Health Accessibility Act, and second, the Expediting Hiring for VA Trained Psychiatrist Act.

Now the Veterans Mental Health Accessibility Act aims to provide for our brave servicemen and -women when they return from combat with both easily visible and difficult to detect wounds. While the physical wounds of war are evident immediately, mental health issues obviously may take longer to discover.

□ 1645

As many as 30 percent of the Operation Iraqi and Enduring Freedom veterans face the possible diagnosis of a mental health disorder. However, after 5 post-service years—and this is the rule in the VA—after 5 years, veterans would go to the back of the line for psychiatric health care.

With the average wait time for a veteran to receive benefits at 273 days, this could mean the difference between life and death. It's like a 5-year statute of limitations.

After a servicemember is separated from the service, if he or she does not report a combat-related mental disorder within 5 years, it's as if they do not qualify for psychiatric care.

The Veterans Mental Health Accessibility Act would ensure that no veteran be denied mental health treatment, no matter when combat-related mental health disorders first appear. It eliminates that ridiculous 5-year rule.

Additionally, I've introduced the Expedited Hiring for VA Trained Psychiatrists Act. This bill allows the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to fast-track the hiring of psychiatrists who have completed a residency at a VA facility.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that we owe a great debt to those who serve our Nation through military service, including those who stood ready at a moment's notice to fight for our freedom. As long as I am a Member of this Congress, I will be working to increase knowledge of benefits available to the veterans community, to correct shortcomings in the VA system, and to ensure that the men and women of the Armed Forces who bravely serve this country receive all of the benefits to which they are so richly entitled.

Ms. SINEMA. Thank you, Representative CARTWRIGHT.

I now yield to my colleague from New York (Mr. OWENS).

Mr. OWENS. Thank you, Congresswoman SINEMA. I appreciate the work you've done in bringing a bipartisan group together to address this issue.

Mr. Speaker, I think it's important that we understand a number of things. In my district, particularly upstate New York, there are 48 attempts at suicide every year. The hotline which was addressed before receives 137,000 calls, on average, annually, and that is statistics gathered from 2007–2012.

That number, and I'll repeat this again for any veteran out their listening today, is (800) 273-8255.

How many of us have known someone who has committed suicide and have thought to ourselves: I didn't see it coming. How could I have helped?

We hear that constantly when we talk to the families of those who have committed suicide.

The New York Times reports that being a veteran increases your risk of suicide double, so you have two times a greater risk of committing suicide if you have served your country.

I urge all of us to stay alert, to make sure that we are focused on watching those amongst us who may show signs of suicide, and it is incumbent upon Congress to provide the funding to defeat this terrible disease.

In my district, a young man committed suicide, who came from Glens Falls, who was assigned to the 10th Mountain Division in Watertown, New York. He was a skilled Blackhawk mechanic. And the theme that I mentioned before was repeated by his friends and coworkers: I didn't see it coming. How could I have helped?

We say thank you to our veterans by oftentimes saying thank you for your

service, but do we provide the service to them that they deserve? We do not nearly enough, and we should.

Ms. SINEMA. Thank you so much, Congressman OWENS.

I now yield to the gentlewoman from New Hampshire (Ms. KUSTER).

Ms. KUSTER. Thank you, Congresswoman SINEMA, and thank you so much for bringing us together today. This is a unique experience since I've been here in the United States Congress.

Mr. Speaker, today we've heard from Republicans and Democrats, men and women, people from literally every corner of our country, young and old, who have served this country and who honor those who serve us. Each of us has been touched by this issue.

And I want to say, from a personal perspective, having been raised by a combat veteran—my husband and I are both the children of combat veterans. My father was a World War II pilot, and he flew in 63 missions before he was shot down and served in a POW camp. My father-in-law landed on the beaches of Normandy when my father was flying overhead.

Both my husband and I were raised in households that, although successful, had many dark secrets. These were households where we lived with PTSD. And I want to say to the veterans who have served our country, of every era, that we are here to serve you, and we will not leave you on the battlefield.

I serve on the Veterans' Affairs Committee, and it's a tremendous honor. With my colleagues on both sides of the aisle, led by Congressman BENISHEK, whom you've heard from today, on the Health Subcommittee, we will stand by the veterans who have served our country. We will work to provide the resources and to help the men and women that are working across this country in our Veterans Administration to provide you with the services and the treatment and the support that you need.

It's been a tremendous honor for me, as I travel around the State of New Hampshire and my district, to work with veterans groups, to sit in veterans centers, and to see the one-on-one support from the VSOs, from those who have worked in this field, from people who understand the dark secrets that you carry.

We are here for you. We will work together and, under the leadership of Congresswoman SINEMA and all of us who serve on the Veterans' Affairs Committee and throughout this U.S. Congress, please know that we are here for you and we will not forget.

Thank you for your service.

Ms. SINEMA. Mr. Speaker, I yield to my colleague from Illinois (Mr. ENYART).

Mr. ENYART. Mr. Speaker, "Always Ready, Always There"—that's the motto of the National Guard. That motto's engraved on this commander's coin, my commander's coin that I carry with me wherever I go.

Before I came to Congress, I had the honor and the privilege and the responsibility, for 5 years, to exercise command over the Illinois Army and Air National Guard. I commanded 10,000 soldiers and 3,000 airmen. It was my responsibility to train them, equip them, and order them into war.

Most of them came back—34 of them did not, 19 of them during my command. I carry those names with me in my breast pocket—ranks, names, ages, hometowns, units of assignment, date of death.

What I don't carry are the two soldiers that I lost to suicide. I don't know why I don't have those names. I should have those names. They didn't come back either.

Most of those soldiers that I ordered to go to war came home. Those few didn't. Many of them came home wounded, some of those wounds not visible.

The first time a soldier under my command committed suicide, my staff came to me and said, General, are you going to go to the funeral? I said, Of course I'm going to the funeral. They said, Well, your predecessor didn't go to funerals for soldiers that committed suicide. I said, I do. We took them whole, sent them to war, and they came back broken. That's my responsibility. I go.

Congressman JIM MCDERMOTT earlier spoke about responsibility. He talked about how we in Congress and we as a Nation must take responsibility for these broken lives. I accept responsibility for what I've done. I accept responsibility for taking whole men and women and sending them to war. I take responsibility for those two soldiers who committed suicide under my command, under my watch. It's not an easy thing to do. But that's what you have to do as a soldier, because you're always ready and you're always there.

Illinois was very lucky. During my command we went several years without a single suicide, while other States were losing soldiers and airmen. And we were very proud of that. We thought we were doing a great job. And, of course, oh, it was because we were doing such a great job, and we drove it down to the lowest levels that it was okay to be stressed and it was okay to accept help and you should get help.

And those are all good things and they were the right things to do; but it wasn't all that we did, because I know those figures were a lie. I know those zero suicides were a lie, because we had soldiers who were drunk at 2 in the morning riding motorcycles who died. We had soldiers driving cars at 120 miles an hour 2 months after coming home from a deployment, and that was a suicide.

We must respond to that, and every soldier who comes home must take responsibility for another soldier so that we can save them.

Ms. SINEMA. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

FURTHER MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A further message from the Senate by Ms. Curtis, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate concurs in the amendment of the House to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 527), "An Act to amend the Helium Act to complete the privatization of the Federal helium reserve in a competitive market fashion that ensures stability in the helium markets while protecting the interests of American taxpayers, and for other purposes."

THE SCOURGE OF MINOR SEX TRAFFICKING

BIPARTISANSHIP

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2013, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. POE) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank Ms. SINEMA from the State of Arizona for her holding the last Special Order, bipartisan, to talk about this terrible plight that has happened to our veterans. Twenty-two veterans a day, Americans, commit suicide. So I thank the gentlewoman for bringing that to the attention of the House and to the American public. That's an issue that we will continue to work on in a bipartisan way to help our veterans.

I would like to, Mr. Speaker, at this time, yield to the gentlewoman from the great State of Florida (Ms. ROSLEHTINEN).

Ms. ROSLEHTINEN. Thank you so much to the great gentleman from the wonderful State of Texas. And I'm so glad that the gentleman brings up the word "bipartisan" to describe what we just witnessed, very heartfelt testimony.

But, Mr. Speaker, we have a lot of work to do right here in the House as well and with the Senate and with the President, because it's time for all parties to work together in a genuine, bipartisan, and adult manner to avoid a government shutdown. A shutdown is not some abstract exercise, as the gentleman knows. It has real consequences for our communities and our families.

The American people sent us to Washington to work together for our great Nation, and it is unacceptable for one side to refuse to negotiate.

□ 1700

Where's the President in all of this? The bully pulpit can just as equally be used for constructive leadership as it can be used for political showmanship.

Let us work together, get something done, and help America's vanishing middle class.

Mr. Speaker, it is just as important to remember that in addition to the constant legislative battles happening right here in Congress, life goes on outside of the Capitol. And I want to take just a few minutes today to recognize

two remarkable south Florida organizations that are holding events this weekend.

Tomorrow, Go Red for Women will be celebrating its 10th anniversary in south Florida. The Go Red for Women organization is an impressive force to be reckoned with. Many people don't know this, but heart disease is the number one killer of women. It is more deadly than all forms of cancer.

Fortunately, we have the strong women of Go Red taking the fight to heart disease. Mothers, daughters, sisters, and friends all are standing together and leading the change and the charge that we need to educate, to advocate, and to raise awareness about heart disease.

I want to especially congratulate Jessica Cerda-Antomarchi, the Miami Heart Society director, as well as Gabrielle Finley-Haze, the 2013 chair, and all of the women of Go Red. With their continued strength and leadership, we will finally put an end to heart disease.

Finally, let me congratulate the Lupus Foundation of America's southeast Florida chapter. They will be holding this year's Walk to End Lupus Now in Miami this month. Despite approximately 1.5 million Americans suffering from lupus, including my stepdaughter, the lovely Katharine Lehtinen, we still do not know what causes lupus. It is a cruel and mysterious disease.

We know that almost 28,000 people are suffering from lupus in my south Florida community. While that disease cuts across racial, gender, and social lines, we do know that lupus disproportionately impacts women and ethnic minority populations.

So I'm extremely grateful for the outreach and the advocacy of the Lupus Foundation of America and especially its southeast Florida chapter. As cochair of the Congressional Lupus Caucus, I will keep up the fight against this terrible disease, and I extend my deepest gratitude to Amy Kelly-Yalden and everyone in the southeast Florida chapter for their continued incredible work.

Let's continue to work together in a bipartisan way to avoid a government shutdown, and I thank the gentleman for yielding me the time.

Mr. POE of Texas. Reclaiming my time, I want to spend some time talking about what I think and believe has become a scourge—a scourge not only in America, but in other parts of the world.

Several years ago, I had the opportunity to be in the Ukraine. I was there on some energy issues, and I came in contact with that scourge that I will talk about today.

The Ukraine, because of its location, because of its former Soviet connections, and because of its high poverty, has a problem that a lot of countries do—and that's human trafficking. I'm not talking about people going from one country to another legally or even illegally. I'm talking about people

being trafficked to other locations for sex slavery. The Ukraine is just one of many countries where this seems to be occurring.

One scenario is that young Ukrainian women looking for jobs—and people from foreign countries come to the Ukraine—they promise them a job in another country and that they will be paid a lot of money if they will go to this country and work doing whatever. They buy into that. They go to that other country, and they are forced into sex slavery. There, they are in a situation that is awful. Many of them never get out of it. The only way to get out, for some of them, is to get someone else convinced to replace them in this scourge.

The Ukraine is not the only country. It's not even one of the primary countries. But it's just one.

And so I learned about that, and I learned about the situation and what they were doing in the country of Ukraine in trying to educate young girls about this issue and how this was a trap that they could get themselves involved in.

Recently, I had the chance to be in Central America for several reasons. One was about terrorism, narcotics trafficking, drugs, et cetera. But I also came upon a situation in Central America in the nation of Costa Rica that's a little different, but not really that different than what's taking place in Europe and in North Africa, and that is the plight, once again, of sex slavery, sex trafficking.

