



United States  
of America

# Congressional Record

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

Vol. 159

WASHINGTON, TUESDAY, OCTOBER 29, 2013

No. 152

## House of Representatives

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

### DESIGNATION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

WASHINGTON, DC,  
October 29, 2013.

I hereby appoint the Honorable CHRIS COLLINS 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.

### BUILDING A NEW MIDDLE EAST— THE WORK OF A GENERATION

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

Mr. SCHIFF. Mr. Speaker, for nearly 3 years, the Arab Middle East, an enormous arc stretching from the Atlantic to the Indian Ocean, has been in turmoil. Restive millions, frustrated by a lack of economic opportunity, repressive politics, and a social structure often at odds with modernity, have taken to the streets demanding change. Their revolution hangs in the balance with the entrenched interests of the

former regimes on one side and the stultifying religious rule on the other.

Faced with these daunting realities, the Obama administration may be in the midst of a strategic reevaluation of our role in the region—one that is far more modest in ambition, more tempered in expectation, and certainly more reliant on the use of its diplomatic, not military, resources.

This new approach stands in stark contrast to the effort by the George W. Bush administration to deliver a “freedom agenda”—sometimes through the barrel of a gun—that would bring democracy to a region that has known mostly misrule. That doctrine, or its application, proved entirely unworkable, as the societies freed of their authoritarian shackles had nothing upon which to build. This is a lesson we may be bitterly learning in Libya as well.

These setbacks and the realization that democracy building is a generational undertaking must not lead us to disengage from the region. The forces freed by the Arab Spring will not be contained, and I still believe they can lead hundreds of millions of people to more representative forms of government, more economic opportunity, and, we must hope, more tranquility and peace within their borders.

The United States needs to help build institutions capable of supporting a transition in the Arab world in three dimensions: political, economic, and civil society. Unmet economic needs are the most pressing. At its heart, the Arab Spring is the expression of discontent of millions of idle, young Arabs, who have seen the economic opportunities that the outside world offers, but whose own economic realities are plagued by stagnation, mismanagement, and cronyism.

The cure is not outright assistance, which will do little to unleash or occupy long-term energies of Arab youth. It is investment that will allow this generation of Arabs to drag inefficient,

antiquated, and highly statist economies in the 21st century. Since the ouster of Ben Ali and Mubarak, I have pushed for both the creation of enterprise funds and other nimble vehicles that will allow us to direct resources at specific sectors that can help to drive economic growth, as well as improve the quality of life for ordinary people.

In coming years, these economies will need to produce sufficient jobs and wealth to both sustain workers and their families and to provide the economic conditions for sustainable political stability. But that cannot be an excuse to put off political reform now, because capital flows will not resume until investors have some confidence that their money is safe.

The experience of both Egypt and Tunisia serve to reinforce the inchoate nature of their political transitions. Both countries emerged from their respective revolutions with energized Islamist movements that were able to triumph over less well-organized secular parties—in large measure because the old governments had atomized their opposition and left political Islamist governments as the only viable alternative. In both countries, this experiment failed as a result of overreaching and a misreading of the people’s wishes—a development that should ease the fears of those who saw a “green wave” sweeping across the Middle East.

The dysfunction in both Cairo and Tunis, and the Egyptian military deposing of President Mohammed Morsi in a coup, are a reminder that a democratic outcome is never assured or to be assumed. The United States must stand ready to assist Arab nations with the long-term institution-building and political spadework that are necessary preconditions for democracy.

In Tunisia, which is small, relatively prosperous, and not nearly as divided as some of its larger neighbors, prospects for a peaceful transition and

□ 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.

H6831

transfer of power from the current Islamist government to a technocratic government that would oversee elections are alive, if not entirely well. But while a framework for the installation of a caretaker government remains, squabbling between the Islamists and the secular opposition has slowed the process and reintroduced uncertainty into Tunisia's fragile politics.

Political institution-building and creating a culture of good governance will require targeted assistance, training programs, and a lot of patience. Egypt and Tunisia may be a mess now but 10 years from now will not be the same as they are today, and we can play a role in helping to shape that future.

Think of some of the other countries that have democratized in recent years in Eastern Europe, Asia, and Latin America. The transitions have not been quick or smooth, and many of them are still ongoing. Amid the euphoria that accompanied the collapse of the Communist bloc in Eastern Europe, we were tempted to believe we were all witnesses to the "end of history," as one academic put it.

The reality has been far messier vestiges of communist oppression still remain throughout the former Soviet Union and the Warsaw Pact.

These experiences hold an important lesson for the Arab states—that persistence pays and that democracy is possible, even where it had not existed previously. The United States must support these transitions, and we must be willing to use financial inducements and other levers to steer their political development in a direction that will best serve the Arab peoples and preserve regional and global peace. The partial cutoff of military aid to Egypt and the broader conversation it has sparked about how best to configure assistance may presage a new diplomatic strategy that is less reliant on military relationships devoted to the status quo and more supportive of civil society, economic and political reform.

This leads to the third area where the United States can play an important role—in trying to support the transition of Arab civil society from one that was imposed from above to one driven primarily by the needs and interests of its people. Free expression, women's empowerment and respect for minority groups are essential to the growth of democracy. Focusing assistance to groups in these areas can help to broaden the constituency for change and also give the young and disaffected an alternative to jihad.

Today's Arab twentysomethings face even greater challenges than the Europeans of the 1990s. But President George H.W. Bush and his successor, Bill Clinton, both understood that the investment in Eastern Europe was one that would pay dividends for decades. They were right and it has. I believe that we have a similar opportunity to help the Arab people. It will take longer and there will be setbacks. But the alternative is to watch a generation succumb to despair—a despair that is likely to have negative consequences for us and for our allies. I prefer to bet on hope and work for change.

#### AFGHANISTAN

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. JONES) for 5 minutes.

Mr. JONES. Mr. Speaker, at this point in our Nation's history, I believe both parties will acknowledge that we have major economic issues facing our country. As Congress just recently came to a temporary resolution which raised the debt ceiling by \$230 billion, it is incredible to me that we still found \$30 billion in aid to send to Afghanistan and \$1.6 billion in aid to send to Pakistan.

Mr. Speaker, at a time when America is drowning in debt, this is completely unacceptable. And even more important than the money are the American lives that have been lost—six in the time the government was shut down and one the weekend after.

As we work to fix our national problems, we should be wise enough to follow the lead of the nations who have interfered in Afghanistan before us—England and Russia are only two examples—and stop wasting lives and money on a country that will never change. History tells us that it is time to bring our troops home.

I want to thank ABC News for their effort each Sunday morning during "This Week with George Stephanopoulos" to faithfully list the names of the Americans who have been killed in Afghanistan, just as they did during the Iraq war. It is with sadness that I report that they have added seven names to this list over the last 3 weeks.

Mr. Speaker, on the poster beside me are the faces of two little girls, Stephanie and Eden, whose father, Sergeant Kevin Balduf, from Camp Lejeune Marine Base, which is in my district, was killed in Afghanistan. He and Colonel Palmer, from Cherry Point Marine Air Station, also in my district, were trying to train the Afghans to be policemen. One of the trainees turned their pistol on Palmer and Balduf and killed both of them. So these little girls are standing at Arlington Cemetery with their mom holding their hands.

Perhaps more disheartening is the fact that two of the most recent deaths in Afghanistan also were an example of Afghans that we were trying to train killing Americans. We were just trying to help them.

Mr. Speaker, a few weeks ago, I spoke on the floor about an article I read, entitled, "The Forgotten War" by Ann Jones. I also will submit an article written by an Iraq war veteran named Jayel Aheram, who now attends the University of Southern California, which is entitled, "Afghanistan War Must End Immediately." Both of these articles hold the same conclusion: the war in Afghanistan is a misuse of American youth, American money, and American military power.

It is time for the Congress of the United States to face the fact that we have our own problems here in Amer-

ica. To send over \$600 billion to Afghanistan to build roads, schools, and utility plants so the Taliban can blow them up makes no sense.

It is time for little girls like these two to have their daddies at home and not in a coffin.

[From the Daily Trojan, Oct. 7, 2013]

#### AFGHANISTAN WAR MUST END IMMEDIATELY (By Jayel Aheram)

Yesterday marked the 12 year anniversary of the war in Afghanistan. Americans have grown weary of the drawn-out conflict's undefined goals and increasingly unsustainable financial costs. According to a CBS News poll, support for the war in Afghanistan plummeted last year to its lowest with only 1 in 4 Americans agreeing that the United States is doing the right thing. President Barack Obama responded to this political reality when he announced last February that "by the end of next year, our war in Afghanistan will be over." But will there really be an end to the Afghanistan war?

There were three ends to the war in Iraq: The first was in May 2003, when President George W. Bush announced, "Mission accomplished," in an infamous speech aboard the USS *Abraham Lincoln* just two months after the invasion of Iraq. The second was in September 2010, when "combat troops" silently crossed the Iraqi border into Kuwait, an event Obama's MSNBC boosters were breathlessly proclaimed as the triumphant "End of the Iraq War." The third was in December 2011, when the Iraqi parliament refused to grant further immunity to U.S. troops beyond 2011, finally forcing to U.S. troops' withdrawal from Iraq. If Iraq had three "end of wars," how many will there be in Afghanistan? According to the Washington Post, a few thousand U.S. combat troops will likely remain in Afghanistan beyond 2014 to train and advise security forces. Despite this promise by Obama of the war's end, American presence in Afghanistan will merely add to the grim death toll after 2014.

According to Los Angeles Times, an American service member was killed last week in an "insider attack"—incidents where Afghan allies attack the U.S. troops who train them. This recent event follows another from the weekend before in which three U.S. troops were killed. According to NATO, in 2011 and 2012, 97 coalition members were killed by their Afghan counterparts in these insider attacks. Even as the United States shifts its role from combat to advisory and training, deaths from insider attacks will most likely continue. Taliban leaders, including Mullah Muhammad Omar, have urged their sympathizers and members to continue to infiltrate the security forces and kill American trainers and Afghan trainees.

Bob Dreyfuss wrote in *The Nation* that military commanders believe in an "insurgent math"—that is, for every civilian the U.S. military kills, 20 insurgents take their place. Approximately 6,841 civilians have been killed since the beginning of the Afghanistan war. Using this "insurgent math," that would mean the U.S. military has created more than 120,000 insurgents who continue to threaten the lives of U.S. troops and Afghans loyal to the Karzai regime. These newly created insurgents have empowered the Taliban as evidenced by a recent article by the Associated Press, which reported that Taliban fighters have started an insurgent campaign of regaining lost territories as foreign troops depart. After 12 long years, \$600 billion spent, more than 2,000 military deaths, 6,000 civilian deaths and tens of thousands of lives irrevocably altered, when will Americans muster the political will and courage to end America's longest war? Renaming the war is not progress, it is not

peace and it will certainly not stop American deaths.

#### HURRICANE SANDY 1-YEAR ANNIVERSARY

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

Ms. MATSUI. Mr. Speaker, as a member of SEEC, the House Sustainable Energy and Environment Coalition, I rise today to recognize the 1-year anniversary of Superstorm Sandy. Today, we remember those who lost their lives during this catastrophe and salute those who continue the rebuilding efforts.

One year ago, Sandy ravaged the east coast, producing devastating floods and widespread power outages, disrupting cellular phone networks and transit systems. As a whole, the region suffered over \$65 billion in economic losses. Families lost their homes, their precious mementos, and reminders of their daily lives. Communities lost their businesses. Tragically, some individuals lost their lives.

While the east coast was the primary victim of Sandy, extreme weather knows no boundaries and other communities around the country are not immune from suffering the same fate. Floods, hurricanes, wildfires, and droughts are becoming all too common, all too intense, and all too costly. These events will continue to wreak economic havoc and uproot families, unless we take meaningful action to address climate change.

In California, climate change is increasing the frequency of extreme heat and prolonged drought, placing millions of Californians at greater risk of public health threats such as heat-related sickness, forest fires, and water scarcity.

At home, my constituents live under the constant threat of flooding, which is why I work relentlessly to strengthen our levees and upgrade our infrastructure. If extreme weather caused a levee to be breached in Sacramento, the damage would be similar to that experienced in New Orleans.

Mr. Speaker, events like Sandy can happen anywhere. They don't just threaten the coasts, but all communities in all States. Events like Sandy can happen at any time—and are happening with alarming frequency. This was not an isolated event that happens every decade.

We cannot continue to sit back and wait for the next disaster to happen before we take action. The time to act is not a year from now, not a month from now, not even a day from now. The time to act is today.

We must implement preventative measures to make our communities more resilient and be proactive in addressing climate change, the root cause of extreme weather events. Only then will we be able to safeguard the country from the destructive effects of extreme weather and ensure that the leg-

acy of Sandy is one of action and not despair and procrastination.

#### COLLAPSE OF AMERICAN HEALTH CARE

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

Mr. MCCLINTOCK. Mr. Speaker, over the past few weeks, it has become obvious that we are watching nothing less than the collapse of the American health care system. Millions of Americans are losing their health plans and set adrift into a dysfunctional system where they cannot find comparable affordable policies.