In all of Costa Rica, there is one shelter for minor sex trafficking victims. It is called Salvando Corazones. If my Spanish is correct, that means "saving hearts." It's run by an American lady who went down to Costa Rica for other purposes, found this problem, and just decided to stay. Maria is doing, I think, a tremendous job saving hearts. I call her the Mother Teresa of Central America. Her story is unbelievable—what she is doing to rescue young girls out of this sex slavery, sex trafficking that is taking place domestically in Costa Rica.

So I and Congresswoman JANICE HAHN, a Democrat from California, spent a Sunday afternoon—it was supposed to be about an hour—talking to these folks at this shelter. We spent the whole afternoon talking to these girls about their plight, what had happened to them, and what Salvando Corazones and Maria are trying to do to treat them and help them get back into a life. Because many of them had no life.

Let me explain it further.

Prostitution in Costa Rica is legal for adults. Minor prostitution is illegal. Prostitution, generally, is legal in Costa Rica. And they attract a lot of foreigners to that country, for a lot of reasons, but this is one reason: for sex tourism. People from other countries and people in Costa Rica take advantage of the legal prostitution system. And that's a debate for Americans to have at another time.

But what occurs is that once that phenomenon starts, it's an easy move for a pimp to sell a child into prostitution. Even though they're working with legal prostitution, which is also sometimes sex slavery, it's easy to move into using children.

And I asked as many people as I could—the people in the government, the people at the shelter—to tell me who these foreigners are that come to this nation for sex tourism. And they all really just told me the same thing: it's Americans. It's primarily Americans—Europeans and other countries as well—for the legal prostitution.

But then you have these young girls that get caught in this system that are sold into trafficking by everybody that comes in contact with them. Sometimes it's their own family members. And so this shelter run by Maria tries to rescue these young girls and salvage their lives and, as the saying goes, save their hearts.

I have a lot of examples. Time doesn't permit for me to go but only an hour. We can't have filibusters in the House of Representatives. But during this hour I just want to mention some of the situations and try to focus on how sex trafficking, human trafficking of children, affects Americans and what may be some things that we need to be aware of. And I have changed all the names of these girls because I respect their privacy.

Abigail was born in Miami. Her father was a Costa Rican. Her mother was from New York. At the age of 5, Mr. Speaker, her father began sexually assaulting her. At 8, she had her first injection of heroin to keep her quiet during sex. She was removed from public school and kept out of school because teachers were getting suspicious.

Then, at the age of 11, she was sent by her father to Costa Rica so he could have her shared with other people. Generally, the family members. She got pregnant twice and decided that if all she was good for was sex and the people who really loved her treated her this way, she might as well turn to prostitution. So she did.

She started when she was 11. She was eventually found at a bus stop, apparently strung out on drugs, barely hanging onto life. She was rescued by this organization and treated with the dignity that she deserved. And the process now is a success story. After she was home-schooled by Maria, she began the healing process. And now she's older, she's sober, and she's married, and a child is on the way. That's a success story of someone that was put into international sex trafficking.

At the age of 5—another 5-year-old—Diana was sold by her mother for a cell phone in Costa Rica. She was sold every week, for over a year, until somebody saw the problem and complained to the government. She was actually raised thinking this was a normal lifestyle for a 5-year-old. The staff at Salvando Corazones rescued her, and they're working with her today. I had

the chance to meet her. A remarkable person.

Felicia was raped by her stepfather, gave birth at 13 to her brother's child, and is now pregnant again at 16. She was sold by her stepfather to someone who wanted to put her to work on the streets. Her stepfather thought, this is easy money for me to sell my stepdaughter on the streets of Costa Rica. She recently was rescued and is at this safe house.

Of course, we need to understand that these girls are tough. They're tough victims to work with. If you talk to anybody, including the numerous groups in the United States working especially with these young women, they're hard victims. They're mad at the world. They have a lot of hate and anger. Of course they do. Who wouldn't, being treated this way from a mere infant?

And so I just want to make it clear to Americans that these victims are hard to work with. Understandably, we can see why they are in the situation that they are in.

Why have they become victims? The reason, Mr. Speaker, boils down to one word: demand. There is the demand to abuse these young girls for money. And the demand being money—the pimp sells the girl so he can get money—and the demand being the customer.

There's three people in this scenario. There is the trafficker that goes around trafficking these young women either domestically or internationally. On the other end is the victim. And she is a victim. She is not a criminal. She is not a prostitute. She's forced into this conduct.

□ 1715

But in the center is the person who demands that service and is willing to pay for it. I'm going to spend the rest of my time mentioning the demand and what needs to be done about that.

Beatriz, she was just 14 and was brought to Costa Rica from Nicaragua, an internationally trafficked child, to work in a home, similar to the young lady that I mentioned in the Ukraine—promised a job in another country. She's going to help her family, good person, but she's trapped once she gets into that foreign country and that is not what she's going to get as a job. But that's what she was promised, that you could get a job in Costa Rica. You're from Nicaragua, you're poor, you don't have any money; I've got a job waiting for you in Costa Rica.

So she goes, had the thought of helping her family out, and instead she was trapped into sex trafficking and forced into prostitution. She was sold in hotels, brothels, and luxury condos, and she had to have sex with men up to 17 times a day for money. She was gang-raped by foreigners, she was tortured into compliance by her pimp, and she was drugged so that she would comply. That is slavery, Mr. Speaker, forced slavery in the name of money.

There was a young mother from Mexico named Alma. She came to the

United States to work in 2009. She, like many others who come here looking for a better opportunity, wanted to help her family. She paid a coyote to help her cross the border into my home State of Texas. Her ultimate destination was South Carolina, but the coyote wanted to stop in Houston for some other business. Alma arrived at what she thought was a safe house in my congressional district, in an area of what is called Spring Branch. She later discovered that this wasn't a safe house at all. She said it was a living hell—the home of the leader of a human trafficking ring in Houston, Texas.

Alma and some others that had been trafficked were all told that they had to give the trafficker information, because the information they gave was about their families so the trafficker could hold them for ransom because they were kidnapped. The trafficker made the ransom calls to the families demanding money. The problem was, with Alma, her family had no money. She was held in that safe house as a hostage, in that prison—living hell—and she was sexually assaulted numerous times.

The family, like I said, could not afford to pay any money, and so the trafficker used her as a sex slave. She was sold to customers who had the demand for that activity. Eventually, though, she was arrested, and she was glad she was arrested. Law enforcement did a good job—went after the trafficker, got him, got Alma and rescued her. She believed that she would have been killed or certainly further abused had she not been rescued by the police. Other than the name, it's a real person, real victim, trafficked internationally into the United States.

Unfortunately, many victims are not rescued. Some certainly are not rescued very quickly at all, and they face the daily abuse of being a slave.

Who are the individuals that traffic these victims? Well, they cover a lot of individuals. You have the drug cartels, for example, and the criminal gangs. They traffic young women, and they do it for money as well.

The thing about using a sex slave, there's more money involved in sex slavery than there is bringing drugs into the United States. I mean, you bring drugs into the United States, it's a one-time deal. You get the money. As the bad guy, you're gone, you're captured, you go to prison. I used to be a judge. I sent a lot of them to prison. But with sex slavery, the trafficker has the ability to use the slave more than once, and there's a lot of money. And the risk of what punishment may happen to the trafficker is really less than in selling drugs.

So you have the drug cartels. You have criminal gangs, like the one I mentioned with Alma. You have individuals doing this. You have family members doing this, either trafficking these kids in their own country or moving them to foreign countries.

And it's happening worldwide, Mr. Speaker. It's not just happening in a handful of countries. I don't know the estimate of the number of people human trafficked throughout the world, but the numbers are staggering from what I do hear.

I'd like to mention one other person from Texas. Cheryl grew up in an abusive home. She was sexually and physically abused by her father. Her mother left when Cheryl was young to escape the abuse by this abusive male. So at the age of 12, Cheryl ran away. Some of these victims turn out to start as run-aways from home. She began hitchhiking with truck drivers and anyone else that would take her. This led her to end up being with a motorcycle group, a biker club, and she was taken advantage of by those individuals.

One of those individuals became a trafficker. So what happened to her, after she left home at 12, she was forced to dance at a strip club by day, and then at night she was sold on the streets. She was in this world of human trafficking. She was not a criminal; she was a victim. We need to make sure that's understood. She had no idea how to get any help because of the abuse that the trafficker would instill on her if she tried to leave.

It actually happened that she was performing at a strip club and one of the patrons figured out she was not an adult. She was 15 by then, after all these 3 years of abuse. One of the patrons helped her escape.

There's a long road to recovery and restoration, but Cheryl's a survivor, and she has personally founded the Mission at Serenity Ranch to help other victims of human trafficking.

So those are some examples, Mr. Speaker, of some real individuals.

When Ms. HAHN and myself were visiting those young girls in Costa Rica, their shelter, like I said, is the only one in the country. It's up in the mountains. It's hard to get to. We complained a little bit—I did—about the rough road, the dirt road going up into the mountain to visit this shelter. After visiting with those girls, we didn't complain anymore about the rain, the roads. When we left, we just thought about those girls. I call them girls because they were girls; they're minors. I believe the youngest one that I talked to that day was 10 and the oldest was 13.

When we left, all we could talk about—we didn't really talk much at all—was about the plight of how here we are in the year 2013, how humanity maybe has progressed in some areas, but in the area of slavery, sex slavery, it's maybe getting worse. It has become a scourge.

So, does it just happen in other places? No, sir, it does not. I've already mentioned Houston. Houston, because of its location, is one of the hubs in the United States for sex trafficking. It's close to the Mexican border, the Gulf of Mexico. It's an international city. Young girls are brought there, and

adult women, and trafficked to other parts of the United States.

So what happens? Well, the police will raid a prostitution ring, let's say. They will arrest the trafficker, the pimp. They will arrest the victim, even though, in many cases, she was forced into prostitution. They put the victim in the criminal justice system—usually the juvenile justice system, but it's still the criminal justice system. They go to jail.

And here's one of the reasons why—and I'm not faulting the police, because I know a lot of police officers and a lot of them that work in this area; tough assignment. But, Mr. Speaker, there's no place to put them. There's no place where that police officer can take that 12-year-old trafficked victim that has been forced into prostitution, either domestically or internationally. There is no place to put them at all.

I understand from SPCA that there are about 5,000 animal shelters in the United States. That's great. I have dalmatians. I've gotten dalmatians from Operation Rescue, from a shelter, from the SPCA, so I think that's a good thing that we've got those shelters for animals.

But in the United States, for minor sex trafficking victims, there are 226 beds. That's it. That's all there is. So the police officer often doesn't have a place to take this victim, a minor sex trafficked victim, except put them in jail for their safety and for other purposes.

You can see a lot of problems with putting them in jail. First, they have a criminal record even though they are not a criminal at all. They're forced into this. So that doesn't make them a criminal. That makes them a victim. They have a criminal record. They're put in the criminal justice system. Once they're in the criminal justice system, they stay in the criminal justice system because there's no place to put them.

I will put into the RECORD the statistics I have obtained of the 226 beds for minor sex trafficked victims, where it comes from, different organizations, Shared Hope, et cetera.

SHELTERS FOR DOMESTIC MINOR SEX TRAFFICKING VICTIMS IN THE U.S.

According to a provider survey conducted by Shared Hope International, ECPAT-USA, and the Protection Project in conjunction with Children at Risk as part of their 2012 National Colloquium on shelters and services, there are 226 beds for domestic minor sex trafficking victims in the U.S.

According to a survey conducted by Polaris Project from January–June 2012, there are 348 beds in the U.S. designated specifically for sex trafficking victims.

There are about 5,000 community animal shelters nationwide according to the ASPCA.

So that is a problem we need to work on—finding places to put them when they are rescued—and having a mindset changed in this country that we as Americans see this situation in three parts:

We see the trafficker;

We see the demand, the customer—I'll get back to that person again in a minute;

But we see this third person as a prostitute, no, but a victim, yes, and treat them as a victim, and we can go a long way helping stop this problem of the scourge of human trafficking.

So I've introduced legislation, bipartisan legislation, with CAROLYN MALONEY, a Democrat. CAROLYN MALONEY has been working on this trafficking issue before I was ever in Congress. But we've introduced the End Sex Trafficking Act, along with KAY GRANGER from Texas, RICK NOLAN, and KRISTI NOEM in the House. On the Senate side, it's bipartisan as well. Senator JOHN CORNYN and Senator AMY KLOBUCHAR have the same bill in the Senate.

What does it do? Well, let me mention this. The United States spent about \$25 million in 2010 on domestic antitrafficking. The United States spent \$85 million on international efforts to stop human trafficking. Yes, there is more for international trafficking issues, helping those, than there is in the United States, \$25 million.

That is a number, but in the big scheme of things, what is \$25 million? Well, I understand a Predator costs \$25 million. The United States spent \$25 million teaching pottery classes in Morocco. About \$25 million was given to Pakistan for their schools. I'm just saying how much \$25 million is. It's not a lot of money, but that's how much money was spent in the United States in 2010 on this issue.

□ 1730

So what we want to do is to expand that amount of money. I'll show you how we are going to do it without raising taxpayer money. But specifically talking about the End Sex Trafficking Act that we've introduced.

Here's what the Federal law does. If the trafficker, a bona fide human trafficker gets caught, Federal law is tough. These Federal judges, God bless them, they are really nailing these traffickers, as they should. I mean, they are the scum of the Earth, these people that sell little girls—and boys too—for sex slavery.

On the other end, of course, we are not doing a whole lot to find homes, shelters, for the young girls. But the person that escapes, really, prosecution is the person in the middle—the customer. So what we have done in this bill, the End Sex Trafficking Act, we are going after the customer, the demand, because as I mentioned earlier, that is the root of all this evil, is that there is the demand for it. All we do is we apply the same Federal laws to the trafficker to the customer—sure there has got to be a Federal nexus. Interstate commerce has got to be involved. We are talking about only Federal cases, we are not talking about State cases—so that the demand is decreased by punishment because, as we all know, we've seen the reports of when a prosecution ring is busted somewhere, not involved in trafficking necessarily, you find out the name of the pimp and

how careful we go out of our way to protect the identity of the person that's the customer. Well, those days are going to end if we get this legislation because those customers are going to be able to be punished under the law for buying sex, giving that money to a trafficker to have sex with minor children in the United States. So that's what we do in this bill. The days of "boys being boys," they're gone, hopefully. We can make sure that they are gone by making sure that they're held accountable for the actions that they chose to voluntarily do.

As I mentioned, I used to be a criminal court judge in Texas. If I had my way and I was writing the law the way I thought it would be best to stop the demand, these people who are convicted, they would not only go to jail—you talk about having photographs on the Internet—we would have the photograph of the customer, the person that abused the child that had been sold into sex slavery. That would slow that down. It would slow the demand down if we started publicizing who those people were if they were convicted. If there was no demand, there would be less supply. The demand is the answer, I think, Mr. Speaker, into going in after stopping the scourge on the United States and other countries.

There are over 100 organizations that support this bipartisan legislation. I would like to put the names of these 100 organizations into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

That's the first step: hold a person who buys this girl—this crime—accountable for their conduct.

But let's go back to the victims of the crime. The victims of the crime need help as well. In fact, that should be our first priority, rescuing those victims. I told you about how many shelters there are in the United States, or beds, less than 300 beds for minor sex trafficking victims exclusively. We need places to take these young women primarily and help them regain some life because life had been stolen from them.

How do we do that? I mentioned to you we spend \$25 million a year on domestic sex trafficking victims, about \$85 million a year, foreign countries receive that. We are introducing soon the Justice for Victims of Trafficking Act. Once again, CAROLYN MALONEY from New York—bipartisan—is the cosponsor in the House. I mention "bipartisan" for a lot of reasons. This is a bipartisan issue. But CAROLYN MALONEY, she and I don't see a lot alike on a lot of issues. I mean, we disagree on a lot of things. We don't even speak the same language. I mean, she's from New York, I'm from Texas. We need an interpreter when we talk to each other.

But this issue it is an American issue. I appreciate the work she's done, and others on both sides, on focusing in on trying to solve this problem. And once again, JOHN CORNYN in the Senate is leading the efforts over there.

So what we are going to do on this legislation is try to fix current law, a

law that was first originated, I think, by CHRIS SMITH from New Jersey years ago.

Let me explain to you the problem with this. When a victim from another country is trafficked into the United States—and let's use a girl, a young girl—because she is from a foreign country, and she is trafficked internationally into the United States—and if she is rescued she is able to receive certain services from Health and Human Services—she can be certified as a human trafficking victim. Once she receives that certification that she is actually a trafficking victim, there are certain services available to her, but only to international victims.

So this law will say, look, we are going to treat international victims, yes, help them, but if it's a domestic victim they're going to be able to receive those same services, and shelters will be able to receive those same services as an international trafficking victim. So once they can obtain certification that they are a trafficking victim, then they can apply and receive those same services as well.

But also we want to be able to have funding for the shelters that we need throughout the country. Mr. Speaker, I'm not going to talk to you about raising taxes—that's not the issue—or even taxpayer money.

How are we going to come up with some money for grants for these nonprofits throughout the country that are really doing as good a job as they can but are short on money? Well, let's go back to the courthouse. We have got people that are coming down to the courthouse that are being convicted of being involved in human trafficking. We get the customers involved in punishment, as well as the trafficker.

This legislation would require that these criminals pay rent on the courthouse. They'll pay for the crime that they have committed, the system they have created. Not just with going off to the penitentiary, the Do Right Hotel, but they are going to pay into a fund—\$5,000 will go into a fund. This fund then will be money that will be open for grants, going through the grant process of the Federal Government, for nonprofit organizations and other organizations, other government entities, to receive for funding to help the victims.

The money is needed. We are spending \$25 million. Let's get some more. Let's punish those criminals, make them pay for it, go to prison, hold them accountable, pay the fine. And, of course, the fine would come after restitution. There will be restitution to the victim. Federal judges know how to do all of those things. Then the money would go into the fund that would go to trafficking victims, similar to the VOCA fund concept that was used or began several years ago where criminals generally in Federal Court pay into a crime victims compensation fund. That money then goes to crime victims. But this would be a special

fund that those people convicted of those dastardly crimes would be required to pay into.

That's the basis of the bill. Let's try to get a grip on this issue—hold people accountable, hold the trafficker accountable, hold the person that is the customer accountable, and then rescue the victim and treat her with the dignity that she deserves as a human being and get them out of that slavery that they have been trapped into. We will soon introduce that legislation in the House and in the Senate.

Mr. Speaker, this conduct that I have talked about I would hope would concern Americans. As I mentioned, I spent a lot of time at the courthouse in Houston, first as a prosecutor, 22 years as a criminal court judge, saw a lot of victims of crime, a lot of children, a lot of those cases, many of these cases, were crimes that were sexual assault.

Sexual assault cases are a unique type of case, Mr. Speaker. Sexual assault cases against minors have a dramatic impact on the minor. Sexual assault against minors that have been trafficked into slavery, I don't know of anything worse because of the repetition of the crime that is committed against that child.

These traffickers, when they commit these crimes, these assaults, on young women primarily, boys as well, or older adults who are still forced into prostitution, that is a sexual assault, it is a crime. When a person commits the crime of sexual assault against another, it is more than a physical crime. It is a crime where the perpetrator tries to steal the soul, the very life, the very heart of the victim, and sometimes, Mr. Speaker, they are successful.

That is why sexual assault is such a horrific crime, because it goes after the inner being of the victim. That's why it ought to bother us that that occurs. It ought to bother us that what's taking place in other parts of the world—whether it's in Europe, central South America, and in the United States—against children, it ought to make us mad so that we can do something about it and hold people accountable.

Congressman JIM COSTA and myself—a Democrat from California and I—started the Victims' Rights Caucus several years ago in 2005, bipartisan, to try to help victims of crime. We have a lot of Members on it—almost 100. We are focusing on this issue of minor sex trafficking victims in the United States, and in other countries, to try to get them rescued—to take them to shelters like Mario runs in Central America, the same type.

When Ms. HAHN and I were there at this shelter talking to these girls they were happy to see us—really happy to see Ms. HAHN. She just has that personality. You know, I'm kind of a grumpy old guy from Texas. They were pleased that somebody actually cared about them, and they made us things. I have a bracelet that a young girl made for me—Ms. HAHN has one too. They tied it

on our wrist. I get a lot of things. I have 10 grandkids. They make me things. I wear this bracelet for a lot of reasons. One, because a child gave it to me that had just horrible things happen to her in her life.

It is important for us—with all of the issues we've got to deal with here in Congress in the United States—that we get back to some basics about how other people in this country are treated. When they are not treated right we need to be upset about it. In this case, we need to hold people accountable for doing things to kids.

We can do that. We can make things better—treat victims like they're victims, hold criminals accountable, stop the demand for minor sex trafficking by putting those folks in jail, making them pay into a fund that goes to grants that will end up in the hands of shelters that try to help these kids, and some other things.

Awareness is very important. It has been said by a lot of people over the years that when we are judged, either as a Nation, Congress, country, we are not judged by the way we treat important folks, we are not going to be judged by the way we treat the rich, the famous, the powerful.

□ 1745

We are going to be judged by the way we treat the poor, the unfortunate, the elderly, children, and victims of human suffering.

I hope we are judged well.

I hope we see the American conscience raised to a level of: this is important. Children are important in this country, and those who have had bad things happen to them, we're going to be concerned about it and not just walk over, as the Good Book says, on the other side of the road and pass them by.

And that's just the way it is.

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

American Association of University Women (AAUW), American Bar Association (ABA), Americans Overseas Domestic Violence Crisis Center, Araminta Freedom Initiative, Attorney General of Texas Greg Abbott, Aware, Inc., Breaking Free, Coalition Against Trafficking in Women Child Justice, Inc., Child Welfare League of America, Children's Advocacy Institute-Sacramento, Children's Assessment Center-Houston, Children's Defense Fund, Children at Risk, Council on Church Financial Integrity.

County Welfare Directors Association of California, Courtney's House, Covenant House International, Crittenton Services for Children and Families, Division of Indian Work, Erik L. Bauer, Attorney at Law, WA, Empire State Coalition of Youth and Family Services, End Child Prostitution and Trafficking-USA Equality4Women, Equality Now, Florida Coalition Against Trafficking, Foster Family-based Treatment, Association Fraternal Order of Police, Futures Without Violence, Georgia Women For a Change, Inc., Girls for Gender Equity.

Give Way to Freedom, Harris County, TX Sheriff Adrian Garcia, Heartland Girls Ranch, Human Rights Project for Girls, Illinois Victims.org, Innocents at Risk, International Association of Chiefs of Police,

International Initiative to End Child Labor, Jesse Duplantis Ministries, Jewish Women International, Junior League of Seattle, Lakewood Church, Lauren's Kids, Lutheran Social Services of New England MaleSurvivor.

Maryland Human Trafficking Taskforce, Men Can Stop Rape, Minnesota Alliance on Crime, Minnesota Indian Women's Resource Center, Minnesota Indian Women's Sexual Assault Coalition, Multnomah County, OR Department of Community Justice, Nancy O'Malley, District Attorney, Alameda County, CA, National Alliance to End Sexual Violence (NAESV), National Association for Children's Behavioral Health, National Association of Council for Children, National Association of County Human Services Administrators, National Association of Police Organizations, Inc., National CASA Association, National Center for Housing and Child Welfare.

National Children's Alliance, National Coalition Against Domestic Violence, National Council of Juvenile and Family Court Judges, National District Attorneys Association, National Domestic Violence Hotline, National Network to End Domestic Violence (NNEDV), National Network for Youth (NN4Y), National Organization for Victim Assistance (NOVA), National Organization of Women, National Task Force to End Sexual and Domestic Violence, New Media Company, New York State Anti-Trafficking Coalition NOMI Network, PACE Center for Girls.

People Against Violent Crime, Perhaps Kids Meeting Kids Can Make a Difference, Pierce County, WA Coalition Against Trafficking, PROTECT, Sanctuary for Families, Saving Innocence, Sensibilities Prevention Services, Sex Trafficking Survivors United, Shared Hope International, Sheriff Marlin Gusman, Sheriff of New Orleans Sheriff Thomas Dart, Cook County Illinois Sheriff Southeast King County, WA Coalition Against Trafficking, State Senator Jeanne Kohl-Welles, Washington District 36.