Few are signing up on the ObamaCare exchanges. How few, we don't know. Because the numbers are so embarrassing, the administration refuses to report them. There are published reports that some 80 percent of the signups are pushed into the Medicaid system, which is itself nearing functional collapse as doctors simply opt out. Those who are able to keep their health plans are seeing their rates skyrocket to unaffordable extremes. Those few who can find affordable policies often discover they are losing their doctors.

□ 1015

Many employers are dropping their employee health plans or reducing salaries or cutting back on work hours or laying off workers while trying to cope with increased costs. A constituent of mine reports her employer cut her salary 23 percent as it tries to cope with ObamaCare costs.

The ObamaCare Web site is a monument to governmental incompetence. This is a Web site designed to sell a single product that has been under development for more than 3 years at a taxpayer cost of more than \$600 million—more than was spent developing Facebook or Twitter—and it does not work.

But that is not the big problem.

The big problem is that, today, there are fewer people with health insurance—apparently, a lot fewer than before this program began less than 1 month ago. This is the disaster that Republicans tried to prevent or at least to delay, but that disaster is now unfolding before our eyes with dire consequences for millions of Americans.

With all its flaws, the American health care system was the finest in the world. It was the most innovative, the most advanced, the most adaptable, and the most responsive to the individual needs of patients, and now we are losing it.

The one question I keep hearing is: Well, what do the Republicans propose?

In fact, Republicans have had a comprehensive alternative for years. Spearheaded by Dr. TOM PRICE of Georgia and Dr. PHIL ROE of Tennessee and sponsored by the Republican Study Committee, this package would bring

within the reach of all Americans health plans that they could choose according to their own individual needs of their own families, that they could own and that they could control, but this package has never passed the House, and it is high time that it did.

It extends the same tax breaks we currently give to companies to employees so they can afford to buy their own health care, again, according to their own needs.

It expands Health Savings Accounts so people can meet their needs with pretax income.

It restores to people the freedom to shop across State lines to find the best policies to suit their needs.

It restores flexibility so that health plans can accommodate people with preexisting conditions while expanding risk pools to provide for those conditions.

It attacks cost drivers like medical liability law that are making health care unaffordable.

It restores pricing flexibility to plans so that a healthy young person can again purchase catastrophic insurance for next to nothing.

It takes the best of the American health care system, preserves it, and corrects its flaws.

Now, I realize the Senate is likely to bury this reform as it has so many, but it is important that the House pass it so the American people can see that there is still hope to save what was once the finest health care system in the world and that it can be again as soon as this fever dream of ObamaCare finally breaks.

We have just been through a government shutdown because Democrats refused to even consider delaying the ObamaCare train wreck. They got their way, and that train wreck is now upon us. I believe, in coming months, the American people will recognize the urgent warnings that the Republicans tried so desperately to convey, and they will be looking for a way out. We need to blaze that trail now.

For that reason, I ask the House leadership to bring the Republican health care reforms to the floor, to get them to the Senate, and then let the American people decide.

Mr. Speaker, freedom works. It is time we put it back to work.

#### PERSONALIZE YOUR CARE ACT OF 2013

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

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, I started my day with my friend and colleague Dr. PHIL ROE, a Republican Congressman from Tennessee. We met with representatives from the American Academy of Hospice and Palliative Medicine. These dedicated professionals deal with helping patients and their families contend with some of the most difficult circumstances any of us

will ever face: loved ones in pain with difficult medical conditions at the end of life.

We were discussing legislation that Dr. ROE and I have cosponsored—the Personalize Your Care Act of 2013, H.R. 1173.

Despite widespread agreement in principle that individuals should be fully involved with decisions related to their health care, too often, this is not the reality. Most adults have not completed an advanced directive. If documents are completed, they are not regularly revisited and can be difficult to locate when needed. Because these issues are difficult to discuss, often surrogates feel ill-prepared to interpret their loved ones' written wishes. These shortcomings leave families and health care proxies faced with the burden of determining their loved ones' wishes in the midst of crisis, adding greater stress and anxiety.

One of the great misconceptions about advanced care planning is that it is a onetime event. Attempting to plan for all of the possibilities in a single document or within a single conversation is both overwhelming and impossible. For advanced care planning to be successful, it must become less about legal documentation and more about facilitating ongoing communication about the future care wishes among individuals, their health care providers and their families.

This approach recognizes that documents like advance directives and physician orders for life-sustaining treatment are not the end but the means—the tools—for documenting care preferences based on informed decisions that incorporate an individual's values, personal goals and current circumstance. This process not only provides higher quality care but personalized care. This is the right time to embrace this simple, commonsense reform.

I stepped out of a hearing going on in Ways and Means about the Affordable Care Act, which has basically become a contest, an ongoing soap opera, not an effort to fix the expensive health care system that too often delivers mediocre results. Instead, it is used as a political tug of war. The Personalize Your Care Act is a way out of this cul-de-sac. It is a way that we can come together to empower families, to know what they face, to understand their choices, to make their wishes known, and to assure their wishes are respected.

I strongly urge my colleagues to join Dr. ROE and me to cosponsor H.R. 1173, the Personalize Your Care Act, and to work with us to guarantee this important protection for all American families.

---

#### NSA AND THE SNOOP AND SPY CAUCUS

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

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Speaker:

The administration puts forward a false choice between the liberties we cherish and the security we provide. No more illegal wiretapping of citizens, no more ignoring the law when it is convenient—that is not who we are. That is not what is necessary to defeat the terrorists. We will again set an example for the world that the law is not subject to the whims of stubborn rulers and that justice is not arbitrary. This administration acts like violating civil liberties is the way to enhance our own security. It is not.

Mr. Speaker, those were the words of Senator Barack Obama in 2007.

That was then. This is now.

The NSA, the National Spy Agency, as I call it, is continuing its stealth intrusion into the lives of not only Americans but of foreign leaders as well, whom Senator Obama once talked about. The NSA has been caught eavesdropping on the Germans, the French, and now new reports say 60 million phone calls in Spain were monitored by the NSA.

A bit more history about the NSA and its spying:

The Department of Justice stealthily seized information from 20 different Associated Press phone lines, including some in the U.S. Capitol—right up there. The Department of Justice stealthily seized phone records of Fox News reporter James Rosen, of his parents and of several Fox News phone lines. In the month of January of 2013 alone, 125 billion phone calls were monitored worldwide, and at least 3 billion of them were phone calls in America.

The NSA stealthily seized from Verizon Business Network Services millions of telephone records, including the locations, numbers and times of domestic calls. A secret government program called PRISM allowed the NSA to search photos, emails and documents from computers at Apple, Google and Microsoft, among many other Internet sources.

NSA and the Snoop and Spy Caucus say this spying on Americans and our allies is necessary to catch the terrorists. They even claim terrorist attacks have been prevented. If this is true, show the evidence. Prove it. Where are the terrorists who supposedly have been thwarted by these surveillance tendencies?

Even if it is true, which I doubt, it still violates the law. In my opinion, it violates the PATRIOT Act. The PATRIOT Act doesn't allow for this nonsense. It violates the constitutional right of privacy, Mr. Speaker. It violates the Fourth Amendment and the right of persons to be secure in their homes, papers and effects without government intrusion. Government cannot use the old Soviet-style, dragnet approach, hoping to catch a big fish while also catching the endangered species of freedom.

Those who argue otherwise say they must seize the whole haystack to find the needle in the haystack. Mr. Speaker, that is exactly what is prevented in the Fourth Amendment. I would like to quote the Fourth Amendment:

The right of the people to be secure in their persons, houses, papers, and effects against unreasonable searches and seizures, shall not be violated, and no warrants shall issue but upon probable cause, supported by oath or affirmation, and particularly describing the place to be searched and the persons or things to be seized.

The Fourth Amendment specifically prohibits government from seizing the whole haystack to find the one needle.

Mr. Speaker, the American people have lost trust in government. It is time for Congress to intervene to prevent the invasion of privacy by government against the citizens. The Federal Government must stop redlining the Fourth Amendment.

According to an administration official, the President did not sign off on this stuff, and was unaware of the depth of the surveillance of foreign leaders.

Who did sign off?

Mr. Speaker, is there a shadow government in America that operates outside the law, outside the knowledge of the administration?

Sort of spooky, isn't it, Mr. Speaker?

Technology may change, but the Constitution does not. We can have security but not at the cost of losing individual freedom because, to quote the constitutional law professor:

There should be no choice between the liberties we cherish and the security we provide.

And that's just the way it is.

---

#### TRADE AND KOREA

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

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, Politico recently reported that U.S. Trade Representative Michael Froman is pressing for another trade bill as soon as possible. This one is called the Trans-Pacific Partnership (TPP), to be signed with Asian Pacific countries, about a dozen of them. But whether it is the Obama administration, the Bush I or Bush II administration or the Clinton administration, the executive branch continues to push the same old failed trade model that puts foreign involvement and multinational interests ahead of America's workers and America's businesses. In fact, these deals have cost America millions and millions of jobs as our trade deficit continues to get worse.

This TPP proposal is particularly disturbing as a new trade deal. Because, if you look at the results of the first Obama administration trade deal, the Korean deal, you will see the proof is in the pudding that things didn't get better with our economy, they actually got worse. We were told with the Korean free trade deal that America would create 70,000 jobs here at home.

Guess what?

The fact is, in reality, with the Korean free trade deal, America has lost another 40,000 jobs as a result of that agreement alone. That is about 4,000

jobs lost each month because of the Korean free trade deal.

We were promised with the Korean deal that our economy would grow through increased exports by \$10 billion to \$11 billion.

Guess what?

In reality, U.S. exports to Korea have actually declined by roughly \$800 million since the agreement took effect. Yes, that is a 20 percent decline. That translates into lost jobs and lost income.

America was told that if we signed the Korean trade agreement that, actually, our trade deficit would shrink.

□ 1030

Well, guess what, the month the Korean trade agreement took effect, the U.S. trade deficit with Korea was \$564 billion. It has nearly tripled to \$1.6 billion, adding to the sea of red trade-deficit ink and more lost jobs.

We were told that America would actually level the playing field in the field of automotive trade if we passed the Korean free trade deal. I didn't vote for it. But guess what? Since the Korean agreement took effect, U.S. exports of motor vehicles to Korea have gone up monthly by, guess what, how much—44 cars—44 cars. That is it. At the same time, guess how many more cars the Koreans are shipping in here per month—20,000. All told, Korea has imported more than 1.5 million motor vehicles to the United States since the agreement took effect.

Meanwhile, America has only exported 34,000 cars—only 34,000. That is a 44 to one advantage on Korea's side. That doesn't sound like an agreement that is working to me. Why model the new TPP on that agreement. The Korean deal isn't working.

The sad thing is the American people have been told the same free-trade agreement lies for the past quarter century. All the lies that are contained in them have resulted in a sea of red ink that is costing us jobs. It is no surprise America has amassed a \$17 trillion budget deficit when you have a \$9 trillion accumulated trade deficit over the last 25 years. Too much of our economic powerhouse has been traded away.

Mr. Speaker, it is time for Congress to stop these bad trade deals. Focus on creating jobs inside our country. I call on Republican leaders to sideline the Trans-Pacific Partnership deal and bring up my bill H.R. 192, the Balancing Trade Act, as a start.

This legislation would require the administration to outline actions to balance the trade deficit with every single country with which we have a trade deficit—including Korea—country by country. America can then again begin to create jobs in this country at a level that the American people expect—to yield a vibrant economy here at home—and grow our middle class forward, not backward.

#### GOVERNMENT GLITCHES

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

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, the American people have become all too accustomed to government glitches, which result largely from government that has grown too large, too bureaucratic, and too difficult to navigate.

Every day, with a dedicated and compassionate staff, I assist constituents in navigating the frustrating and challenging bureaucracy of the Federal Government. On a daily basis, we attempt to problem-solve issues that citizens face when seeking resolution on issues with Federal agencies, agencies such as the Internal Revenue Service, the Environmental Protection Agency, Veterans Affairs, or FEMA, just to name a few.

The frustrations and difficulties created as unintended consequences of the Affordable Care Act have dramatically expanded how large and damaging government glitches can be. The Web site glitches are just icing on the cake; for over the last several years, the broken promises have continued to mount. One of the more glaring broken promises was reported yesterday when Americans found out they won't be able to keep the plan they have, despite what the President has been telling us.

Yesterday, NBC News aired a report that sources involved in the Affordable Care Act have admitted that:

Fifty to 75 percent of the 14 million consumers who buy their insurance individually can expect to receive a "cancellation" letter or the equivalent over the next year because their existing policies don't meet the standards mandated by the new health care law.

One expert was reported as predicting that number could reach as high as 80 percent. All of the four NBC sources said that many of those forced to buy pricier new policies will experience "sticker shock."

While millions of Americans are being shocked by cancellation letters for their health insurance, the Obama administration has known of this government glitch for at least 3 years.

Mr. Speaker, the so-called Affordable Care Act has been anything but affordable. Prices continue to rise on insurance premiums, and the cost of care nationally continues to go up.

Mr. Speaker, this law was intended to expand access and quality. Yet in Pennsylvania, children are being forced out of the Children's Health Insurance Program, commonly known as PA CHIP, and into medical assistance. CHIP is serving our kids adequately through commercial products that are widely accepted by physicians. It is low-cost, market-based health insurance coverage. Moving these kids onto Medicaid has the potential to dramatically limit access to care.

Given the mounting evidence of glitches in ObamaCare's rollout, affordability, and individual choice, you

have to wonder about what the future holds. From the missed deadlines, delays, and special waivers to, now, Web site crashes and Americans losing the plans they have, the outcomes we are encountering with this law are completely unacceptable.

Mr. Speaker, it is time for the administration to delay and fix all these glitches that are so evident in the Affordable Care Act. It is time for the Obama administration to do the right thing. The American people deserve as much.

#### IN CELEBRATION OF DIWALI

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

Mr. HONDA. Mr. Speaker, let me just be a little uplifting today.

I rise today to wish my friends and colleagues a happy Diwali. Diwali is this Sunday, November 3, and it signifies the start of the lunar new year. The festival of Diwali is a rich cultural history. It celebrates the victory of good over evil, light over darkness, and knowledge over ignorance.

Diwali is one of the biggest festivals for Hindus, celebrated with great enthusiasm and happiness. The festival is celebrated for 5 continuous days, where the third day is celebrated as the main Diwali festival or Festival of Lights. This holiday commemorates Lord Rama's return from 14 years of exile after defeating the demon King Ravan.

Different colorful varieties of fireworks are always associated with this festival. People shoot firecrackers to drive away evil spirits. On this auspicious day, people light up diyas lamps and candles all around their house. These lamps are kept on during the night and people clean their houses to welcome Lakshmi, the goddess of wealth, into their homes. Lakshmi is said to bring prosperity and happiness to people in the new year.

During Diwali, all the celebrants wear new clothes and share sweets and snacks with family members and friends. They perform the ceremonial Puja in the evening and seek divine blessings from Lakshmi. The festival of Diwali is never complete without the exchange of gifts. People present Diwali gifts to all near and dear ones.

Diwali is an official holiday in India, Nepal, Sri Lanka, Myanmar, Mauritius, Guyana, Trinidad and Tobago, Suriname, Malaysia, Singapore, and Fiji. This holiday is one of the most important holidays in Indian culture and a time for families to reunite and enjoy one another's company.

I ask my colleagues to join me in the celebration of Diwali, the Festival of Lights. Happy Diwali.

#### HONORING GEORGE BERRY, SR.

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

Mr. HARPER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the craftsmanship of George Berry, Sr.

George's life has been dedicated to woodcarving. This interest began at a young age and developed into a lifelong pursuit. His artwork displays a passion for nature, particularly the wildlife of Mississippi.

George has not only been committed to his art, but also to sharing his gifts through teaching. He has become an important fixture within the local art community in Mississippi, and he has been recognized both within this community and outside of it with several distinguished awards. Through his passion for art and education, George Berry, Sr. has made a tremendous impact on many Mississippians and others throughout this country.

George was born in Vinita, Oklahoma; and at the age of 6, George was taught woodcarving by his father. He moved to Mississippi in 1972 to teach industrial arts at the Piney Woods School, a historically African American boarding school located in Rankin County, Mississippi. A year later, he became a charter member of the Craftsmen's Guild of Mississippi, a program created to promote folk art within the State.

After retiring from Piney Woods in 1984, George Berry has dedicated a majority of his time to woodcarving. Even so, he continues to spend a great deal of his time teaching others. George teaches weekly classes for the Mississippi Craftsmen's Guild and frequently instructs students at the Allison Wells School of Arts and Crafts in Canton, Mississippi. Additionally, he has taught at the John C. Campbell Folk School in Brasstown, North Carolina.

George Berry's preference in style is reflected in his large body of work. His realistic depictions of nature are the constant theme in his artwork. In particular, many of his wood pieces represent Mississippi wildlife with works such as catfish, deer, and hunting dogs. Beautiful sculptures of leaves and birds are other staples of his artwork. His skillful craft is a demonstration of the grace and rustic beauty that is found in nature.

This Mississippi craftsman has been recognized with many awards and honors. George Berry received a Folk Artist Fellowship from the Mississippi Arts Commission in 1999. In 2002, he was presented with the prestigious Governor's Award for Excellence in the Arts. The Craftsmen's Guild of Mississippi awarded him with their Lifetime Achievement Award in 2009. On October 18 of this year, I had the privilege of speaking at the celebration of the opening of the George Berry, Sr. Gallery of the Craftsmen's Guild of Mississippi, joining hundreds of family and friends in honoring George.

In addition to these awards, George Berry's work has been on display at several major festivals, including the Mississippi Arts Festival, Festival USA on the Strand, the Festival of Pennsylvania Folklife Bicentennial, and the Mississippi pavilion at the world's fair.

His carved wood sculptures are on exhibit in a number of museums, including the Old Capital Museum in Jackson, Mississippi, and the Museum of Natural Science.

George has been featured in many national and regional publications, such as Southern Living and Mississippi Outdoors. These many accolades are a testament to this gifted artist.

So again, on behalf of the House of Representatives, I would like to congratulate and recognize Mr. George Berry, Sr. on his achievements as both an artist and as a teacher. For more than 50 years, George has used his God-given gift as a skillful craftsman to make beautiful pieces of art. Today, he continues to graciously share his knowledge and skill with many others.

#### 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 42 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

Reverend Jack Hibbs, Calvary Chapel Chino Hills Church, Chino, California, offered the following prayer:

Almighty God and Father, if it be Your will that we be revived as a Nation, hear my prayer. I ask You to make us a thankful people, that we would bless You, the author of abundant mercies.

Enable us to display our gratitude for all Your goodness by endeavoring to fear and obey You. Bless us with Your wisdom in this House, success in our battles, and let our prosperity be tempered with generosity.

We pray that You would keep the United States in Your holy protection, that You would incline our hearts to cultivate a spirit of peace and obedience to both You and Your government, and that You would cause us to do justly and to love mercy and to walk humbly in that love that is characteristic of Your Son, the author of our blessed faith.

Grant us this prayer through Jesus Christ our Lord.

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.

#### PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER. Will the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. QUIGLEY) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. QUIGLEY 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.

#### 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. 893. An act to provide for an increase, effective December 1, 2013, in the rates of compensation for veterans with service-connected disabilities and the rates of dependency and indemnity compensation for the survivors of certain disabled veterans, and for other purposes.

#### WELCOMING REVEREND JACK HIBBS

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the gentleman from California (Mr. GARY G. MILLER) is recognized for 1 minute.

There was no objection.

Mr. GARY G. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, it is my honor to have my good friend and my pastor, Jack Hibbs, here with us today to give the opening prayer.

He is a senior pastor with Calvary Chapel Chino Hills. He has an incredible mission going on in California. Plus, he has a global ministry going on the radio. He does an amazing job in preaching God's word, and I am glad to have him here with us today.

#### ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

#### CONSTITUENTS CONCERNED ABOUT OBAMACARE

(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, constituents living across South Carolina's Second Congressional District have communicated very sincere concerns about the implementation of ObamaCare.

Sarah from North Augusta writes:

People should not be punished because they grow old. One day, we will all be in their shoes . . . It is preposterous that the government will be the one to tell doctors what to charge for their services and what services can be provided.

Justin from Columbia writes:

The full implementation of ObamaCare will be a disaster for America and the American people. Not only is it a direct assault on

our freedom, but it also puts the government in the middle of our health care decisions; it increases costs, and it will inevitably lead to a single-payer system.

As the rollout of ObamaCare continues to fail, Congress must act to address this problem now before it is too late and before every American family falls victim to this unworkable law which destroys jobs.

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

#### UKRAINE'S 80TH ANNIVERSARY OF MAN-MADE FAMINE AND GENOCIDE

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

Mr. QUIGLEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to commemorate the 80th anniversary of Ukraine's man-made famine and genocide.

The "Great Man-made Famine" was executed under Joseph Stalin's Communist rule in an effort to eradicate Ukrainian culture, education, and social institutions. Under Stalin's regime, the Ukrainian people were stripped of their land and grain and were herded onto collective farms where they were eventually left to starve to death. What was once the "breadbasket of Europe" became home to a forced famine that ultimately took the lives of over 6 million innocent men, women, and children.

But Stalin's attempt to squelch the spirit and history of the Ukrainian people failed.

This Friday, the Ukrainian National Museum in Chicago will remember those whose lives were taken by this man-made genocide. The museum will also, justifiably, celebrate the strong and vibrant people in the nation of Ukraine that thrives today.

#### PUTIN OPPRESSION OF AHISKA TURKS

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

Mr. KINZINGER of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I was stunned to see Russian President Vladimir Putin disparage American exceptionalism a few weeks ago. Simply put, Mr. Putin's human rights record leaves much to be desired, including his treatment of Ahiska Turks. A distinct minority, they are severely persecuted by top Russian authorities in Putin's government solely for their ethnicity and religion.

During Mr. Putin's first term, the State Department designated Ahiska Turks as a group of special humanitarian concern. Since then, 12,000 Turks have resettled in America, including many in Illinois and in my district. However, 80,000 Ahiska Turks remain in Russia, and they routinely face

discrimination and persecution in areas of their lives that we often take for granted. In an ethnic cleansing campaign, Stalin uprooted and resettled Ahiska Turks to central Asia from their ancestral lands in Georgia in 1944. Unable to return, they have since been perennial refugees in Central Asia and Russia.

This is the reality of Putin's Russia: in Russia, people are routinely and severely discriminated against, tortured, even killed, and are economically and financially repressed.

When given the freedom to chase the American Dream, these same Ahiska Turks have fulfilled their potential in less than a decade. I will let my colleagues make their own determinations about which nation is exceptional.

#### THE AFFORDABLE CARE ACT—A WINNER FOR SENIORS

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

Mr. COURTNEY. Mr. Speaker, the government announced yesterday good news for seniors: their Medicare part B premiums for 2014 will go up zero dollars and zero cents. It will stay at \$104 per month. This is now the third year in a row that CMS Medicare part B premiums have defied the trustees' predictions and have come in lower than projected. It also defies the relentless campaign of misinformation that seniors have been subjected to that their Medicare part B premiums are going to go up.

Just on Friday, I was at a senior fair where a woman showed me a chain email that read that Medicare part B premiums for 2014 were going up to \$247 a month—just a viral infection that has been out there and that I have been confronted with at senior centers over and over again. The facts are that they are going up zero. Medicare Advantage premiums have stabilized. Medicare part B premiums have stabilized. Prescription drug costs have gone down because of closing the doughnut hole.

In every respect, the Affordable Care Act since it passed in 2010 has been a winner for seniors, and it has helped strengthen the solvency of the program. Again, Medicare part B premiums are going up zero for 2014.

#### LEGION OF VALOR BRONZE CROSS RECIPIENT

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

Mr. DESJARLAIS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to commend an exceptional young leader from Rutherford County in Tennessee's Fourth District. Elizabeth Ethridge recently received the Legion of Valor Bronze Cross for leadership, a testament to her strong work ethic and dedication to her Junior ROTC battalion.

An honor student at Smyrna High School, Elizabeth is exceptionally well-rounded. She is ranked in the top 10 percent of her class as well as of her JROTC grade. In addition to her service through JROTC, Elizabeth volunteers to give back to the community. Elizabeth is one of six Bronze Cross recipients, competing against cadets from more than 200 schools for this great honor. Last month, Elizabeth was presented with the award at the Rutherford County Board of Education meeting.

Elizabeth hopes to attend Vanderbilt University to study medicine and to one day join Doctors without Borders. I wish her the best of luck in her future endeavors, and I know she will continue to make our Fourth District proud.

#### PRESERVE THE FOOD STAMP PROGRAM

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

Mr. KILDEE. Mr. Speaker, this week, unfortunately, food stamps will be cut by \$5 billion. We expected that. What is worse is that even deeper cuts could follow.

Conferees start negotiating a farm bill this week, and billions of dollars in cuts—in fact, \$40 billion—have been proposed by Republicans in the House, which is 10 times the number of cuts passed in the bipartisan bill in the Senate.

Since I have been here in Congress, I have talked to dozens of people in my district who have come up to me and said, Thank you for fighting to preserve the food stamp program. I have never told anybody, they say, but I received food stamps at one point in my life, so thank you for fighting.

I am afraid that many Members of Congress simply don't know what it is like to be poor in America. These are real people—real human beings. The cuts that we contemplate here are not numbers on a piece of paper but are cuts that would literally take food out of the mouths of people who are hungry.

This is wrong. It cannot stand. I urge my colleagues to fight to preserve this important program.

#### FALSE PROMISES

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

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, another day goes by, and the ObamaCare train wreck continues.

In 2009, President Obama promised, If you like your health care plan, you can keep it. It still promises that on the White House Web site and on the healthcare.gov Web site if and when you can get on that Web site.

Mr. Speaker, when are these false promises going to end? What do I say

to Gail in Maryland who wrote me this?