State Senator Sandra L. Pappas, Minnesota District 48 and President of Senate, Street Grace, Susan D. Reed, District Attorney, Bexar County, TX, Texas Association Against Sexual Assault (TAASA), Texas CASA, The Advocates for Human Rights, The Center for Children & Youth Justice The Demand Project, The Family Partnership, The Freedom Center of New Orleans, The National Crittenton Foundation, The NYC Association of Runaway, Homeless, and Street-Involved Youth Organizations.

The Protection Project, The Women's Center of Tarrant County, The Women's Foundation of Minnesota, To Love Children Educational Foundation International, Inc., Washington Engage, Witness Justice, World Hope International, World Vision International, YouthCare youthSpark/A Future. Not A Past.

BUDGET AUTONOMY FOR DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA AMIDST THREAT OF GOVERNMENT SHUTDOWN

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MASSIE). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2013, the Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia (Ms. NORTON) for 30 minutes.

Ms. NORTON. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Last week, the Nation's Capital—the District of Columbia—was in great grief and pain as we lost 12 employees at the Washington Navy Yard on Monday. I want to thank Members who

have expressed their condolences when they've seen me here.

Tuesday, I was on this floor for a moment of silence with four Members of Congress who had served in the Navy even though this is actually a naval installation which houses, largely, Federal civilian employees of the Naval Sea Systems Command. Sunday, I was at a memorial service for the 12 with the President and other Members of Congress and a large group of friends and families of the 12. Yesterday, I attended the funeral of Arthur Lee Daniels, a most sobering and sad funeral of a man who supported his wife and children and who was much beloved by them. He was the breadwinner, and now he is gone.

All during that week, however Mr. Speaker, there was another cloud hanging over this city that I could not forget, that, strange as it may seem, the shutdown threat facing the Federal Government was also facing the District of Columbia. We are talking about a local budget and a budget that, by rights, should not be in the Congress at all. September 30 is the end of the fiscal year. That is Monday—4 days away. The prospect of a government shutdown increases as each day passes. All that we hear here are permutations on the conditions that have now been put on the congressional resolution for keeping the government open, so I cannot assume that there will not be a shutdown, at least, for a short period of time. Considering the shutdown of 1995, anyone who reads history or who was here then, I think, would not want that to happen again.

The cost of a shutdown to the Nation's Capital according to the figures from 2011—the cost of a shutdown threat, because the government has not shut down in recent years, but there were three possible shutdowns in 2011. The cost of a shutdown was \$131,000 to the District of Columbia and 3,000 staff hours. That's money and time that should be spent on running a big city.

I am sure Members must be saying, Well, what is it that the District of Columbia did to make the Congress want its budget to come to the Congress? Because that's anathema to most Members of Congress. I think most Members of Congress would almost rather repeat the Revolution of our forefathers rather than see one's local budget here before Members who know nothing of it and have nothing to do with it and don't have a dime in it. This is a matter of history and anachronism that nobody should be proud of.

We are talking about a local budget of \$8 billion in local money, and there is not anything about the D.C. budget that has summoned it to the Congress. It comes because it has always come. It's on automatic pilot, despite a budget autonomy referendum that has been overwhelmingly passed in the city, despite my budget autonomy bill, despite my statehood bill; but we are only talking about the local budget now, about local budget autonomy.

So, my friends, I can say there is nothing about the D.C. budget that causes it to be here. On the contrary, the District of Columbia has a \$1.5 billion reserve. It puts money in its reserves every year—in good times and bad times. That is one of the largest reserves in the United States today. Most jurisdictions would be proud to have any reserve at all these days. So far from there being something about the D.C. budget, there ought to be a resolution on this floor that commends the District of Columbia for how it has handled its local budget. Its budget was submitted here, on time. The budget was in such good shape that it was easily approved by both appropriations committees. There it sits in the House and Senate, along with Federal appropriations—although the District budget alone among them is not a Federal appropriation. It is a local budget.

So in this matter that ties the city up in the Congress, there is no budget issue. Indeed, the appropriators have never interfered or tried to change the local budget. There is no way they could do so. A local budget is put together with great delicacy after local subcommittee hearings and other hearings and negotiations between the council and the Mayor, with trimmings here and additions there. No one would dare touch it. In my more than 20 years in Congress—and most of my time has been spent in the minority—no one on either side of the aisle has attempted to get into the innards of the District budget.

I have every confidence in the District budget because the District of Columbia has something that no other jurisdiction in the United States has. It has an independent chief financial officer who serves on a 5-year term and who cannot be fired by the Mayor or city council except for cause, and you know what "cause" means. He is independent. You can't spend money unless he passes off on it. The money isn't available unless he says so. Of course, there is the same kind of discretion that your own local jurisdictions have to spend money, but it's not nearly the kind of discretion you're used to. Indeed, no political figure—no other mayor or council or local legislature—has a chief financial officer who gets the final say on budgetary matters.

You see, there is nothing that any Member could raise about the budget. If anything, the District budget is subject to a kind of scrutiny that no Member's local budget is. There are Members in this body whose local or state budgets are balanced only by straws and fluff. Ours is a balanced budget that has had the sanction not only of a Mayor and a city council, but of a chief financial officer.

So, you say, there must be some good motive here. After all, who would want to bring a big, complicated city to its knees for nothing. The answer, my friends, is: no one. There is no one in this body or in the other body who has called for or made a statement that

would lead you to believe that she is for the present predicament of the District of Columbia's, allowing the city to close down if the Federal Government shuts down.

Nor is this one of the usual ideological or philosophical differences between the two sides where Democrats and Republicans have deep differences on matters like their budgets or health care or the rest—not this one. No one complains about the budget and how it is put together. No ideological or philosophical differences have been raised; and if there were some, I think there would have been no hesitation in raising them.

So there is nothing in D.C.'s local budget for any Member of this House. There is nothing in a threat of a shutdown for any Member of the House. There is nothing in a shutdown, itself, and here I am referring to a local government shutdown. Part of the reason it goes on is that most Members don't pay attention to any local jurisdiction, even one right in their faces—the Nation's Capital's budget. That's not what they've been sent here to do. Most don't even know about it. I'm sure they don't care about it.

So this historic anomaly, doing great damage to the city, continues. Worse, this matter with our local budget here now, facing the great Nation's Capital with a shutdown, violates every principle of federalism. My colleagues on the other side stand on federalism, it would appear, above all other matters; and I should think they would be the first to want the local budget out of the hands of the "big foot" Federal Government. On my side of the aisle, there are deep feelings about local control as well.

Put yourself in my position. How would any Member of this House feel or react if its local money had to pass any eyes in this Chamber who had nothing to do with raising that local money? I don't have the words to say what you would say in that circumstance. If this government were founded on any principle, it was founded on the principle of federalism, and if there is any meaning to federalism, it begins with money: no taxation without representation.

You, Members of the House and Senate, elected by your constituents, don't get to say what my constituents do with their own money. That's a basic principle of American federalism.

The gentlelady from Texas.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. I was in my office, Congresswoman, and I could not help but both agree and hear you.

I wanted to come just to applaud you for, first of all, restoring and educating this House on the issues of federalism, local control, and also of reintroducing them to Washington, D.C., which gained local control and gained the right to elect its local officials. Also—maybe most people don't know—it has an operational budget that is balanced and that, in actuality, could continue to run its services for its people, as the Congresswoman has indicated, but for

the pass-through that is required here in the House of Representatives.

□ 1800

I simply wanted to come and applaud you and say a government shutdown is for naught. It is not good for anyone, and it is shameful that it is tied to the defunding of ObamaCare when the millions of Washingtonians, who are here, who dutifully provide for this House and this Senate and all of those who come in and out of Washington, D.C., the millions of tourists, the international guests, that we would dare tell them, without a vote, without a voice, in terms of the voting voice, to say not only are we shutting down the government that is going to hurt all of America, we're going to shut you down and you're in local control with your own monies, ready to run, ready to help, ready to provide for the safety and security of the comings and goings of those who work in the Federal Government in the House of Representatives.

So I could not miss the opportunity to again reinforce my commitment to the legitimacy of Washington, its right to a voting representative in both the House and the Senate, and, as well, the fact that you make a very potent argument, because in many of our jurisdictions, city government may still be operating. Of course, many people will be hurt—Social Security, the military, veterans, the soldiers' families who don't get a paycheck. What the Congresswoman is saying, and I want to add to that, insult to injury coming from this shutdown is the fact that a whole city would not be able to operate the Nation's Capital where people are now heading to by airplane for whatever visits they may have—tourists, international guests.

I just met with an international leader today. They will all be coming to a city that will literally be shut down because my Republican friends want to defund ObamaCare and don't have the respect to give you the waiver, the position that you have asked for to make sure that Washington, D.C., runs.

I thank you for alarming us. I hope that as we enter into our discussions tomorrow that we will raise this issue and that those of good common sense will come to their senses not only for the people of the District of Columbia in hearing your plea, but they'll come to their senses for the American people and keep this government running.

Ms. NORTON. I thank the gentlelady from Texas, who, in her generosity, has come down to speak from the point of view of another Member who isn't facing this in her own jurisdiction but understands what we are facing from the Federal Government and how it must indeed be. I thank you very much for your generosity and for those very insightful statements about our predicament.

Indeed, before I recognized the gentlelady, I was speaking about federalism. Essentially, our forefathers

and foremothers distrusted Federal power. Nothing is more alien to Federal power than a local budget. I can't imagine that they would have abided that under any circumstances for the District of Columbia or any other city. This country is, in many ways, State and local-oriented, not Federal oriented. We need the Federal Government, we can't do without it; but as to our principles, we set up a Republic that separated local and State matters from Federal matters, and of those matters none is more salient than matters affecting the purse.

The District does not regard itself as a hostage. We are not a hostage to this fight. If that were the case, we would try to negotiate our way out of it or give up. But we're not a part of this fight. When you're a hostage, somebody would say something about you or they would want something and they're using you to get it, but they're not. No one has claimed the District of Columbia as some link to the disputes that are going on here between the administration and Congress.

We face a no-exit, no-way-out proposition because there's nothing we could, ourselves, do. There's nothing for us to give. There's no concession for us to make that would free us. We've got to depend upon the goodwill of the Speaker of the House of the majority, leader of the House of the majority, majority leader of the Senate and the minority leader of the Senate, their leadership, this leadership, and, of course, of our own minority leadership and the Members of the House and the Senate.

I cannot believe they do not identify with me as I stand here trying to get recognition for my city to spend its own money. I believe if they put themselves in my place, there would be enough generosity in this body to agree that wherever we stand on the dispute before us, the District of Columbia is not a part of it and should not be dragged into it.

This is a big, complicated city. It's run well. Its budget and reserves show that. The Federal Government, unlike the Nation's Capital, does not deliver direct services. That's what big cities and small towns do. A Federal shutdown will have its effects throughout the country because we've got almost 3 million Federal workers, and they will feel it first and foremost; and some of the services that the American people regard as essential, but which are not considered essential by the Office of Personnel Management, some of those services will not be available. But those are not like the services that many of you who live in the District of Columbia, Members of Congress, depend upon from the District of Columbia, like picking up your trash and garbage, for example. Even that would be stopped.

Who would be affected, therefore? Well, clearly the 600,000 plus—actually, it's close to 625,000 residents now because the District has been gaining

population at a rate of about 1,000 a month. That speaks to how well the city is doing. That's how attractive the city is to people moving to this area. It clearly serves, first and foremost, its own citizens; but the District of Columbia is the Nation's Capital and serves private businesses. It serves Federal officials, visitors, Federal buildings, and foreign embassies. The circle is very broad of those who will feel any shutdown of the District of Columbia.

Moreover, our finances, which have been doing so well, could be very negatively affected. The city has financing agreements of various kinds, such as a master equipment lease, for example. Like every city, it leases a wide variety of equipment, like some traffic lights and automobiles and public safety vehicles, and it has certificates of participation on some of its buildings, like its command center for public safety. All of those could face a default if a payment is due while a shutdown occurs. Of course, if that occurs, if they miss a payment, then, of course, under the terms of these agreements, the bondholders must be notified, and that would drive up the city's costs.

Is there a Member that even knows this? Surely there are Members who would care that this unintended effect would lead to such serious results.