I have been informed by Blue Cross & Blue Shield of Maryland that I cannot keep my current coverage and will have to choose a new policy. . . . I have to change my coverage and pay 53 percent more in premiums for coverage that is not as good. My husband and I . . . will now have to pay at least \$330 more per month for less coverage.

Gail and her family will lose the plan they like and will have to pay almost \$4,000 more per year for a plan that delivers less.

Mr. Speaker, American families deserve better than false promises.

#### BUILDING A BETTER BUDGET

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

Mr. VEASEY. Mr. Speaker, I want to talk to you today about the importance of responsible budget-making in our government. Budgets are moral documents that reflect our priorities as a Nation. For the sake of our economy, this Congress must turn back from the current brinkmanship and obstruction, and must return to the practice of negotiation and compromise.

The proposed budget and across-the-board spending cuts to domestic programs are continuing to slam families, children, seniors, veterans, and persons with disabilities in the congressional district that I represent. Impacts to Texas include \$9 billion in cuts to SNAP benefits over 10 years, almost \$32 billion in cuts to health care for Texas seniors, and the loss of over 5,000 jobs for our Texas educators.

We should focus on improving our education, on strengthening old infrastructure, on investing in advanced domestic manufacturing, and in paving the way for the future.

Let's show the American people that compromise and negotiation are not a thing of the past and that Washington can work together on their behalf. As elected leaders, we owe it to the American people to do the jobs we were sent here to do.

#### IF YOU LIKE YOUR HEALTH PLAN, YOU CAN'T KEEP IT

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

Mr. MESSER. Mr. Speaker, "If you like your health plan, you will be able to keep your health plan."

That is what the President said in 2009, but now NBC News is reporting that this administration knew for at least 3 years that that wasn't true.

Now millions of hardworking Americans in the individual market will not be able to keep their plans even if they like them. People across the Nation are experiencing sticker shock as they receive cancellation letters from their insurers and see their monthly premiums rise up to 400 percent. More people have

received cancellation letters than have enrolled so far through all of the Affordable Care Act exchanges.

The Affordable Care Act has proven to be anything but. It is time for the President and my Democratic colleagues to work with us to suspend this flawed law and to work to fix it. We have to find a better way to deliver the reforms people really need because this law isn't working.

□ 1215

#### SUPPORT OUR VETERANS

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

Mr. HIGGINS. Mr. Speaker, this week the House will consider a number of bills to honor and support our veterans.

These are good bills, but they are not enough. A good and grateful Nation would also make sure a strong commitment is made to helping our veterans find work when they return home.

Mr. Speaker, the current unemployment rate for post-9/11 veterans is 10 percent; and among young veterans between the ages of 18 and 24, it is 22 percent. This is unacceptable. We owe it to our veterans to support programs like the not-for-profit Helmets to Hardhats, which partners with the Department of Defense, American businesses, and organized labor to help returning veterans prepare for work in the construction trades.

We must also be sure that veterans have the ability to get the educational benefits they have earned without being constrained by deadline, as my legislation, the Veterans Educational Flexibility Act, would do.

Along with the commitment to nation-building right here at home, we can create good American jobs that can't be outsourced and give back to those who have served our Nation.

#### DEBT AND SPENDING

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

Mr. HOLDING. Mr. Speaker, just a week after the debt ceiling was suspended, the Federal Government added \$375 billion in new debt. Without a limit on spending until mid-February, the Federal Government continues to borrow more than it takes in and spend at an outrageous rate.

The fact is, Mr. Speaker, at a spending rate of \$375 billion a week, U.S. debt would be over \$22 trillion by the next debt ceiling deadline. This is unacceptable and unsustainable.

Mr. Speaker, the reason we have found ourselves in a fiscal rut is because of outrageous, frivolous government spending. We have to come to the table and do more to cut spending in the next debt deal. This includes comprehensive tax reform to make our Tax

Code less burdensome and changes to our entitlement programs to ensure that they are working as they should for future generations.

American families know that they cannot spend limitlessly and never pay their bills. Our Federal Government should not be any different, and it is time to break our bad spending habits.

#### THE AFFORDABLE CARE ACT IS WORKING

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

Ms. HAHN. Mr. Speaker, the Affordable Care Act is more than a Web site; it is affordable, quality health insurance made available to everyone.

While my friends on the other side of the aisle like to keep talking about bad stories, there are some good stories about the Affordable Care Act, and I have one of them. It is Sarah and Joe, parents of two small children from Los Angeles, who have been working very hard every day to provide for their family while they were paying a high health care premium every month.

Just last month, they were paying \$1,259 a month for COBRA. Last week, they got on the exchange, and they enrolled in a Blue Cross Silver 70 plan and are now paying more than \$400 less a month—less a month. Sarah shared with us:

We are a family of four with two young kids. Regular access to doctors is a must for us.

This plan does that.

The recent problems people have encountered on the Web site are unacceptable, and they are being fixed. Let's not allow these temporary glitches to overshadow the life-changing benefits that the Affordable Care Act is bringing to millions of American families like Sarah and Joe.

#### BUREAUCRATS, NOT PATIENTS, ARE THE FOCUS

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

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, people want to be able to trust their President.

When he said: If you like your plan, you can keep your plan, many Americans believed him. But keeping the insurance you liked was never a real possibility under ObamaCare.

By design, the law requires every single new health plan and any existing plan that has been altered over the past 3 years to satisfy the one-size-fits-all requirements of Washington's central planners. That means millions of Americans are losing their current coverage, even though many liked their plans—plans that were tailored to work for them—that meet their specific needs and fit into their family budgets.

Unsurprisingly, though, when placating bureaucrats is the rule, patients certainly can't be the focus.

The President did say: If you like your plan, you can keep your plan, but he simultaneously championed a law that replaced custom care with cookie-cutter care.

Millions are being booted from their health plans as a result.

#### SUPERSTORM SANDY 1-YEAR ANNIVERSARY

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

Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, 1 year ago today, New York City and the entire eastern seaboard were ravaged by Superstorm Sandy. Entire communities were shattered, families were torn apart, and lives were lost.

In New York City, the water level was so high it was covering cars. The Nation's largest and busiest mass transit system closed down for the first time in a century; 8½ million people lost their power and some still do not have it returned; and 125 Americans lost their lives.

The gratitude I feel for all those who helped their friends and neighbors is hard to express. There were a great number of heroes and heroines, and we sorely needed them.

On the Federal level, with the support of this body, FEMA has approved over \$3.2 billion in funding for emergency work and over \$1.4 billion in assistance to over 182,000 survivors. The Small Business Administration has approved \$2.4 billion in low-interest loans. The National Flood Insurance Program has provided more than \$7.9 billion to policyholders.

I would like to thank all of my colleagues and all those who stepped up to help during these difficult times. New York and others are deeply grateful.

#### OBAMACARE ROLLOUT III

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

Mr. WALBERG. Mr. Speaker, over and over and over again, the President told the American people: If you like your health plan, you can keep it.

If that were true, why then is Kaiser Health News reporting that "health plans are sending hundreds of thousands of cancellation letters to people who buy their own coverage"? The Kaiser report goes on to say that some consumers are now being forced to "buy more costly policies."

If folks turn to the government for help—if they go to [healthcare.gov](http://healthcare.gov)—they will be met with so many bugs and glitches as to make signing up almost impossible.

Mr. Speaker, this is simply not fair. Nor is it fair that the President wants to find people who can't sign up using his own faulty Web site.

House Republicans want to promote fair solutions that create more jobs for all Americans. That is how we are going to get our economy growing.

#### UNIVERSITY OF NEVADA, LAS VEGAS

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

Ms. TITUS. Mr. Speaker, the annual Battle for Nevada between the University of Nevada, Las Vegas, and the University of Nevada, Reno, is not just a football game played once a year; it is a time-honored tradition that reflects the best of Nevada's sports rivalries. The victor not only wins bragging rights for a year, but also the coveted Fremont Cannon, which is painted in the winning school's colors.

For 8 long years, Reno has claimed these spoils. But this past Saturday, after a great game between Nevada's two outstanding universities, UNLV celebrated its first victory against the Wolf Pack since 2004 and the long-anticipated return of Fremont Cannon to Las Vegas.

Congratulations to UNLV's coach, Bobby Hauck, and all the Rebels for their 27-22 victory against UNR. You have made southern Nevada proud.

As part of a friendly wager placed on the game and in honor of Make a Difference Day, my colleague, MARK AMODEI from Nevada's Second District, and I will be performing a community service project wearing Rebels red.

Go Rebels.

#### SUPERSTORM SANDY 1-YEAR ANNIVERSARY

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

Ms. HANABUSA. Mr. Speaker, as a Member of the House Sustainable Energy and Environment Coalition, I rise today to recognize the 1-year anniversary of Superstorm Sandy and remember those who tragically lost their lives, as well as those continuing to rebuild from that destruction.

In the year since Superstorm Sandy ravaged the east coast, communities across the Nation have suffered through new extreme droughts, storms, wildfires, and flooding.

My home State of Hawaii is incredibly vulnerable to the effects of climate change. As you can imagine, a sea level rise is a real threat and concern for us. Earlier this year, Honolulu joined more than 70 other U.S. communities asking for the President to cut greenhouse gas emissions that are driving climate change and increasing Hawaii's risk of extreme weather events and sea level rise.

When I was in the Hawaii Legislature, I am proud to say that we passed a bill, and were one of the first States, to address the greenhouse gas emissions.

As we reflect on this somber anniversary, I remain committed to ensuring the people of Hawaii have the resources to prepare, respond, and recover from devastation. We must all remember it is climate change.

#### OBAMACARE

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

Mr. ROHRBACHER. Mr. Speaker, I hope that the American people have fully understood what has been going on here for the last 6 weeks.

The Republicans offered what? The Republicans offered to delay ObamaCare as a compromise position in order to have the continuing resolution to keep our government going. That compromise was rejected. We were called all kinds of names, and then we were told we were the ones that closed down government.

Take a look at what has happened. ObamaCare, this disaster that is taking place, the glitches, all of the problems, we know now ObamaCare wasn't even ready. The President and the country needed the extra time in order to perfect ObamaCare, but he would rather have closed it down—our government—rather than reach a compromise with the House of Representatives.

That is what this is all about. We had arrogance on the part of our Chief Executive unwilling to negotiate with the House. What was the House offering? Time to delay ObamaCare so it could work.

Now the American people have not only suffered a closure, but now are suffering from an ObamaCare that is not ready to be launched.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will remind Members to refrain from engaging in personalities toward the President.

#### CONGRATULATING ASTRONAUT RICK MASTRACCHIO

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

Ms. ESTY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to offer my congratulations and support to Astronaut Rick Mastracchio of NASA's best and brightest and a proud son of Waterbury, Connecticut.

Astronaut Mastracchio and two colleagues will launch on a mission to the International Space Station on November 6, bringing along a package of trackable geocaching tags from Waterbury Elementary students.

He will spend 6 months on the ISS, conduct several hundred experiments, and return to Earth in May.

Astronaut Mastracchio attended Crosby High School and received his bachelor of science degree in electrical engineering and computer science from the University of Connecticut.

He is a veteran of three space flights, having logged nearly 40 days in space.

He continues to be an inspiration for students back home in Connecticut and around the world.

We wish him the best of luck and a safe journey.

#### OBAMACARE ROLLOUT I

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

minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. CONAWAY. Mr. Speaker, just how unworkable is the Affordable Care Act, or the “Unaffordable Care Act,” as I am often corrected back home in District 11?

Let’s take a look at some recent headlines about the launch of the new Web site:

The Orlando Sentinel called it a “hit-or-miss proposition.”

CNN said:

Americans are still having a tough time.

Wow, what an understatement.

Yes, we all know about how the ObamaCare Web site—built with taxpayer dollars—is riddled with glitches.

But is a bad Web site the only problem Americans face? Not by a long shot.

How about those premiums that are shooting up all over America for affordable health care?

Last month’s mediocre jobs reports show our economy is still struggling, and higher insurance costs will not help hardworking Americans solve those problems.

This is not what we were promised, but it is exactly what we are getting under the Unaffordable Care Act.

□ 1230

#### CONGRATULATING LINDENWOOD UNIVERSITY-BELLEVILLE ON 10TH ANNIVERSARY

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

Mr. ENYART. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the 10th anniversary of Lindenwood University’s campus in Belleville, Illinois.

On November 3, 2003, Lindenwood acquired the 22-acre site at the old Belleville West High School. Fifty-two students enrolled in evening classes that semester. In the decade since, Lindenwood University-Belleville has grown into a strong and vibrant institution that contributes much to the richness of Belleville and to the higher education choices of southern Illinois. Today, Lindenwood has over 1,000 full-time students enrolled in a wide range of academic programs, with hundreds more in graduate, continuing education, and specialized programs.

This past spring, I had the high honor of addressing graduates at Lindenwood’s first commencement exercises. I quoted Lindenwood University’s mission statement to provide programs “leading to the development of the whole person—an educated, responsible citizen of a global community.”

In its first decade, Lindenwood has done just that. I congratulate Lindenwood University-Belleville on its 10th anniversary and wish the entire campus community much continued success.

#### OBAMACARE ROLLOUT

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

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, more and more news continues to come to light about the poor workmanship that went into the Obama administration’s Web site for ObamaCare. It is a problem and it is a mistake, and Americans are dealing with it all across America. The Associated Press reports that folks in the administration “saw red flags for months,” and The Washington Post said that bureaucrats insisted on plowing ahead despite this known failure that would lie ahead.

So, Mr. Speaker, we would ask a question: Why are the American people going to be required to be in a health care system other than the one that they chose? And the answer is because President Obama and Democrats passed a law years ago that is something that the American people do not want and were misled into. Premiums are skyrocketing, and some insurers are kicking people off their plan that they were on entirely.

Mr. Speaker, Republicans have a plan for the future, and it allows people to have their own doctor, their own insurance company, and to make their own decisions.

#### CLIMATE CHANGE

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

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Mr. Speaker, as a member of the House Sustainable Energy and Environmental Coalition, I rise today to recognize the 1-year anniversary of Superstorm Sandy and remember those who tragically lost their lives as well as those continuing to rebuild from the destruction.

My constituents in Colorado understand the pain that comes with extreme weather events, having recently suffered from devastating and historic flooding and fires. The flooding killed nine people, damaged or destroyed almost 18,000 homes and businesses across the State, damage to our roads and bridges is estimated to be \$450 million, and our cities and counties saw over \$170 million in infrastructure damage.

Yet floods were not the only severe weather events in Colorado this year. Numerous wildfires and droughts damaged and destroyed property and crops and took lives.

I applaud the President for putting forth his climate action plan in an effort to implement meaningful policies that are slowing the effects of climate change. Congress should take further action to minimize the impacts of these natural disasters and to better understand our weather patterns.

We will and we must work together to rebuild stronger and smarter to better prepare for future natural disasters that are becoming all too common be-

cause of the real impacts of climate change.

#### LET THE AFFORDABLE CARE ACT WORK FOR FAMILIES

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

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Speaker, I want to share a letter I received from a constituent of mine named Mary Ann from Milford, Connecticut. She is suffering from cancer, and she wrote to me during the recent Republican government shutdown. She wrote:

I’m attaching a picture I snapped of the statement I received from my insurance company regarding my chemotherapy treatment of the month of July, which was one treatment.

Over \$110,000.

I’m grateful I have insurance right now, but it’s COBRA. It is expensive, and it runs out in 18 months. If the Affordable Care Act is not in place in 18 months, I will never be able to get insurance or treatment.

This is real for me. It is life or death for me, and I am grateful that President Obama is not willing to negotiate with my life as this Nation is held hostage by political terrorists.

Mr. Speaker, I receive calls and letters like this every single week. The Affordable Care Act is already making a profound difference for individuals and their families. Those on the other side of the aisle who talk about it is not necessary, they have health insurance. They have it.

Why is it that this body goes on to say “no” to health insurance for millions of Americans who are out there? This body needs to stop partisan political games and let the Affordable Care Act work for families. It is a matter of life or death.

#### CLIMATE CHANGE

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

Mrs. DAVIS of California. Mr. Speaker, as a member of the House Sustainable Energy and Environment Coalition, I rise today to recognize the 1-year anniversary of Superstorm Sandy and to remember those who tragically lost their lives, their homes, and so much of the communities that they knew.

The storm’s crippling impacts still persist up and down the east coast. While we cannot blame climate change for any one event, all of these natural disasters taken together are undeniable evidence of a looming man-made disaster.

My constituents in California are also struggling to deal with climate change. In my State, 12 of the 20 most damaging wildfires occurred in the last 10 years, and crops have been decimated due to rising temperatures and water scarcity.

We need to ask ourselves: What have we learned from Sandy? What have we

learned from other disasters, and what can we do to prevent the next one?

This problem has no party. There is no more personal or more compelling issue. Climate change is a human problem, with the direst of consequences. It is time to put aside our partisan differences and start working together to address these issues.

**PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 992, SWAPS REGULATORY IMPROVEMENT ACT, AND PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 2374, RETAIL INVESTOR PROTECTION ACT**

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 391 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

**H. RES. 391**

*Resolved*, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider in the House the bill (H.R. 992) to amend provisions in section 716 of the Dodd-Frank Wall Street Reform and Consumer Protection Act relating to Federal assistance for swaps entities. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. The bill shall be considered as read. All points of order against provisions in the bill are waived. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill to final passage without intervening motion except: (1) one hour of debate equally divided among and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Agriculture and the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Financial Services; (2) one motion to recommit.

SEC. 2. Upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider in the House the bill (H.R. 2374) to amend the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 to provide protections for retail customers, and for other purposes. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. In lieu of the amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on Financial Services now printed in the bill, an amendment in the nature of a substitute consisting of the text of Rules Committee Print 113-23 shall be considered as adopted. The bill, as amended, shall be considered as read. All points of order against provisions in the bill, as amended, are waived. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill, as amended, and on any further amendment thereto, to final passage without intervening motion except: (1) one hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Financial Services; (2) the further amendment printed in the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution, if offered by Representative George Miller of California or his designee, which shall be in order without intervention of any point of order, shall be considered as read, shall be separately debatable for 20 minutes equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question; and (3) one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

SEC. 3. Notwithstanding section 1002 of the Continuing Appropriations Act, 2014—

(a) a motion to proceed under such section—

(1) may be offered even if the committee to which a joint resolution has been referred has not reported or been discharged; and

(2) shall be in order only on the legislative day of Tuesday, October 29, 2013, or the legislative day of Wednesday, October 30, 2013; and

(b) a joint resolution under such section shall be debatable for one hour equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent.

SEC. 4. On any legislative day during the period from October 31, 2013, through November 11, 2013—

(a) the Journal of the proceedings of the previous day shall be considered as approved;

(b) the Chair may at any time declare the House adjourned to meet at a date and time, within the limits of clause 4, section 5, article I of the Constitution, to be announced by the Chair in declaring the adjournment.

SEC. 5. The Speaker may appoint Members to perform the duties of the Chair for the duration of the period addressed by section 4 of this resolution as though under clause 8(a) of rule I.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Texas is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to my friend, the gentleman from Boulder, Colorado (Mr. POLIS), pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume. During consideration of this resolution, all time yielded is for the purpose of debate only.

**GENERAL LEAVE**

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, H. Res. 391 provides a structured rule for consideration of H.R. 2374 and a closed rule for consideration of H.R. 992. However, I think it is important to note that H.R. 992 is a closed rule by default because the Rules Committee did not receive any amendments despite Members having ample time to submit them. So we made sure that, in the interest of time, we are going to move forward on this important legislation.

Mr. Speaker, today's bills are technical in nature, but each carries very important policy implications designed to strengthen our Nation's financial services industry while simultaneously protecting consumers and providing more certainty for our economy.

First, H.R. 992, the Swaps Regulatory Improvement Act, amends section 716 of the Dodd-Frank Act to provide banks and their customers the flexibility to effectively manage risk better.

Today, many banks and bank customers, such as utility companies and agricultural co-ops, use swaps as an effective means to manage their businesses and to operate their cash flows in a safe and practical manner. Unfortunately, section 716 of the Dodd-Frank Act would require banks and their customers to shift these practices out of the traditional bank model and place them in newly created, capitalized,

nonbank entities. Such a change to current business models would create unnecessary instability in domestic markets and potentially restrict access to these important financial instruments. Federal Reserve Chairman Ben Bernanke has said that such a move would "weaken both financial stability and strong prudential regulation."

H.R. 992 would allow banks and their customers to keep the majority of swaps transactions in-house and prevent needless financial instability. Additionally, it is important to note that, despite what my colleagues on the other side of the aisle may say, this legislation only permits traditional swaps to continue under the current operating structure. All structured swaps, such as an asset-backed security and other riskier investment vehicles, will be required to be housed in nonbank entities. I believe this legislation represents commonsense ideas that allow for greater financial flexibility for consumers while ensuring that investors are not subject to unnecessary risk.

□ 1245

The second bill, H.R. 2374, the Retail Investor Protection Act, aims to prevent potentially conflicting and costly definitions of fiduciary standards from being applied to broker-dealers and other financial service professionals. Currently, the Department of Labor is in the final stages of drafting a new definition of fiduciary standards for broker-dealers under the Employee Retirement Income Security Act known as ERISA. This new requirement would dramatically change a longstanding business model and potentially diminish the ability of everyday Americans to access quality investment advice, meaning, the broker that they choose.

At the same time, the Securities and Exchange Commission, known as the SEC, is considering adopting its own uniform fiduciary standard for broker-dealers pursuant to the Frank-Dodd Act. H.R. 2374 would prevent the Department of Labor from issuing any new fiduciary standards before the SEC finalizes its new rule. In other words, we would like for them to work together. This delay would prevent the two agencies from promulgating different and conflicting definitions that could prove difficult, if not impossible, for many financial service professionals to adhere to. Such a change in current business practices is a solution in search of a problem. Current suitability standards applied to broker-dealers did not play a role in the financial crisis of 2008, and Congress should not force American families to have to pay more not only for legal definitions they do not need, but against their own common sense.

Today, millions of Americans who save for retirement take advantage of many affordable investment options that broker-dealers provide. Changing fiduciary standards for broker-dealers

would increase costs and decrease access to important investment tools, especially for low- and middle-income families. I believe that H.R. 2374, as brought to the Rules Committee by the chairman of the Financial Services Committee, the Honorable JEB HENSARLING from Dallas, Texas, provides the certainty and flexibility that Americans need for retirement and to plan for their future and for their own children's education while promoting a safe and equitable marketplace.

I urge my colleagues to vote "yes" on the rule and "yes" on the underlying legislation.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Texas for yielding me the customary 30 minutes, and I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the rule, which is a closed rule for H.R. 992, the Swaps Regulatory Improvement Act. It only makes in order one amendment for H.R. 2374, the Retail Investor Protection Act, and it would allow for this political game that we like to play which is called the "vote on the disapproval of raising the debt ceiling," which I will talk about a little bit more later.

What I truly object to here is the way that this body, this House, is only meeting for one full day this week. We came in yesterday evening around 6:30 p.m. We are meeting today and, it is my understanding, for about half the day tomorrow. Most people in this country, Mr. Speaker, work a solid 40-hour workweek. I don't know why Members of Congress in this House, the expectations would somehow be they work 10, 12, 15 hours a week, call it a week, and go home, when there are many important things that we could be doing.

Don't get me wrong, Mr. Speaker. What we are talking about today—and I agree with some of the bills under this rule and I disagree with others—is an honest day's work. We are discussing and debating important bills. Would that we were having these kinds of discussions for 5 days a week rather than 1 day a week, Mr. Speaker.

While I disagree with this approach to getting very little work done that is important to the people of this country, this bill does make in order H.R. 992, which I support. I think this bill is common sense. It modifies a revision of the Dodd-Frank bill, which many, including many of the bill's authors, like former Representative Barney Frank and Federal Reserve Chairman Ben Bernanke, regard as problematic. It corrects that.

Many economists and regulators have noted that, without this legislation, it is quite likely that certain swaps activity could be pushed out from the heavily regulated bank institutions, having the opposite effect of what many of us wanted to accomplish with the Dodd-Frank bill and increasing costs to financial institutions. In fact, if we don't pass this bill, it could

make our financial system more susceptible to systemic risk and reduce our international competitiveness, according to former Chairman Bernanke.

I am confident that this bill will pass with a strong bipartisan coalition and does represent important work that this body will do.

The underlying bill, H.R. 992, also ensures that federally backed financial institutions can continue to conduct risk-mitigation efforts that serve commercial and hedging needs of their customers, while still prohibiting dangerous swaps that contributed to our economic collapse. I am pleased to join my colleagues from across the aisle in making this important fix, rather than repealing the law entirely.

I wish, Mr. Speaker, that the approach to ObamaCare and the Affordable Care Act was more analogous to this approach that we are having with Dodd-Frank. I think many of us who supported Dodd-Frank agree there are a number of changes that need to be made.

As far as I know, in the history of this institution, there has never been a perfect piece of legislation passed. It is regularly routine to have cleanup bills that improve and build upon what has been done. I wish that we could get there with the Affordable Care Act. I am a cosponsor of a number of bills that I think would improve the Affordable Care Act. I know that my colleagues from across the aisle are as well.

I think it is time to get past this discussion of trying to repeal ObamaCare and instead get to a discussion of: How do we make it work for our country? How do we make health care work for our country? How do we make health care affordable for our country and build upon the successes of the Affordable Care Act and address the shortcomings of the Affordable Care Act?

This rule also makes in order H.R. 2374, the Retail Investor Protection Act, which addresses pending rulemakings at both the Department of Labor and the Securities and Exchange Commission regarding the new fiduciary standards of care. Again, while the merits of this legislation are up for debate, under this rule the House majority only allowed consideration of one amendment for the two underlying bills. Instead, it is sending us home early with half a day of work tomorrow, Wednesday, rather than staying through the week and allowing further discussion of additional amendments and other important topics, like replacing our broken immigration system with one that works for our country.