Wall Street already penalizes the District because its budget has to come here at all. When your budget is not final when it is passed by your local officials, it has to come to a body like the Congress of the United States, even at its most stable, the fact of dual sanctions to approve a budget costs the city on Wall Street, not withstanding its handsome reserves.

I'm not asking the Congress to do the unprecedented. Eighteen years ago when the government shut down—and it was shut down for a week—I went to Speaker Gingrich and asked him not to allow the District to shut down again. There were partial shutdowns, but each time a CR came. He included the District in the CR, and I'm asking for that relief, as well, from the House. It was a House and Senate in Republican hands and an administration in Democratic hands—it was also a polarized time—yet the District of Columbia was kept open.

There are remedies. We are included in the pending congressional resolution because, thanks to the appropriators for the last 10 years, if there is a congressional resolution or, for that matter, a bill, the District of Columbia can spend its local funds at next year's levels. That's not a big favor to the District of Columbia because, remember, we are not a Federal agency, which can only spend at the present year levels. But it was an important thing to do because it had calamitous effects, when the District could not move ahead with its own appropriations as planned and with contracts and with schools and with the many different operations that were affected, when you couldn't

spend at the next year's level which you had approved and had been approved by your chief financial officer.

So I've had three bills. One was to amend the CR so that if it turns out to last until December 15 or if it turns out to be a week from now, whatever it is, the District would not have to lurch from CR to CR in short-term CRs. We've asked that the District be permitted to spend its funds for the 2014 fiscal year.

Then I also have an independent bill that would allow the same remedy—not part of the CR—that the leadership could bring to the floor simply to allow the District to spend for the 2014 fiscal year, same terms, nothing changed, exactly what is now in the appropriation that is pending, except that it could now go forward for the next fiscal year.

Then I have a permanent no-shutdown bill.

What makes all of this so ironic is that pending, as I speak, is bicameral, bipartisan support for preventing government shutdowns.

This summer, the Oversight and Government Reform Committee and the Senate Appropriations Committee approved larger bills that contained provisions that would permanently authorize the District government to remain open and spend its local funds. The President's fiscal year 2013 budget contains the same authorization, and the appropriators in the House have acknowledged the harm done to the District by these shutdowns and asked the authorizers to proceed.

□ 1815

As we move closer to the government shutdown, the need to free the District's budget from the grasp of a dispute that shows no sign of ending has become more clear. These continuing resolutions, and the preparations for shutdown are having a punitive effect on the Nation's Capital.

The Nation's Capital is an innocent party to this Federal dispute. Only legislation like the three bills I have just named or my budget or autonomy legislation would keep the Nation's Capital from being embroiled in Federal fights. I ask Members to consider what I have said here this evening and to free the city from disputes I don't think you mean us to be a part of.

I thank the Speaker and yield back the balance of my time.

COUNCIL ON AMERICAN-ISLAMIC RELATIONS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. VALADAO). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2013, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GOHMERT) for 30 minutes.

Mr. GOHMERT. Mr. Speaker, there has been some interesting news come out. The Council on American-Islamic Relations is changing its name. There was an article in the American Thinker on September 23. This article points out that an explosive story posted Sun-

day by Charles Johnson at The Daily Caller reveals that:

CAIR has apparently been laundering money obtained from Middle East donors in violation of Federal law. While it publicly presents itself as a single organization, CAIR has, in fact, created a multitude of 501(c)(3) organizations and a 501(c)(4), CAIR Action Network. By moving donations around, CAIR may have evaded taxes and has avoided disclosure of its foreign funding sources required by the Foreign Agent Registration Act.

Quoting Johnson, "Under IRS regulations, an organization may have 501(c)(3) and 501(c)(4) related entities, but they must maintain a wall between the two; this is accomplished by establishing separate bank accounts, board of directors, bookkeeping, and payroll. CAIR, though, had none of these."

Johnson cites David Reaboi, vice president for strategic communications at Frank Gaffney's Center for Security Policy, "Plentiful legal evidence, acquired in the course of a lawsuit—plus CAIR's own official filing documents to the Department of Consumer and Regulatory Affairs (DCRA) and IRS—make clear that CAIR has engaged in a thinly-disguised money laundering operation. In addition to violating its 501(c)3 regulations, CAIR's undisclosed and hidden foreign donations amount to violation of the Foreign Agent Registration Act as well."

Guidestar reveals nine state chapters, a property holding company in California, a main office in Washington, D.C., and the CAIR Foundation. Many of these chapters have little income. The Iowa chapter—yes, there is one—has none. The Foundation was de-listed in 2011 because it failed to file the requisite IRS form 990 tax returns for the three prior years. However, in June, WND reported that while Tea Party organizations were being sandbagged by IRS, the agency quietly restored the CAIR Foundation's non-profit status following a meeting with White House officials.

Well, the article, though, points out that CAIR is changing its name. And it should also be noted that this comes on the heels of an inspector general report last week that was made public that established that the FBI had not properly followed its own directives, that it had told FBI offices that they were not to have non-investigative relations with CAIR as part of their so-called community outreach program because of the evidence that was introduced in the Holy Land Foundation trial in 2007-2008.

It should be noted that the judge in the U.S. District Court in the Holy Land Foundation trial—in which there were over 100 counts of funding terrorism, basically, that were found to have been violated, criminal violations—found that when CAIR, ISNA moved to have their name struck—there was one other name, I believe—they had been listed as unindicted co-conspirators. And they wanted to have their names removed. And the court there at the District Court refused to remove their names. So they appealed to the U.S. Fifth Circuit Court of Appeals. The U.S. Fifth Circuit Court group of judges ruled that there was plenty of evidence to support CAIR, ISNA, their names being part of the suit because the evidence was sufficient to show they were the largest Muslim Brotherhood front organizations in America.

So it is interesting when the article points out that they got their IRS non-profit status returned after they had visited with White House officials.

Which reminds me of back 2 years ago. There was a law enforcement seminar at Langley out at the CIA headquarters. And CAIR, though—at the time, the FBI was not supposed to have any relationship with them. The White House certainly had plenty of relationships with them. And they made calls to the administration, and they got these seminars eliminated out at Langley because they objected to people being taught about what radical Islam believed, what it wanted to accomplish.

And they actually got people delisted from being able to teach. One of whom, Steve Coughlin, spent many years studying radical Islam. And he used to brief our military commanders. And it was located at the Pentagon. Studied radical Islam. And then all of a sudden, because CAIR makes a phone call or two to the administration, now a man that knows a tremendous amount about radical Islam is no longer able to teach people about the dangers of radical Islam. That went well in line with CAIR's complaints that the FBI training material needed to be purged because there were things in there that they found offensive. And so things were eliminated.

Well, when MICHELE BACHMANN, TRENT FRANKS, myself, and a couple of others sent five separate letters to five different departments—the Department of State, Homeland Security, intelligence—one was to the Department of Justice. And in each letter, it set out specific facts indicating that there was at least some Muslim Brotherhood influence in that department. So the inquiry was not requesting an indictment, just an investigation about the extent of Muslim Brotherhood influence in that particular department.

The Department of Justice response indicated they had an ongoing investigation at that time, and it was with regard to the impropriety of FBI offices dealing with CAIR, despite the FBI's new policy to the contrary, since there was evidence they were a large Muslim Brotherhood front organization.

But nonetheless, some FBI offices continued to have their so-called outreach programs. One found that they had brought a couple of CAIR officials in to help teach about Islam and Muslim activities. And the relationship went on.

I asked the former FBI director why it took so long since the FBI had been gathering that information about CAIR's relationship to the Muslim Brotherhood, why it took so many years after they started gathering evidence about them to sever that partnership relationship for community outreach.

So there's no question there's Muslim Brotherhood influence in this administration. The Egyptians have pointed that out for a long time. And

even under President Morsi in Egypt, it was published that they were so proud that there were six—and they named the six—Muslim brothers who were in high positions affecting the Obama administration.

Well, since CAIR—like ACORN had before it, when ACORN was found to have engaged in improper activities and they were captured on video engaging in highly inappropriate activities, and there was a move in Congress to sever any Federal funds going to ACORN—well, they just changed their name, and established different organizations so they could still get Federal funding.

But now CAIR—and I don't know if they had seen what ACORN did so they could still get Federal funding from different other agencies—CAIR, according to this article, has changed their name, to the WTF. They changed their name to WTF. So no longer will they be CAIR for the Council on American-Islamic Relations. Now they will be WTF. CAIR has now become WTF? Well, now when people want to have relations with CAIR, they'll have to seek out WTF.

So the article also mentions the Justice Department inspector general's report. This article says, "Yesterday the Justice Department Office of Inspector General released, then yanked, then released again, its report on the FBI's questionable interaction with CAIR—sorry again, WTF. The FBI had a strict policy in place limiting its interactions with the group following revelations of CAIR's involvement with terror in the Holy Land Foundation Trial. But those policies have not been followed."

So anyway, quite interesting there.

And I see my friend from Minnesota has come to the House floor. But it is very important to know that CAIR has been found by a district court and a Federal appellate court to be a Muslim Brotherhood front organization.

□ 1830

And now, when you seek out CAIR, you'll have to seek out WTF, the Washington Trust Foundation, or WTF instead.

I'd like to yield to my friend from Minnesota (Mrs. BACHMANN).

Mrs. BACHMANN. I thank the gentleman from Texas.

You are talking about an extremely important subject because the Muslim Brotherhood has been on the rise across the world, and the Muslim Brotherhood, Mr. Speaker, as we know, is a terrorist organization.

So a terrorist organization has tried to manufacture a false front or a false facade for itself. They called themselves CAIR, or the Council on Arab Islamic Relations. They set up shop here in America. They wanted to be the voice for the Muslim community in the United States, even though they are the voice for the violent Muslim Brotherhood terrorist group, which, by the way, was outlawed in Egypt for about 30 years under former President Mubarak.

And then the Muslim Brotherhood came in. They became the party of record in Egypt. The former President of the Muslim Brotherhood became the President of Egypt, until the people of Egypt decided to go into the streets, in the largest human demonstration in history, to take their country back because they didn't want the cruelties of this organization.

It's bizarre to think that this organization, CAIR, was having any relationship of any kind with the United States Government, with the Obama administration, and with the FBI.

When you think about our chief law enforcement organization, which we all have great respect for, it's incomprehensible that the FBI would be reaching out in a so-called engagement strategy and bring in this Muslim Brotherhood front group to advise the FBI on how to deal with Muslims.

So here you have a terrorist organization that tries to put a new face on themselves, call themselves CAIR, a terrorist organization, come into the United States, and our FBI is working with them and asking CAIR to advise them on how to reach out and deal with the Muslim community? No wonder the FBI Director Mueller said, We're not going to have this anymore, and decided we wouldn't have that engagement. And it's disturbing to hear that there was continual engagement going on with this organization.

One thing that I've noticed with a lot of these organizations that have sometimes nefarious purposes—certainly CAIR would be one of those groups—what is very interesting is that a lot of times these groups do change their name. They change it to protect the guilty because people are on to them, and that's exactly what's happened with CAIR. People figured out who they are, just like you said, Representative GOHMERT, Mr. Speaker, that the CAIR organization was found to be part of this terrorist coalition and involved in terrorist financing in the Holy Land Foundation case.

So, now that this word is getting out to the American people in a mainstream way, now they change their name to WTF. Well, it's kind of self-explanatory. WTF, that will be the new acronym. But the American people are smart. It's just the same group. They changed their name to protect the guilty terrorist organization they were before, a front group they were today. It doesn't matter what their name is. WTF may be a very good name for this organization, may be a very good name, but it doesn't change and alter who they are underneath.

I'm glad that you brought that up.

Mr. GOHMERT. Reclaiming my time, it's also important to note, the American people are smart, but somebody at this administration continues to give CAIR access to the White House, to the administration, continues to listen to them.

I know the gentlelady from Minnesota and I were there to go through

the materials that were purged from FBI training materials, and you actually came back and went through some additional materials later that I didn't, the only one to have done that.

And it's interesting, again, to me that it was CAIR's complaining. Here they are, a Muslim Brotherhood front organization, according to the courts, and they complained about instruction on radical Islam and the material is removed.