More disappointingly, the light workload this week of a day and a half is emblematic of how the next 2 months are calendared for this House of Representatives. There are only 19 days left of work for this House before the end of the year. The House is only in session for 2½ days before we recess in a week. Again, I think that the Amer-

ican people expect and demand a minimum 40-hour workweek from the people that they hire to represent them here in Washington, and I think most people in this country have more than 19 days that they have to work in November and December. That is 2 full months, November and December. Yet, we only have 19 days over that 2-month period that this body will be in session.

Yet, there are critical issues that the American people are demanding that we act on. As an example, today is the 302nd day of 2013 that we have failed to bring to the floor a comprehensive immigration reform bill. Time is running short, and the need for a comprehensive immigration overhaul is growing every day. Even the United States Senate, hardly an institution that is prized for the speed with which it moves, has passed comprehensive immigration reform with more than a two-thirds majority.

Now, I am proud to be a part of a coalition of House Members, a bipartisan coalition, that has introduced a bill very similar to the Senate bill that has replaced some of the border security language with House border security language, H.R. 15, the Border Security, Economic Opportunity, and Immigration Modernization Act. This bill would create jobs, reduce our budget deficit, include a pathway to citizenship, unite families. It would help reflect our values as Americans in our immigration laws, grow the economy, create jobs for Americans here at home, and finally get real about enforcing our immigration laws.

Do you realize, Mr. Speaker, there are over 10 million people in this country illegally? When are we going to get serious about enforcing our laws and not making a mockery of them? This Nation is a Nation based on the rule of law. H.R. 15 reflects that commitment, as does the Senate immigration bill. It is time that we fix our broken immigration system rather than go home on a Wednesday and meet for 19 days in a 63-day period.

This is a bipartisan bill, H.R. 15. We have been joined by several Republicans—Representative DENHAM, Representative ROS-LEHTINEN. We encourage my colleagues, and I certainly invite my friend and colleague from Texas, to join us as cosponsors of this bill that will allow us to create enforcement, a pathway to citizenship, grow jobs, and finally resolve our broken immigration system.

Mr. Speaker, perhaps I am being paranoid, but it appears to me that perhaps leadership—Mr. Speaker, leadership, as you know, controls what we vote on here on the floor of the House. Leadership, of course, being my colleague, Mr. CANTOR from Virginia, and my colleague, Mr. BOEHNER from Ohio. Perhaps, Mr. Speaker, they fear that this bill would pass if it was brought to the floor. Yes, Mr. Speaker, this bill would pass if it was brought to the floor of the House. Twenty-nine Republicans have already publicly expressed

support for a pathway to citizenship. Many more Republicans, Mr. Speaker, have privately expressed support for a pathway to citizenship. It should hardly take courage to do so. Over 70 percent of the American people have expressed support for a pathway to citizenship.

Regrettably, the only action that this House has taken on immigration has been one vote, which voted to undo the deferred action program for childhood arrivals. It voted to deport DREAMers. Yes, the House of Representatives actually voted to do that. Fortunately, it didn't happen. The Democrats control the Senate and stopped it. The President likely would have vetoed it. It is his program that he started in the absence of this body acting. By the way, in the absence of the House of Representatives taking on immigration reform, I hope the President expands deferred action. What other tools does he have at his disposal to address our immigration system if this body, the law-making body, refuses to actually solve the immigration issue? If this body refuses to solve the immigration issue, the number of people here illegally will only increase, and this body, the House of Representatives, and the majority, the Republican Party, who won't allow us to vote on H.R. 15, will be responsible for more illegal immigration and having more people here illegally if we do not act now.

Mr. Speaker, just this week, nearly 600 conservative supporters of immigration reform will storm Capitol Hill from the faith community, the business community, the law enforcement community. An unprecedented coalition will be meeting with Republican members, and is meeting with Republican members, demanding that they take action. We are talking about Partnership for a New American Economy; the Bibles, Badges, and Business coalition for immigration reform; FWD.us; strong support from the technology and business community; and the U.S. Chamber of Commerce, Mr. Speaker.

Regrettably, the only immigration amendment that has passed this House has been to deport DREAMers. Again, thankfully, it didn't happen. The Senate and President were able to stop it. That is the only idea so far that has been proposed and, sadly, tragically, accepted by this body for dealing with DREAMers. We are talking about young people who grew up in this country, have been through American schools, football teams, cheerleaders, prom, got good grades, played by every rule they knew. They were brought here when they were 2 years old, 5 years old. Frequently, they don't even speak another language. They want to get back to our country if only we will let them. Yet, this House voted to eliminate the program that allows them to work in this country. It instead would deport them back to a country they don't know anybody in

and don't speak the language of. We would be denying them the ability to be legally in the only country they know, to make our country stronger.

That is action. The majority party took action on an amendment. They passed the amendment to undo the deferred action program, but I refuse to believe that that is the action that Speaker BOEHNER had in mind when he said he wants to move forward and fix our broken immigration system. Regardless of what we do with the DREAMers, that is only a small part of our broken immigration system.

□ 1300

There are many adults that are working illegally in this country because we refuse to enforce or fix our immigration laws; and that will continue unless this House of Representatives chooses to change that.

The American people, Mr. Speaker, are fed up. That is why enormous majorities of Democrats and Republicans, of Independents, of men, of women, of every single breakdown that you have of the American people want to see the House of Representatives fix our broken immigration system, would like to see us pass the bill, H.R. 15, here in the House of Representatives, a bipartisan bill ready for the floor today and ready to be passed into law.

The House majority needs to move a bill to the floor that includes an earned pathway to citizenship, border security, enforcement of our laws, meets the needs of the businesses, the technology sector, the agriculture sector, other important sectors that rely on an immigrant workforce.

And, yes, we can count the votes, Mr. Speaker. We can help Majority Whip MCCARTHY with his job. The votes for a pathway to citizenship, I am proud to report back to my colleague from Texas, who I know is a member of Republican leadership, and my good colleague, Mr. SESSIONS, we can report back, and you can report back to Majority Whip MCCARTHY that at least 29 House Republicans have publicly endorsed the pathway to citizenship as a component of immigration reform, the principles that are included in H.R. 15 in the Senate bill, and many more Republicans have privately committed their support.

Yet we are hearing more and more about counterproductive measures that might be brought to the House. For instance, I have heard that there might be an effort to introduce the so-called SAFE Act in an immigration package, which would, essentially, turn undocumented immigrants into criminals overnight, creating an enforcement challenge.

If we can't enforce our current laws, can you imagine trying to enforce a set of laws where there are 10 million or 15 million criminals in our country?

Now, it is important also to distinguish, Mr. Speaker, when we look at our immigrant detention centers, and we are talking about people who are

here illegally who have committed crimes, not just the civil violation of being here illegally, we join with our Republican colleagues in seeking deportation and punishment.

Whether somebody is here legally or illegally, whether they have paperwork or not, if they ever commit a crime that harms our community, we have no sympathy for them, and we seek their full punishment under the law.

But how can you enforce or punish people when you create a whole new class of criminals?

We can barely punish the criminals we have. We already incarcerate more people, as a percentage of our population, than any other Western industrialized nation. Clearly, incarcerating and deporting more not only is not the answer, but would be a tremendous burden to the American taxpayer.

Each deportation, Mr. Speaker, costs over \$10,000 of your money. Over \$10,000. Is that the solution?

Or should we make sure that people who are working here pay taxes?

Would you rather pay, Mr. Speaker, \$10,000, or would you rather accept their checks to make sure that they are paying their fair share to reduce our budget deficit and reduce the tax burden on everybody else, to the tune of over \$200 billion, which is how much, according to the scoring of the Senate bill, comprehensive immigration reform will reduce our deficit?

And we will be happy to work with the Republican majority to use that \$200 billion to reduce the individual tax rate. It is an issue that I have talked about with my colleague from Texas (Mr. SESSIONS). We would love to bring down those marginal rates. Instead of 39.6 percent, let's get them down to 38, 35, I think, you know, however low we can get them and bring down rates for everybody else as well.

Mr. SESSIONS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. POLIS. I will address the question to my good colleague and friend from Texas. We might be able to use the \$200 billion in immigration reform to bring down the individual or corporate tax rate. I will be happy to pose that question to my good friend.

I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. SESSIONS. I will answer the question quickly. We believe there should be no more than a 25 percent tax on any American for paying their taxes.

Mr. POLIS. Reclaiming my time, and in that mix of the pay-fors might be immigration reform. That won't get us fully there. That is \$200 billion, and I would have to see the scoring on getting it down to 25; but that is a pay-for that I think would have support from my side of the aisle. There are other pay-fors that would as well.

Now, we are not willing to do this if it is going to increase the deficit, as we have talked about. If we just bring down tax rates for the people and that goes to the deficit, I think there would be problems on both sides of the aisle.

But if we can offset it with spending cuts, if we can offset it with immigration reform, if we can offset it by getting rid of loopholes for the oil and gas industry, I think we have a good, bipartisan way to discuss bringing down tax rates for all Americans going forward.

Immigration needs to reflect our values as Americans. It needs to bring people out of the shadows, enforce our laws, be good for American business, be good for labor, create jobs, and help make America more competitive.

Let me talk briefly, Mr. Speaker, about the overwhelming public support for immigration reform. Take my home State of Colorado as an example. More than three-quarters of Coloradans support comprehensive immigration reform with a pathway to citizenship for the people already here.

In California, there have been a number of polls. In the 21st District, represented by my friend and colleague, Representative VALADAO, 77 percent of voters support the Senate immigration bill, H.R. 15, comprehensive immigration reform.

In the 22nd District in California, represented by my friend and colleague, Mr. NUNES, over 74 percent support H.R. 15-style legislation.

Let's move to Nevada. In the Second District of Nevada, represented by my friend, Mr. AMODEI, 72 percent, Mr. Speaker, of voters support comprehensive immigration reform.

In the Third District of Nevada, represented by my colleague, Mr. HECK, over 74 percent.

I can go on and on; the point being, Mr. Speaker, that the American people are demanding action of this body.

H.R. 15 is simply common sense. Instead of going home after 1 day of work, let's bring it to the floor on Thursday, then pass it on Friday, Mr. Speaker. Let's get it done. Common sense.

If the House majority is serious about bolstering innovation, growing our economy, reducing our deficit, bringing down taxes, increasing prosperity for all Americans, a pro-growth agenda that they frequently lend lip service to, then put this immigration reform bill on the floor, and let the House work its will. It will pass.

We can attract investment and entrepreneurs and encourage them to create American jobs, reduce our deficit, bring down the tax burden and, guess what, help restore integrity to our entitlement programs, help make sure that people are paying in to Social Security and Medicare, and that they are solvent. We can accomplish that this week. Or, you know, if you really want to go home on Wednesday of this week, let's come back next week, instead of taking next week off, and we will pass immigration reform then.

I will be happy, and many Members from my side of the aisle would be happy, to cancel vacation plans for next week to come back and pass immigration reform; and I would encourage my colleague from Texas to encourage his leadership to do that.

It is time, Mr. Speaker. Frankly, it is past time. H.R. 15 improves border security, interior enforcement, resolves the issue of the 11 million people who are here illegally, improves our legal immigration system.

The bill makes sure that the Department of Homeland Security develops a comprehensive plan to protect our southern border, a plan that has passed unanimously by the House Homeland Security Committee, Democrats and Republicans joining together to actually get serious about our border security.

The American people are calling out for this body to take the moral high road, the economically beneficial path, for Democrats and Republicans to work together to bring a comprehensive immigration reform bill to the House before the end of the year.

So I can't support this rule today, Mr. Speaker. I can't support a rule that sends us home on Wednesday of a workweek. I can't support a rule that only gives us 19 more legislative days before the end of the year.

Mr. Speaker, I would love to be able to support a rule here on the floor of the House. And if my colleague from Texas and my colleagues on the Rules Committee are willing to bring forward a rule, bring forward H.R. 15 Thursday, bring it forward next week, I will be happy to stand here and proudly support that rule.

But until we reach that time, I will have to voice my opposition to the rule.

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

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the dialogue that the gentleman from Colorado is having. In fact, I have, for a long period of time, not only understood the plight of those who are perhaps in this country as undocumented people, but also I understood the plight of people who are trying to get a job in this country, Americans who are trying to find work.

And there are lots of things that we should have done on this. I would remind the gentleman that for 4 years the Democrat majority had this front and center as a promise that they would accomplish, and the Republican majority now is attempting to work through this issue.

We have had working groups. We have had Members who are very serious about how we work on a bipartisan basis; and I know the gentleman, Mr. POLIS, has been not only aware of that, but also understands the intricacies.

We need to be able to understand that there are still very dangerous people in this country, and the Senate bill did not even get close to understanding who is in this country that is dangerous, some 30,000 people who are special interest aliens who this government is watching. They would sneak right underneath the wire toward citizenship; that normally a person who comes into this country would have to go through a background check, and we

would know who they are and we would transform them from a great member of another country to a proud American.

What we want to make sure is that we measure twice and saw once, and that is really what the Republican Party is trying to do.

Mr. POLIS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SESSIONS. I will not. The gentleman had 18 minutes to get his message out, and I am going to take my few minutes to get this out.

And with great respect to the gentleman from Colorado, I do recognize not only his heart, but his brain is engaged in trying to make sure that we work together; that we do it on a bipartisan basis; that we see the future of hardworking people who are in this country; but that we also recognize that there must be a chance to protect this country and not give constitutional rights and the hard work in this country away, as the Senate bill does, gives it away, rather than having an earned citizenship to where people then have a chance to make our country stronger.

It is a big debate, and the gentleman is most eloquent in his enunciation of support of pushing all of us together. I stand with him. But we will keep working until we get it right.

We will, once again, measure three times and saw once.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Bowling Green, Kentucky (Mr. GUTHRIE), a member of the Energy and Commerce Committee.

Mr. GUTHRIE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman for yielding time to speak on an important issue that the Retail Investor Protection Act addresses.

Employee Stock Ownership Plans provide good jobs and secure retirements in my home State, the Commonwealth of Kentucky, and across the Nation. In fact, ESOPs had fewer layoffs during the recession than other businesses.

I have been joined by two dozen colleagues, from both sides of the aisle, on a bill to prevent the Department of Labor from imposing the fiduciary standard on appraisers of ESOP stock.

IRS law today requires that ESOPs get an independent appraisal in order to determine the value of the stock. On the other hand, fiduciaries are, by definition, not independent. Any rule that would define ESOP appraisers as fiduciaries would create a conflict with the IRS regulations; and by creating conflicting duties for appraisers, any Department of Labor rules in this area would substantially increase the cost of ESOPs and, in fact, could regulate them out of existence.

DOL's proposal would add costs to all parties and encourage needless litigation time and again. DOL has failed to sufficiently document the problems with ESOPs that they claim they are trying to remedy.

This is simply another example of this administration overreaching and

creating unnecessary burdens on business leaders for providing a great service to their employees.

I am pleased to stand in support of the rule and the underlying bill today because, if enacted, this bill will help protect ESOPs in the near term. By barring DOL from finalizing a rule on fiduciaries until after the SEC has acted, this bill will provide some temporary protection for ESOPs and their appraisers.

We must continue to defend business leaders and their employees from professional regulators whose ill-considered and counterproductive proposals are making it more difficult for hardworking Americans to achieve the American Dream.

And we have been working with both sides of the aisle; and this party, the Republican Party, on this side of the aisle wants to make sure Americans have the opportunity to achieve the American Dream. This bill does that; and, therefore, I support the rule and the underlying bill.

□ 1315

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I am proud to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. HOLT), my friend.

Mr. HOLT. Mr. Speaker, I want to join my friend from Colorado in lamenting the lack of legislative action on immigration and so many other issues.

I am sure the gentleman doesn't want to leave the impression that Members of Congress do nothing when we are not actually in session. However, the lack of number of days in session, the small number of days in session, is really symptomatic of the problem. It is an unwillingness to deal with the great issues of the day, be they immigration, appropriations and funding for government activities, reauthorizing the Elementary and Secondary Education Act to replace No Child Left Behind, providing workplace training and job creation, the transportation legislation and nutrition programs.

It is worth pointing out that only now—I mean right now, we are about to lose 13 percent in the SNAP program, the food stamp program. For all of those reasons, we should be working here in the Chamber and in committee and elsewhere.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in opposition to the so-called Retail Investor Protection Act, which is one more attempt to delay and derail implementation of the Dodd-Frank Wall Street Reform law. The financial crisis should be all the evidence we need to know that stronger, not weaker, enforcement; tougher, not weaker, regulations are necessary.

Dodd-Frank is the law of the land. Yet, as with ObamaCare, the Republican agenda consists only of delay and repeal, with no solutions to, in this case, prevent a future economic meltdown.

I want to be clear that, in voting against this bill, I am not stating ap-

proval or endorsement of the U.S. Department of Labor's proposed fiduciary rule. In fact, since 2011, I have voiced concerns about how the proposed changes to the definition of "fiduciary" might lead to a reduction in financial education and access to investment advice.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. POLIS. I yield the gentleman an additional 30 seconds.

Mr. HOLT. Americans are not well prepared for retirement. I have long believed that the more investment advice available to employees the better. They need more advice, not less; more encouragement to invest, not less.

I look forward to continuing to work with the Secretary of Labor to craft a rule to allow more Americans, not fewer Americans, to be better prepared, not less prepared, for retirement.

I thank the gentleman from Colorado for the time.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to now yield 4 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Gainesville, Georgia, Congressman COLLINS, a member of the Oversight and Government Reform Committee.

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, as I come here today, one of the things that I have been listening to—and my friend from across the aisle, from Colorado, we talk about things and substantive issues.

I have been in three committee hearings this morning, and a lot of it was going across the aisle, working on issues that work.

One of the things that just concerned me as I was listening to this as well is that the Republican majority is working toward finding solutions for bad bills. Now that doesn't mean that everything is delay, as it was just explained. But when you find something that is wrong, from where I am at, you fix it.

Mr. POLIS. Will the gentleman yield for a moment?

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. I will yield at the end.

I rise in support of the rule and the underlying bills, especially H.R. 2374. You know, I rise because we must continue to look at this regulatory beast. It is strangling, really, what I feel American business and families are struggling with, the very same issues that really are across the aisle.

I have Democrat friends. I have Republican friends. The bottom line, when it comes to business, is that business has always been about making a profit, money. The gentleman understands that. The gentlemen and ladies on this side understand this.

We have got to get into a position in which the Federal Government is out of the way, except in the areas where it needs to be, so that businesses can flourish and businesses can thrive. I believe this is what we are looking at today.

The Federal agencies too often move forward with new and burdensome reg-

ulatory mandates without proving they are needed to correct harm in the marketplace. I call it, in some ways, a job protection.

They want to do good. I am not implying that the government employees are not hardworking, strong individuals. But many times, they are looking at their own job, and they are saying, What do I need to do to make sure that we are "doing something?"—at the expense, many times, of the ones that are having to live with what they are doing.

So as I look into this today, I want to thank the gentlewoman from Missouri for putting forward legislation to ensure that families in my district and across the Nation are not harmed as they strive to pay for their kids' college or invest for the future.

Our Republican majority is working on bills like this that remove these kinds of issues. The SEC must explore all other options before moving to a fiduciary standard for brokers and dealers. Anything less is a disservice, really, to the individuals the SEC is supposed to protect.

But before I go, one of the things that I have advocated for in my short time here is that Congress has to take back its article I authority. We have got to get into our oversight. Passing bills and leaving it to a nameless, faceless executive agency is not what we need to be doing. When need be, Congress needs to be doing things like this, where we come in and say, No, let's take a break. Let's slow down. Is this really what the law intended? Is this really what the law meant? Is this what we are supposed to be doing?

Congress has a constitutional role. We have got to take that back. I think what we are doing here today—and I think having exchanges across the aisle, whether it be today or tomorrow or next week, when I will be back home actually working and talking to people and preparing for what really right now is crushing in our area, the implementation of the health care legislation is what we are getting—these are the kinds of things that we need to be talking about. When we do that, then we have real dialogue. We have real solutions. But Congress has got to take back its article I authority. We have let it go for years.

This is a small part. Even what my friend from Colorado is talking about, these are issues that need to be debated. We are debating.

The Judiciary Committee, on which I sit, has taken up several of these kinds of issues, and we did it this morning under patents and all kinds of things. This is what matters to the American people. They want to see us work. They want to see us be a part of it and not just simply here talking to the cameras and talking to each other. We have really got to be out listening and working our committees and doing things back home so that they understand that as well.

So when I look at this, I look at this as something powerful to move forward

on. I look at it as something that is a good rule. It is a good underlying bill. The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. SESSIONS. I yield the gentleman an additional 1 minute.

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. I appreciate the chairman yielding.

This Republican majority was working in a bipartisan manner, giving us the ability to work like this. These are bipartisan pieces that we understand.

So I did promise, and I am good to my word. I yield to the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. POLIS. I appreciate the gentleman from Georgia, and I appreciate his words, that there is a lot of important work going on. Committees are meeting. You mentioned the Judiciary Committee working on patents. It is a very important issue.

I just wanted to ask the gentleman, with all of the important work that is going on, why the House will be adjourning on Wednesday and not meeting next week as well?

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Well, I think as we go back here and if we really look at this—and you took the opportunity to discuss immigration and other things—I have to simply back up my chairman and go back to when the Democrats had the entire floor, they had everything that they wanted. They chose other priorities, strangling typically businesses and other ideas that right now we are having to deal with. The Republican majority is moving forward on getting the un-strangling back. I just have to go back and say, We will work on those things.

In support of our Republican majority, we are working for businesses and families who right now are struggling to put back jobs, but I do appreciate the question.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Vermont (Mr. WELCH).

Mr. WELCH. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Speaker, part of this rule is addressing the debt ceiling. This Congress put the American people and our economy through the spectacle of 16 days of shutdown, with the culmination being the actual threat that we would not pay our bills; we would default. That is the second time we have done that in 2 years. There is some progress in this rule because it is going to allow Congress to vote to disapprove, but it can't pass unless it gets, in effect, the President's signature.

There is another way that we ought to do this. We ought to, once and for all, acknowledge that if this Congress, with Republican and Democratic votes, passes an appropriation that has an impact on the debt ceiling, that is the time of reckoning at the moment that appropriation is passed.

What we have done is a good deal hypocritical towards the people we represent. We will vote for spending on day one, and then on day two, when the bill comes due, we will vote against the

debt ceiling increase that was required by the very vote we made. That is just not a stand-up way for a country to operate. We pay our bills.

The idea that we would have a debate, as we did in this Congress, where the premise of that debate was that it was actually an acceptable outcome that we would stiff our creditors, that we wouldn't pay the mortgage, that we might forsake the 1 million veterans who are coming home from Iraq and Afghanistan and not provide to them the services that we have all promised, that is just not right.

The damage we did with the debt ceiling debate and the threat to default was enormous both in August of 2011 and in October of 2013.

In August of 2011, consumer confidence dropped to a 31-year low. The third quarter gross domestic product increased barely at 1.4 percent. It led to, for the first time in the history of this country, us losing our AAA credit rating and suffering a downgrade from Standard & Poor's.

The loss of 0.3 percent of the fourth quarter growth rate translated into \$24 billion of lost revenue. Household wealth collapsed by \$2.4 trillion. While it is true that wealth has come back, the loss of that created an immense amount of insecurity, reduced consumer spending, and cost us jobs. The Peter Peterson Foundation indicated that the uncertainty that was created was something that contributed to \$150 billion in lost output and 900,000 jobs.

The October 2013 shutdown and the threat of default was the biggest plunge in consumer confidence—bigger even than August of 2011—the biggest plunge since the Lehman Brothers collapse in '08. We must acknowledge something very simple: we must pay our bills.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the gentleman, my dear friend from Colorado, speaking most eloquently about the effects of 5 years of President Barack Obama.

I will remind this body that President Obama said he would not negotiate with House Republicans. In fact, the majority responsible for the bill that had to prepare our country for what we would do for moving our country forward with not only the CR but also the sequestration, House Republicans for months have spent time to make sure we did appropriations bills. Meanwhile, our friends on the Senate did zero appropriations bills.

House Republicans prepared us not to have the demise that we did, and our friends across the aisle did nothing to help us in this endeavor, not even to begin a negotiation. So, unfortunately, it turns out that it goes on someone's record.

I would like for the RECORD to reflect that House Republicans came up with ideas to avoid the government shutdown and to fund the government. We have done that for months, and we will continue to do that.

Mr. Speaker, at this time, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Win-

field, Illinois, Congressman HULTGREN, a member of the Committee on Financial Services and one of the cosponsors and lead sponsors of the bills that are on the floor today.

Mr. HULTGREN. I thank the gentleman from Texas, Chairman SESSIONS, so much for your work. I want to thank the entire Rules Committee for your important work as well.

Mr. Speaker, we have before us today a couple of deserving bills that redirect cumbersome and burdensome Federal regulation and, for a change, put customers first.

I am particularly interested in the fate of H.R. 992, the Swaps Regulatory Improvement Act. I introduced this bill in the 113th Congress and want to thank my bipartisan cosponsors Representative JIM HIMES and, also from the Agriculture Committee, Representative RICHARD HUDSON and Representative SEAN PATRICK MALONEY, who all have done great work in coming together in a bipartisan way to put together legislation that solves a real problem with the law that was passed a couple of years ago. We also owe a debt of thanks to former Representative Nan Hayworth, who carried this effort in the 112th Congress.

H.R. 992 may seem complicated, but the aim is simple: it is to save, for me, Illinois farmers and manufacturers, utility providers, hospitals, and small businesses from higher costs and greater uncertainty.