At the same time, another organization, the Islamic Society of North America, ISNA, was also one of those mentioned, a named coconspirator in the Holy Land Foundation trial. And ISNA's President, Mohamed Magid, Imam Mohamed Magid, has—every time we hear about him it seems like it's another piece of influence he has had on the White House.

And I know I've even read a speech given by the Chief of Staff of the President himself, Denis McDonough, when he was the Deputy National Security Advisor. He spoke at the All Dulles Area Muslim Society, ADAMS—and I'm sure John Adams appreciates this. But he spoke at the All Dulles Area Muslim Society and thanked Imam Magid for his wonderful prayers during the Iftar celebration at the White House.

We know the head of ISNA, Imam Magid, has been in the center of the State Department, was there when President Obama gave a speech. He supposedly had helped him with his speech about the Middle East, which explains why there were problems with things the President said in his speech that were an insult to Israel and not factually accurate.

So, just as the letter that we signed, five different letters, five different statements of fact in each of those five letters, but just as they pointed out, we know there is Muslim Brotherhood influence in each of those Departments. All we were asking for, not an indictment, just please investigate your Department, as this limited IG inspection did at Justice, of the FBI, and tell us how extensive or how little the influence is. We know there's some there, so is it very little? Is it great?

It's still a legitimate question. And I think, in view of the IG report, it's time to revise our letter to the Department of Justice and make further inquiries, because there's more information the gentlelady from Minnesota and I have obtained that indicates it's an even bigger problem than we knew at the time that those letters were sent.

I yield to my friend from Minnesota.

Mrs. BACHMANN. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I think one thing that absolutely shocked me was in the month of June, when an individual who was the chief deputy of the spiritual advisor of the Muslim Brotherhood—Qaradawi is the spiritual advisor for the Muslim Brotherhood. His deputy, whose name is bin Bayyah, was granted a visa by the

United States State Department to come into the United States.

Now, that's pretty unusual. You have a terrorist organization that was outlawed in Egypt formerly, and the United States Government is issuing a visa to the chief deputy of the spiritual advisor of the Muslim Brotherhood. That, in itself, should kind of raise concern. Not only was he granted a visa, he came into the United States this June. He had a meeting in the White House.

How do we know that?

Bin Bayyah put a photo up on his Web site and bragged about this meeting that he had, and he said it was in the White House, in the Executive Office Building. He named the people. There were people, obviously, in the photo. And he said, during the course of that meeting, he came in and requested that the White House give arms and training and weapons to terrorists that would be fighting in Syria. That was what the request was that he made. That's in his words. That's not my words. That was in bin Bayyah's words on his Web site.

Well, just this last Monday, not the Monday of this week but the Monday before, on the same day as the tragic shooting of 13 people at the Navy Yard here in Washington, D.C., just 2 miles from where Representative GOHMERT and I are standing today, Mr. Speaker, on that same day, President Obama signed a waiver to the Arms Export Control Act. Nobody heard about it because it was a big news day. Thirteen Americans were gunned down that day by an individual.

But this is very big news because President Obama, when he signed this waiver of section 40 and section 40(a) of the Arms Export Control Act, what he did is waived the prohibition against the United States arming terrorists, including al Qaeda, in Syria. And this isn't MICHELE BACHMANN saying this. This isn't Representative LOUIE GOHMERT saying this. This is the White House saying this and also major news reports coming out that the President signed this waiver.

Now, I want to just repeat it, because this was hard for me to understand when I heard this, that our President of the United States, Barack Obama—this is not meant to insult him in any way, it's just meant to inform the American people—he signed a waiver from the prohibition.

It would make sense that we would prohibit spending U.S. tax money to arm terrorists. That would make sense that we wouldn't want to do something like that. No arming of terrorists, especially al Qaeda. We've only been trying to fight them and defeat them for 12 years, minimum, more than that.

But a week ago Monday, President Obama chose to waive that prohibition; and, as myself and Representative GOHMERT are standing on the floor today in this greatest of all deliberative bodies in the world, it is a fact, today, in the United States, that our President has

intentionally chosen to arm terrorists, including al Qaeda.

Now, I think it's important that the American people know that, that our President signed that piece of legislation—or not legislation, waiver, because if that was legislation that came on this floor, I don't think you would find Democrat Members of Congress who would be willing to vote for that measure. I don't believe they would, because one thing I know about this Congress, we're pretty bipartisan when it comes to national security. I don't care what your political background is, you want this country safe; and I'm very, very proud of what I've seen coming from Democrats and Republicans working together, because we want national security.

But this is a big issue, and that's why I think it's very important that Representative GOHMERT is bringing up this issue, Mr. Speaker, about the level of influence of the violent terrorist organization known as the Muslim Brotherhood, what their presence is in the United States, and, most particular, what their influence is on our United States Government.

Mr. GOHMERT. Reclaiming my time, that is an extraordinary development, our President deciding, after America rose up so clearly with, basically, one voice, saying, do not get us involved in Syria.

I know in my own office, we had heard from, I think, three people who did not live in our district and between 1,300, 1,400 that did, saying, do not get involved in the war in Syria.

And we knew at the time that the largest part of the rebels were al Qaeda-linked. We knew that President Assad was backed by Iran and Hezbollah and with Shia. We knew that the rebels, the largest part of them, were Sunni, al Qaeda, Muslim Brotherhood, and there's no reason to get in the middle of that. And, frankly, that's why, since we know so much about the Muslim Brotherhood terrorist activities abroad, despite CNN's reporting and so many reporting about the so-called coup in Egypt, we knew, the gentlelady from Minnesota and I having been in Egypt in the last few weeks and talking to so many people and doing our own homework, that that was not a coup. And the Coptic Christian Pope told both the lady from Minnesota and me that that was not a coup; that was the Egyptian people rising up.

And I did not know—maybe the gentlelady from Minnesota knew. I did not realize that the constitution in Egypt that America supposedly gave them advice about, didn't have a provision for impeachment. So when they had a Muslim Brotherhood sympathizer as the President who was disregarding the constitution, there was no way they could bring impeachment charges to get him out.

They had one answer, one solution, and they acted peacefully; and millions—millions—more than ever has protested in the history of the world,

came out to the streets and demanded the Egyptian military remove the President. And they did so, and he's awaiting trial. I'm hoping they'll wait until newly elected officials are present so that they can have the trial of former President Morsi in front of a new regime that's elected by the people.

□ 1845

But we didn't help give them any options there. And yet so much of the mainstream media has been reporting, as the Muslim Brotherhood has been killing Christians, killing moderate Muslims, and just destroying and burning churches, that it's basically the military, when it's not the military at all. It's the Muslim Brotherhood.

And they have made clear they'll burn the country down, and they'll kill everybody they can in order to get Egypt back under radical Islamic control. Because for those that envisioned a new Ottoman Empire, envisioned the beginning of a worldwide caliphate, they could not afford, in their dream of running the world as one massive, radical Islamic caliphate, to lose Egypt. And they were willing to do whatever violence they had to do to avoid that. As the gentlelady has mentioned, the Muslim Brotherhood now has been outlawed in Egypt. I really applaud the efforts of the people in Egypt.

I couldn't help but be amused by some of the mainstream and then some of the far left-wing reporting about my coming here to the floor and showing blowups of pictures and giving speeches here about what the Egyptian people were doing and rising up and that they were upset not with America—they showed by their signs they love America—but they were upset with our President. Frankly, in my own ignorance, I didn't even know who our Ambassador was, but the people of Egypt knew. They had signs out there. They are upset with her. They were upset with the Obama administration. But they love America.

And I thank the gentlelady from Minnesota for her valuable input, and I yield back the balance of my time.

OBAMA CARES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2013, the Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. WILSON) for 30 minutes.

Ms. WILSON of Florida. Mr. Speaker, this is my own little "non-filibuster" in the House of Representatives. I simply cannot stay quiet when a crowning achievement for the American people is under attack.

The term "ObamaCare" was coined by Republicans in 2010 to mock the Affordable Care Act. Well, this is one place where I agree with the Republicans. I believe that ObamaCare is the perfect name for the Affordable Care Act because the Affordable Care Act is proof that Obama cares. He cares about

America's families. He cares about mothers. He cares about fathers. He cares about young people. He cares about babies. He cares about seniors. He cares about the future of the American people. Yes, Obama cares.

We know that Obama cares because insurance companies can no longer deny 17 million children with pre-existing conditions health coverage. We know that Obama cares because 105 million Americans with life-threatening diseases no longer have to live in fear of maxing out on their lifetime dollar limits on their insurance coverage. We know that Obama cares because more than 3 million young people up to age 26 can now have coverage because insurance companies can no longer remove them from their parents' plans.

Mr. Speaker, I do not want to say that the people in Congress who oppose ObamaCare do not care, but I need help in understanding this dilemma. Where do they live? Who do they represent? Who could oppose health care for their constituents?

The opponents of ObamaCare have not proposed a single serious alternative to provide health care coverage. Their constituents get sick, too. Have these Members of Congress ever been sick? Have they ever had a sick family member without insurance coverage? Have they ever been to a public emergency room? They should be afraid for their neighbors, their friends and family who may someday become jobless, uninsured, and sick. They will lose everything that they own.

Who do these people represent? Do they represent robots? Do they feel? Do they bleed? Do they have pain?

Members of Congress should be encouraging people to get coverage and expand access to health care. We can stop the crisis of uninsurance that is killing people, draining our tax dollars, and degrading our health system. Instead, too many legislators are spreading myths and half-truths about the only plausible plan that exists right now to end our health care crisis.

ObamaCare is not a government takeover. To the contrary, it is an improvement on our private, free market-oriented health care system. You will have choices. You will have access. If you are unemployed with no health care, you will likely get it. If you are employed with health care, you will likely experience no change in your present health care coverage. If you are on Medicare, do not be frightened. You will experience no changes in your Medicare coverage.

The Federal Government is simply making it easier and cheaper for people who have no insurance to get insured. The Federal Government will subsidize your health care bills according to your income status. ObamaCare is trying to ensure that no one's livelihood is destroyed by a serious illness.

When I was an elementary school principal, I worked to help a homeless family whose children were attending

my school. The father was a professional man—an optician—whose lifetime was destroyed when he hit his lifetime cap for health care coverage because of serious medical conditions related to sickle cell anemia. They suffered. They lost everything—their home, their dignity, their health. The whole school joined in to help them through this crisis. This family was forced to work incredibly hard to survive. They would not have had to face such a hardship if the Affordable Care Act protections were in place.

We know that ObamaCare is about women because pregnancy can no longer be considered a preexisting condition. We know that ObamaCare is about young people because young people—the likeliest to be involved in auto crashes or motorcycle crashes or drug use—will be insured. They are not invincible, as they so often believe. As it stands now, someone has to pick up the tab when they make a mistake. They need to be insured.

Have you been to a public emergency room lately? It's a nightmare. People everywhere are suffering, waiting endlessly for their turn. So many of these patients are not insured and cannot pay. Not only do they suffer, but the taxpayers and public health system also suffer. The costs are passed on down the line. What a relief it would be for our public hospitals and for the taxpayers if we could ensure that every person in America that was eligible has health insurance.

This is about fiscal responsibility. People want to be insured. They want the peace of mind and stability. ObamaCare is about the economic future of this Nation because the Affordable Care Act ensures that Americans pay for all the health care services they use. Preventive care would save so much money and save so many lives.

Mr. Speaker, no one said that this would be easy. Progress is never easy. We went through this struggle with Social Security in 1935. Before Social Security, senior citizens suffered and died in poverty. Social Security provoked a tremendous backlash from conservatives. Members of Congress even fought to strip domestic workers and agricultural workers of their benefits in order to keep African Americans out of the system. We had to fight, but we ultimately succeeded in building a Social Security system that keeps tens of millions of Americans out of poverty. We have come a long way.

We went through this struggle with Medicare in 1965. Back then, Republicans, including then-California Governor Ronald Reagan, declared that Medicare was a "Soviet-style health model" and the end of freedom in America. But we ultimately succeeded in building a health care system for the elderly that prevents untold suffering and death.

ObamaCare is about 30 million lives. October 1, 2013. It's about marching forward in the proud tradition of Social Security and Medicare. It's about

marching toward the goal of a society that truly cherishes human life.

Nobody said that it would be easy. We knew it would be difficult. We knew it would be hard. We've been here before. We fought hard—and we won. And we're on our way to another crowning achievement in the history of this Nation, simply because Barack Hussein Obama cares.

I yield back the balance of my time.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION WAIVING REQUIREMENT OF CLAUSE 6(a) OF RULE XIII WITH RESPECT TO CONSIDERATION OF CERTAIN RESOLUTIONS REPORTED FROM THE COMMITTEE ON RULES, AND RELATING TO CONSIDERATION OF THE SENATE AMENDMENT TO H.R. 2642, FEDERAL AGRICULTURE REFORM AND RISK MANAGEMENT ACT OF 2013

Mr. SESSIONS, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 113-231) on the resolution (H. Res. 361) waiving a requirement of clause 6(a) of rule XIII with respect to consideration of certain resolutions reported from the Committee on Rules, and relating to consideration of the Senate amendment to the bill (H.R. 2642) to provide for the reform and continuation of agricultural and other programs of the Department of Agriculture through fiscal year 2018, and for other purposes, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

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. 252. An act to reduce preterm labor and delivery and the risk of pregnancy-related deaths and complications due to pregnancy, and to reduce infant mortality caused by prematurity; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

Karen L. Haas, Clerk of the House, reported and found truly enrolled bills of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H.R. 527. An act to amend the Helium Act to complete the privatization of the Federal helium reserve in a competitive market fashion that ensures stability in the helium markets while protecting the interests of American taxpayers, and for other purposes.

H.R. 3092. An act to amend the Missing Children's Assistance Act, and for other purposes.

SENATE ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The Speaker announced his signature to an enrolled bill of the Senate of the following title:

S. 793. An act to support revitalization and reform of the Organization of American States, and for other purposes.

ADJOURNMENT

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

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 6 o'clock and 59 minutes p.m.), the House adjourned until tomorrow, Friday, September 27, 2013, at 9 a.m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS,
ETC.

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

3098. A letter from the Under Secretary, Department of Defense, transmitting a report of a violation of the Antideficiency Act, Army Case Number 11-07; to the Committee on Appropriations.

3099. A letter from the Program Manager, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the Department's final rule — Medicaid Program; State Disproportionate Share Hospital Allotment Reductions [CMS-2367-F] (RIN: 0938-AR31) received September 18, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

3100. A letter from the Deputy Director, Regulations Policy and Management Staff, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the Department's final rule — Listing of Color Additives Exempt From Certification; Mica-Based Pearlescent Pigments; Confirmation of Effective Date [Docket No.: FDA-2012-C-0224] received September 17, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

3101. A letter from the Program Manager, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the Department's final rule — World Trade Center Health Program; Addition of Prostate Cancer to the List of WTC-Related Health Conditions [Docket No.: CDC-2013-0012; NIOSH-267] (RIN: 0920-AA54) received September 18, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

3102. A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting pursuant to section 3(d) of the Arms Export Control Act, as amended, certification regarding the proposed transfer of major defense equipment (Transmittal No. RSAT-13-3561); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

3103. A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting Transmittal No. DDTT 13-127, pursuant to the reporting requirements of Section 36(c) of the Arms Export Control Act; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

3104. A letter from the Director, International Broadcasting Bureau, Broadcasting Board of Governors, transmitting Fiscal Year 2013 Federal Activities Inventory Reform Act submission; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

3105. A letter from the Director, Office of National Drug Control Policy, transmitting the Office's report entitled, "Fiscal Year 2012 Performance Summary Report"; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

3106. A letter from the Chief Administrative Officer, transmitting the quarterly report of receipts and expenditures of appropriations and other funds for the period July 1, 2013 through September 30, 2013 as compiled by the Chief Administrative Officer, pursuant to 2 U.S.C. 104a Public Law 88-454; (H. Doc. No. 113—65); to the Committee on House Administration and ordered to be printed.

3107. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Special

Local Regulation; Cumberland River, Mile 190.0 to 192.0; Nashville, TN [USCG-2013-0721] (RIN: 1625-AA08) received September 19, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3108. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting The Department's final rule — Standard Instrument Approach Procedures, and Takeoff Minimums and Obstacle Departure; Miscellaneous Amendments [Docket No.: 30914; Amdt. No. 3549] received September 9, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3109. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Amendment of Class E Airspace; Point Thomson, AK [Docket No.: FAA-2012-1175; Airspace Docket No.: 12-AAL-11] received September 9, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3110. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Amendment of Class E Airspace; Lexington, OK [Docket No.: FAA-2013-0272; Airspace Docket No.: 13-ASW-10] received September 9, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3111. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; General Electric Company Turbofan Engines [Docket No.: FAA-2013-0195; Directorate Identifier 2013-NE-08-AD; Amendment 39-17553; AD 2013-16-15] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received September 9, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3112. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Standard Instrument Approach Procedures, and Takeoff Minimums and Obstacle Departure Procedures; Miscellaneous Amendments [Docket No.: 30915; Amdt. No. 3550] received September 9, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3113. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Airbus Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2012-1321; Directorate Identifier 2011-NM-147-AD; Amendment 39-17528; AD 2013-15-12] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received September 9, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3114. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; PIAGGIO AERO INDUSTRIES S.p.A Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2013-0472; Directorate Identifier 98-CE-097-AD; Amendment 39-17538; AD 99-07-10 R1] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received September 9, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3115. A letter from the FMCSA Regulatory Ombudsman, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Unified Registration System [Docket No.: FMCSA-1997-2349] (RIN: 2126-AA22) received September 19, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3116. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule — Application of Section 179(f) for Qualified Real Property [Notice 2013-59] received September 17, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

3117. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule — Update for Weighted Average Interest Rates, Yield Curves, and Segment Rates [Notice 2013-58] received September 17, 2013, 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:

Mr. GOODLATTE: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 1493. A bill to impose certain limitations on consent decrees and settlement agreements by agencies that require the agencies to take regulatory action in accordance with the terms thereof, and for other purposes (Rept. 113-230). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. SESSIONS: House Committee on Rules. H. Res. 361. Resolution waiving a requirement of clause 6(a) of rule XIII with respect to consideration of certain resolutions reported from the Committee on Rules, and relating to consideration of the Senate amendment to the bill (H.R. 2642) to provide for the reform and continuation of agricultural and other programs of the Department of Agriculture through fiscal year 2018, and for other purposes (Rept. 113-231). Referred to the House Calendar.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions of the following titles were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mr. COFFMAN (for himself and Mr. COOPER):

H.R. 3184. A bill to provide for auditable financial statements for the Department of Defense, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas (for himself, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Mr. AL GREEN of Texas, Mr. OLSON, and Mr. STOCKMAN):

H.R. 3185. A bill to establish the Buffalo Bayou National Heritage Area in the State of Texas, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. KIND (for himself and Mr. BACHUS):

H.R. 3186. A bill to award a Congressional Gold Medal to Hank Aaron, in recognition of his contributions to the national pastime of baseball and his perseverance in overcoming discrimination and adversity to become a role model for all Americans; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Ms. SINEMA (for herself and Ms. GABBARD):

H.R. 3187. A bill to appropriate such funds as may be necessary to ensure that members of the Armed Forces, including reserve components thereof, and supporting civilian and contractor personnel continue to receive pay and allowances for active service performed when a Governmentwide shutdown occurs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services, and in addition to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, 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. MCCLINTOCK (for himself, Mr. BISHOP of Utah, Mrs. LUMMIS, Mr. LAMALFA, Mr. WALDEN, Mr. MCCARTHY of California, Mr. NUNES, Mr. COOK, Mr. DENHAM, Mr. HASTINGS of Washington, and Mr. VALADAO):

H.R. 3188. A bill to expedite the planning and implementation of salvage timber sales as part of Forest Service and Department of the Interior restoration and rehabilitation activities for lands within the Stanislaus National Forest and Yosemite National Park and Bureau of Land Management lands adversely impacted by the 2013 Rim Fire in California; to the Committee on Agriculture, and in addition to the Committee on Natural Resources, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. TIPTON (for himself, Mr. BISHOP of Utah, Mr. MCCLINTOCK, Mr. AMODEI, and Mr. POLIS):

H.R. 3189. A bill to prohibit the conditioning of any permit, lease, or other use agreement on the transfer, relinquishment, or other impairment of any water right to the United States by the Secretaries of the Interior and Agriculture; 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 Mr. CHABOT (for himself, Mr. GOODLATTE, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. SENBRENNER, and Mr. SCOTT of Virginia):

H.R. 3190. A bill to provide for the continued performance of the functions of the United States Parole Commission, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. COHEN (for himself and Ms. NORTON):

H.R. 3191. A bill to amend the Small Business Act to increase the maximum loan amount for loans under the microloan program; to the Committee on Small Business.

By Mr. DUFFY:

H.R. 3192. A bill to amend the Consumer Financial Protection Act of 2010 to bring the Bureau of Consumer Financial Protection into the regular appropriations process, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. DUFFY:

H.R. 3193. A bill to amend the Consumer Financial Protection Act of 2010 to strengthen the review authority of the Financial Stability Oversight Council of regulations issued by the Bureau of Consumer Financial Protection, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. DUFFY:

H.R. 3194. A bill to amend the Dodd-Frank Wall Street Reform and Consumer Protection Act to remove certain special deference provided by courts to the Bureau of Consumer Financial Protection when the Bureau is interpreting provisions of a Federal consumer financial law; to the Committee on Financial Services, and in addition to the Committee on the Judiciary, 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. ISRAEL:

H.R. 3195. A bill to amend the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act of 1978 to provide for the designation of Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Court judges by the President, majority of the Supreme Court, Speaker and minority leader of the House of Representatives, and majority leader and minority lead-

er of the Senate, and to provide for the public disclosure of Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Court decisions; to the Committee on the Judiciary, and in addition to the Committee on Intelligence (Permanent Select), 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. LATTA (for himself and Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas):

H.R. 3196. A bill to amend the Communications Act of 1934 to prohibit the Federal Communications Commission from adopting certain rules or policies relating to multi-channel video programming distributors, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. LATTA (for himself, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Mr. WITTMAN, and Mr. WALZ):

H.R. 3197. A bill to protect and enhance opportunities for recreational hunting, fishing, and shooting, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources, and in addition to the Committees on Agriculture, Energy and Commerce, Transportation and Infrastructure, and the Judiciary, 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. PEARCE:

H.R. 3198. A bill to amend the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act to prohibit government subsidies for the purchase of health plans by Members of Congress and congressional staff and to apply to Delegates and Resident Commissioners to the Congress, and to employees of committees and leadership offices of Congress, the requirement of such Act that the only health plans that the Federal Government may make available to Members of Congress and congressional staff are plans created or offered through an Exchange established under such Act; to the Committee on House Administration, 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. STOCKMAN (for himself, Mr. POSEY, Mr. GOHMERT, Mr. OLSON, Mr. LAMALFA, Mr. WEBER of Texas, and Mr. BURGESS):

H.R. 3199. A bill to safeguard military and civilian personnel on military bases by repealing bans on military personnel carrying firearms, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services, and in addition to the Committee on the Judiciary, 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. FLEMING (for himself, Mr. ROE of Tennessee, Mr. CARTER, Mr. GOSAR, Mr. MARINO, Mr. CULBERSON, Mr. LAMALFA, Mr. GOHMERT, Mr. POSEY, Mrs. BACHMANN, Mr. STUTZMAN, Mr. CASSIDY, Mr. STOCKMAN, and Mrs. LUMMIS):

H. Res. 360. A resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives that Congress should retain its authority to borrow money on the credit of the United States and not cede this power to the President; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

CONSTITUTIONAL AUTHORITY STATEMENT

Pursuant to clause 7 of rule XII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the following statements are sub-

mitted regarding the specific powers granted to Congress in the Constitution to enact the accompanying bill or joint resolution.

By Mr. COFFMAN:

H.R. 3184.

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

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 14 states that Congress shall have the power "to make rules for the government and regulation of the land and naval forces;"

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 16 states that Congress shall have the power "to provide for organizing, arming, and disciplining the militia;" and

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 18 states that Congress shall have the power "to make all laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into execution the foregoing powers. . . ."

Congressional power over the finances of the Department of Defense is an exclusive power. This includes the inherent right of Congress to direct the Department of Defense to conduct an audit of its finances and manage the manner in which this is conducted.

By Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas:

H.R. 3185.

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

Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution and Article IV, Section 3, Clause 2.

By Mr. KIND:

H.R. 3186.

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

Article I Section 8.

By Ms. SINEMA:

H.R. 3187.

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

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1 and Article I, Section 8, Clause 12

By Mr. MCCLINTOCK:

H.R. 3188.

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

Article IV, Section 3, Clause 2 confers on Congress the authority to manage and regulate territory or other property held by the United States.

"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."

By Mr. TIPTON:

H.R. 3189.

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

The constitutional authority of Congress to enact this legislation is provided by Article 4 Section 3 Clause 2 of the United States Constitution, which states 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.

By Mr. CHABOT:

H.R. 3190.

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

The authority to enact this bill is derived from, but may not be limited to, Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. COHEN:

H.R. 3191.

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

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1 of the United States Constitution, known as the General Welfare Clause.” This provision grants Congress the broad power “to pay the Debts and provide for the common defense and general welfare of the United States.”

By Mr. DUFFY:
H.R. 3192.

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

Article I, Section 8: To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.

By Mr. DUFFY:
H.R. 3193.

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

Article I, Section 8: To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.

By Mr. DUFFY:
H.R. 3194.

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

Article I, Section 8, To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.

By Mr. ISRAEL:
H.R. 3195.

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

Article I, Section 8.
By Mr. LATTA:
H.R. 3196.

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

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3
The Congress shall have Power to regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes

By Mr. LATTA:
H.R. 3197.

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

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3
The Congress shall have Power to regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes

Article IV, Section 3, Clause 2

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

Amendment II

A well regulated Militia, being necessary to the security of a free State, the right of the people to keep and bear Arms, shall not be infringed.

By Mr. PEARCE:
H.R. 3198.

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

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 of the United States Constitution grants Congress the power to enact this law.

By Mr. STOCKMAN:
H.R. 3199.

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

The Second Amendment: A well regulated Militia, being necessary to the security of a free State, the right of the people to keep and bear Arms, shall not be infringed.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

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

H.R. 7: Mr. SMITH of Missouri and Mr. COL-
LINS of Georgia.

H.R. 137: Mr. GRAYSON.

H.R. 184: Ms. DUCKWORTH.

H.R. 278: Mr. O'ROURKE.

H.R. 318: Mr. POSEY.

H.R. 320: Mr. GRAYSON.

H.R. 346: Mr. ROGERS of Alabama, Mr. PETERSON, and Mr. SMITH of Missouri.

H.R. 350: Mr. LAMBORN and Mr. HARRIS.

H.R. 366: Mr. SMITH of Washington and Mr. ENGEL.

H.R. 383: Mr. ENYART.

H.R. 523: Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York and Mr. GALLEG0.

H.R. 541: Mr. MORAN, Mr. LATHAM, Mr. DOYLE, Mr. TONKO, Ms. SLAUGHTER, and Mr. LANGEVIN.

H.R. 543: Mr. GRAYSON, Mr. YODER, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mr. HINOJOSA, Mr. VARGAS, and Mr. COOK.

H.R. 676: Mr. FATTAH and Mr. LOWENTHAL.

H.R. 685: Mr. MATHESON and Ms. WILSON of Florida.

H.R. 724: Mr. WHITFIELD, Mr. CÁRDENAS, Mr. RENACCI, Mr. NUGENT, Mr. HOLDING, Mr. MICA, and Mrs. NOEM.

H.R. 764: Mr. KEATING.

H.R. 855: Mr. TONKO, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Mr. DAINES, Mr. GERLACH, and Mr. HECK of Washington.

H.R. 920: Mr. GERLACH and Mr. LOEBSACK.

H.R. 1000: Ms. MOORE.

H.R. 1010: Ms. KUSTER.

H.R. 1024: Mr. MICHAUD.

H.R. 1037: Mr. HECK of Washington.

H.R. 1078: Mr. NUGENT.

H.R. 1095: Mr. FRANKS of Arizona and Mr. BILIRAKIS.

H.R. 1130: Mr. JEFFRIES.

H.R. 1159: Mr. KILMER.

H.R. 1173: Mr. CICILLINE and Mr. GARAMENDI.

H.R. 1179: Mr. NEAL, Mrs. NEGRETE MCLEOD, and Mr. BERA of California.

H.R. 1199: Mr. RUIZ.

H.R. 1255: Mr. HORSFORD.

H.R. 1310: Mr. GRIFFIN of Arkansas.

H.R. 1461: Mr. SIMPSON.

H.R. 1462: Mr. SIMPSON.

H.R. 1507: Mr. KILDEE, Mr. POLIS, Mr. KENNEDY, and Mr. GRAYSON.

H.R. 1508: Ms. WATERS and Mr. RIGELL.

H.R. 1518: Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mr. LANCE, Mr. BEN RAY LUJÁN of New Mexico, Mr. VARGAS, Mr. HECK of Washington, and Mr. SHERMAN.

H.R. 1563: Mr. POE of Texas.

H.R. 1597: Mr. HASTINGS of Florida.

H.R. 1635: Mr. POCAN and Mr. RANGEL.

H.R. 1666: Mr. RANGEL, Mr. JONES, and Mr. YODER.

H.R. 1708: Mrs. BLACK and Mr. STOCKMAN.

H.R. 1726: Mr. SWALWELL of California, Mr. MICA, Mr. CARTER, Ms. CHU, Mr. DOGGETT, Mr. CONYERS, and Ms. KELLY of Illinois.

H.R. 1731: Mr. VARGAS, Ms. FRANKEL of Florida, Ms. BROWNLEY of California, Ms. LOFGREN, Mr. SHERMAN, and Mr. SCOTT of Virginia.

H.R. 1779: Mrs. KIRKPATRICK, Mr. COLLINS of New York, Mr. MEEHAN, Mr. ROGERS of Michigan, Mr. UPTON, and Mr. HOLDING.

H.R. 1787: Mrs. KIRKPATRICK.

H.R. 1812: Mr. LARSEN of Washington.

H.R. 1814: Mr. PAULSEN.

H.R. 1827: Mr. LOEBSACK.

H.R. 1830: Ms. BROWNLEY of California.

H.R. 1884: Mr. ENYART.

H.R. 1920: Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia, and Mr. YOUNG of Alaska.

H.R. 1984: Mr. MICHAUD, Mr. CONNOLLY, Ms. LEE of California, and Mr. ANDREWS.

H.R. 2041: Mrs. CAPITO.

H.R. 2053: Mr. GRAVES of Missouri.

H.R. 2058: Mr. CICILLINE, Ms. SHEA-PORTER, Ms. JACKSON LEE, and Mr. BACHUS.

H.R. 2066: Mr. FARENTHOLD.

H.R. 2189: Mr. ISSA.

H.R. 2288: Mr. HIMES and Ms. MOORE.

H.R. 2300: Mr. YODER and Mr. ROTHFUS.

H.R. 2302: Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York, Mr. LATHAM, and Ms. PINGREE of Maine.

H.R. 2330: Mr. YODER.

H.R. 2426: Mr. SWALWELL of California.

H.R. 2476: Mr. KING of New York.

H.R. 2482: Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. BLUMENAUER, and Ms. FOX.

H.R. 2502: Mr. VARGAS and Ms. BROWNLEY of California.

H.R. 2504: Mr. HECK of Washington.

H.R. 2553: Mrs. NAPOLITANO.

H.R. 2590: Mr. DAINES.

H.R. 2619: Ms. LOFGREN.

H.R. 2632: Mr. BLUMENAUER.

H.R. 2663: Ms. GRANGER.

H.R. 2692: Mr. O'ROURKE and Ms. KUSTER.

H.R. 2725: Mr. PERLMUTTER, Mr. TONKO, Ms. BONAMICI, and Mr. PRICE of North Carolina.

H.R. 2734: Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas.

H.R. 2737: Mr. MORAN.

H.R. 2760: Mr. HONDA.

H.R. 2767: Mr. PRICE of Georgia and Mr. WILLIAMS.

H.R. 2780: Mr. HASTINGS of Florida and Mr. CARSON of Indiana.

H.R. 2790: Mr. MICHAUD.

H.R. 2801: Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi.

H.R. 2809: Mr. SMITH of Missouri, Mr. SHUSTER, Mr. HUNTER, Mr. SCHOCK, Mr. AMODEI, Mr. RENACCI, Mr. FORTENBERRY, Mr. PITTENGER, Mr. CRAMER, and Mr. GIBBS.

H.R. 2839: Ms. ESHOO, Mr. HONDA, and Mr. LYNCH.

H.R. 2857: Ms. MENG.

H.R. 2894: Mr. LATHAM and Mr. REED.

H.R. 2908: Mr. KLINE.

H.R. 2914: Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi and Ms. SHEA-PORTER.

H.R. 2917: Mr. GALLEG0.

H.R. 2931: Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi.

H.R. 2935: Mr. MORAN.

H.R. 2975: Mr. MEEKS.

H.R. 2976: Mr. MEEKS.

H.R. 2997: Mr. SMITH of Missouri.

H.R. 2998: Ms. NORTON.

H.R. 2999: Ms. LEE of California.

H.R. 3002: Mr. KINGSTON, Mr. LAMALFA, and Mr. LONG.

H.R. 3005: Mr. HIGGINS and Ms. GRANGER.

H.R. 3026: Mr. MARCHANT.

H.R. 3040: Ms. NORTON.

H.R. 3041: Mr. LATHAM.

H.R. 3045: Ms. ESTY.

H.R. 3047: Ms. WILSON of Florida.

H.R. 3076: Mr. BURGESS and Mr. MARCHANT.

H.R. 3082: Mr. MCCAUL.

H.R. 3088: Ms. BASS, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Mr. POCAN, Mr. MEEKS, and Mr. ENYART.

H.R. 3099: Mr. GARCIA.

H.R. 3103: Ms. ESHOO, Mr. WOLF, Mr. KING of New York, Mr. ENYART, and Mr. WEST-MORELAND.

H.R. 3105: Mr. GRIFFIN of Arkansas and Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi.

H.R. 3106: Mr. YOUNG of Indiana.

H.R. 3111: Mr. CASTRO of Texas.

H.R. 3115: Ms. SHEA-PORTER.

H.R. 3135: Mr. MEEKS.

H.R. 3152: Mr. YOUNG of Indiana.

H.R. 3154: Mr. MCHENRY and Mr. MARCHANT.

H.R. 3169: Ms. DUCKWORTH.

H.R. 3179: Mr. MURPHY of Florida.

H.J. Res. 34: Mr. ENYART.

H.J. Res. 51: Mr. SALMON.

H.J. Res. 64: Mr. GUTHRIE, Mr. POMPEO, and Mr. MURPHY of Pennsylvania.

H. Con. Res. 36: Ms. CHU.

H. Con. Res. 51: Ms. ESHOO.

H. Res. 135: Mr. KILMER.

H. Res. 147: Mr. PITTENGER and Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee.

H. Res. 227: Ms. LOFGREN.
 H. Res. 231: Mr. TONKO, Mr. MARINO, Mr. GARDNER, Mr. MICHAUD, Mr. CARNEY, and Mr. LATTA.
 H. Res. 250: Mr. HENSARLING.
 H. Res. 254: Mr. OWENS.
 H. Res. 281: Mr. AMODEI, Mr. PASCRELL, Mrs. HARTZLER, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. TONKO, Ms. KUSTER, Ms. GRANGER, Ms. KAPTUR, Mrs. BUSTOS, Mr. VARGAS, Ms. HAHN, and Mr. DAINES.
 H. Res. 285: Mr. WAXMAN.
 H. Res. 301: Mr. MCGOVERN.

H. Res. 353: Mr. MCGOVERN.
 H. Res. 356: Mr. HUELSKAMP.

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. 2914: Ms. JACKSON LEE, and Mr. BACHUS.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 3 of rule XII,

52. The SPEAKER presented a petition of the City of Whitewater, Wisconsin, relative to a resolution seeking to reclaim democracy from the expansion of corporate personhood rights; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.