So much that I hear from my constituents—specifically from people who are looking to grow jobs, grow this economy—is the fear and the uncertainty that they are facing. It is not an uncertainty of whether they can do the job or whether they can provide a product or whether they can provide a service. They know they can do that. The uncertainty they are feeling is can they deal with what government is going to do to them if they grow their business and the greater uncertainty that has come from laws that have passed over the last couple of years.

One area that has created great uncertainty is this Dodd-Frank law that was passed a couple of years ago, and specifically, provision section 716 was supposed to really be focused at Wall Street. What we have seen is, it hurts Main Street, Main Street customers more than anything else, taking away options, raising costs, and raising uncertainty for, again, farmers and manufacturers, people who are providing a great product to our consumers in our districts.

□ 1330

So this legislation is important to bring back that certainty.

For me, as well, this is important. My history is I grew up in a family funeral home. I worked in helping people plan for their future certainly through that family business, but also as an investment adviser and as an attorney helping people.

In Congress, my hope is to continue to help people—and our Nation—plan

for the future and to fight for future generations to make sure we are going to be making good decisions for our kids and grandkids.

This is one of the areas where I see, throughout my lifetime, through our family business and the work that I have done, that trust relationships are important; and the trust relationships that our farmers and our manufacturers have been able to create with their local community banks are important.

Unfortunately, this law that was passed a couple of years ago forces those relationships to be broken so that you can no longer use the trusted financial bank or financial services provider in your local area to be able to help you plan for uncertainty in the future; but, again, they are pushed out into other entities that are less regulated and oftentimes offshore.

I am so excited about taking this step to bring certainty back, and ultimately, hopefully, as that confidence grows with our farmers and manufacturers and employers, our job creation will grow once again. Investment in hiring people is what we want. That is the number one priority that we are fighting for.

There will be time for further debate on this, but I ask my colleagues to adopt the rule for the reasons stated by Federal Reserve Chairman Bernanke in testimony before the House Financial Services Committee on February 27. He said: 716—the section that we are changing here—requires the push-out of certain kinds of derivatives. And it is not evident why that makes the company, as a whole, safer. And what we do see is that it will likely increase costs of people who use the derivatives and make it more difficult for the bank to compete with foreign competitors who can provide a more complete set of services.

This is an important change.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, if we defeat the previous question, we will offer an amendment to the rule that would allow the House to consider the Make It In America Manufacturing Act of 2013. To discuss the proposal, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Rhode Island (Mr. CICILLINE).

Mr. CICILLINE. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, it is beyond time for Congress to focus on getting Americans back to work. If we want to get things back on the right track, we have to start making things again in this country.

Job creation should not be a Democratic issue or a Republican issue; it is an American issue. At some point, the gridlock in Washington needs to end and we need to take advantage of the opportunities we have to reinvigorate this critical sector of our economy.

That is why I urge my colleagues to defeat the previous question today, so we can consider the Make It In America Manufacturing Act, legislation that I have introduced that would facilitate the creation of unique public-private

partnerships, bringing together Federal, State, local, and regional stakeholders to develop comprehensive manufacturing enhancement strategies and deliver targeted resources to strengthen the manufacturing sector, which has proven vital to our country's economy.

It will provide small- to medium-sized manufacturers with the resources they need to retool and retrofit their operations and train their workforce in order to transition to the manufacturing of clean energy, high technology, and advanced products. It would enhance the competitiveness of the industry, including through increased exports and domestic supply chain opportunities.

Mr. Speaker, it is time for Congress to work together to make things again so that Americans can make it again; and this is about strengthening the manufacturing sector, which helped build the middle class of this country, which helped build one of the strongest economies in the world. This would allow manufacturers who are beginning to see a resurgence, a revival, because of some market conditions. Because of the great innovations and the great quality of our workforce, it would allow us to strengthen this sector and grow jobs at a critical time for my State and for our country.

So I urge my colleagues to defeat the previous question so that we can consider the Make It In America Manufacturing Act, something we should be able to come together on that would create job growth in this critical sector of our Nation's economy.

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

I appreciate the gentleman speaking very clearly about getting manufacturer jobs, and that is why the Republican Party listens to the National Association of Manufacturers. They have a very specific list of things that they, as manufacturers, want as they try and make not only more jobs available in this country, but also as they want to make sure that investment and opportunity and keeping their companies alive is something that goes forward into the future.

That is why they oppose ObamaCare. That is why their number one issue is to say that they see a big government spending program, not just like ObamaCare, but also taxes on energy, which our friends on the other side of the aisle push every day, and higher taxes for investors and more and more and more Big Government.

So I do understand what manufacturers want, and it is directly related to the meetings that I have with people from Dallas, Texas, and all across this country who are in the business. They put their names on their doors. Manufacturers are awesome and important people to our economy.

Mr. Speaker, what we are really here to speak about are these two bills from the Financial Services Committee today.

H.R. 2374 is something that has been talked about. What it really boils down

to is there are investment advisers, and investment advisers are those people in the marketplace that an individual customer would go to. That financial adviser has not only a higher standard on them, but they also have legal and regulatory costs to go with it. But they are to know the customers and the customers' needs and how old that customer is and what they are trying to achieve and to know about their family and their processes, and not to take risks where there shouldn't be any but to match the expectation of performance.

And then there is the broker-dealer. That broker-dealer is available in the marketplace. Maybe they are a \$5 or \$6 or \$7 per trade person. It is somebody that you call up and you execute the agreement that you have from your investment adviser.

What we are trying to say here today—Mr. HULTGREN and others—we don't think that the regulatory burdens, including costs, including legal fees and other burdens, should be placed on the broker-dealers. They should be someone that has a lesser or different standard. They are simply the person that takes the order to effectively and cheaply get the order done that came from the customer as a result of their advice from the financial adviser.

How important is this? It is important enough because the U.S. Chamber of Commerce, that stalwart that stands for all business—not just manufacturers, but also customers—has said this about what Chairman HENSARLING is attempting to accomplish today. I quote from a letter that came from Bruce Josten, who is executive vice president of the Chamber, dated October 28, to all Members of the U.S. House of Representatives, asking them for support:

Due to the increasing overlap between the Department of Labor and the SEC in the area of retirement plans and the related nature of each agency's fiduciary initiative, the Chamber believes that the two agencies should coordinate and work in a systematic manner, allowing the SEC to complete its rules first to avoid investor confusion, regulatory conflict, and one rule being usurped by the other.

Mr. Speaker, this is common sense. That is your U.S. Chamber that is speaking on behalf of all the people across this country saying let's not put ourselves into a circumstance where indecision that has been talked about today becomes a hindrance in the marketplace and where good rules and commonsense are able to flourish.

And that is what the Republican majority is attempting to do today. That is why H.R. 2374 means that what we are trying to do is to provide our ideas to a marketplace rather than having the Department of Labor go first and perhaps have one set of rules and then the Securities and Exchange Commission, who really should be the lead agency, come up with their own rules and regulations. Let's have them work together. And that is what we are

doing here. Common sense means asking government to work with itself between a regulatory body and a Cabinet-level position.

I believe that if we are successful on the floor today, we will see that white flag that comes up that says, well, this bill may not make it through the other body, like so many other bills that we have, but common sense should prevail. That is why Republicans are here today, and that is why the U.S. Chamber of Commerce stands up and says, This is what we see as the real issue in the marketplace.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert the text of the amendment in the RECORD, along with extraneous material, immediately prior to the vote on the previous question.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, since this week is spoken for, that leaves us with 19 legislative days before the end of the session. Reportedly, I have read in the press, that House leadership is struggling to find ways to fill that time. Well, I have an idea.

Four weeks is more than enough time to pass immigration reform; and if we can't stay here on Thursday and Friday to do it, let's do it in the 19 days we have left. There is no reason at all for us to leave here in December, disappoint the American people, without taking action on an issue that is on Speaker BOEHNER's agenda and on Majority Leader CANTOR's agenda for over a year. Speaker BOEHNER and the House leadership can present a plan for votes on immigration reform before the end of the year.

Every week that Congress is in session until we pass immigration reform, I will be on the floor speaking about the cost of inaction. Immigration reform will create 750,000 to 900,000 jobs for Americans that are out of work.

My colleague from Texas mentioned that there are dangerous people that we don't know where they are in this country. That is true. By passing comprehensive immigration reform, we will make sure that we know where people who represent a threat to this Nation are. The people have to register. Enforcement of the law actually means something.

The Senate has acted and passed a bipartisan, comprehensive immigration bill last June. Meanwhile, the House of Representatives hasn't dedicated a single minute of legislative floor time to any immigration bill; and so, too, this week, this House is going home Wednesday instead of discussing immigration reform.

The price of inaction is too heavy a price to pay for the American people. The majority of this body—the Republicans who control the floor of the House—have a choice: they can sit

back, twiddle their thumbs and watch the costs of our immigration problems go up for the American people, destroying more jobs and decreasing our deficit; or they can come to the table, start a serious discussion about immigration reform, bring a bill to the floor of the House and pass it, reduce our deficit, improve security, and create jobs for Americans.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote "no" and defeat the previous question. I urge a "no" vote on the rule, and I urge us to bring up immigration reform.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

I appreciate the courtesy that the gentleman has afforded me with what I believe is his support of the bill, the underlying legislation, the importance to the marketplace, and perhaps more importantly, what we are trying to do here today, and that is to move forward with ideas that will help the American people.

I also know that the discussions that he wanted to have are really not what we are here to meet for today but are very, very important issues not only to the gentleman from Colorado, but I think every single Member of this body, and that is an intention that we give to understanding the legislation that could be attached to the immigration bill.

But the work that we are doing today is about what we have, which is here for a reason, and that is to make it easier for people back home to be able to make decisions about financial long-term issues and ideas, whether it is their retirement, whether it is about sending their kids to college, or whether it is about trying to take costs out of the marketplace to allow a consumer a better opportunity to come to a broker-dealer of their choice, to go to the financial adviser to work whatever they do and then to go to a marketplace that is cost-effective for them. That is why we are here today.

The bottom line is that the Dodd-Frank Act puts unnecessary rules and regulations on the entire industry. That takes away from the effectiveness and how nimble the marketplace can be. It takes away and adds cost to consumers who would wish to not only make a trade—they have already gotten the advice they need, and now what they are interested in is executing that trade without trying to receive, necessarily, someone who is trying to be careful about what they do.

□ 1345

So, Mr. Speaker, you know why we are here today. I urge my colleagues to vote "yes" on the rule and "yes" on the underlying legislation.

The material previously referred to by Mr. POLIS is as follows:

AN AMENDMENT TO H. RES. 391 OFFERED BY  
MR. POLIS OF COLORADO

At the end of the resolution, add the following new sections:

Sec. 6. Immediately upon adoption of this resolution the Speaker shall, pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule XVIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the bill (H.R. 375) to require the Secretary of Commerce and the Secretary of Labor to establish the Make It in America Incentive Grant Program, and for other purposes. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. General debate shall be confined to the bill and shall not exceed one hour equally divided among and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Financial Services and the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Education and the Workforce. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. All points of order against provisions in the bill are waived. At the conclusion of consideration of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions. If the Committee of the Whole rises and reports that it has come to no resolution on the bill, then on the next legislative day the House shall, immediately after the third daily order of business under clause 1 of rule XIV, resolve into the Committee of the Whole for further consideration of the bill.

Sec. 7. Clause 1(c) of rule XIX shall not apply to the consideration of H.R. 375 as specified in section 6 of this resolution.

THE VOTE ON THE PREVIOUS QUESTION: WHAT IT REALLY MEANS

This vote, the vote on whether to order the previous question on a special rule, is not merely a procedural vote. A vote against ordering the previous question is a vote against the Republican majority agenda and a vote to allow the Democratic minority to offer an alternative plan. It is a vote about what the House should be debating.

Mr. Clarence Cannon's Precedents of the House of Representatives (VI, 308-311), describes the vote on the previous question on the rule as "a motion to direct or control the consideration of the subject before the House being made by the Member in charge." To defeat the previous question is to give the opposition a chance to decide the subject before the House. Cannon cites the Speaker's ruling of January 13, 1920, to the effect that "the refusal of the House to sustain the demand for the previous question passes the control of the resolution to the opposition" in order to offer an amendment. On March 15, 1909, a member of the majority party offered a rule resolution. The House defeated the previous question and a member of the opposition rose to a parliamentary inquiry, asking who was entitled to recognition. Speaker Joseph G. Cannon (R-Illinois) said: "The previous question having been refused, the gentleman from New York, Mr. Fitzgerald, who had asked the gentleman to yield to him for an amendment, is entitled to the first recognition."

The Republican majority may say "the vote on the previous question is simply a vote on whether to proceed to an immediate vote on adopting the resolution . . . [and] has no substantive legislative or policy implications whatsoever." But that is not what they have always said. Listen to the Republican Leadership Manual on the Legislative Process in the United States House of Representatives, (6th edition, page 135). Here's how the Republicans describe the previous

question vote in their own manual: “Although it is generally not possible to amend the rule because the majority Member controlling the time will not yield for the purpose of offering an amendment, the same result may be achieved by voting down the previous question on the rule . . . . When the motion for the previous question is defeated, control of the time passes to the Member who led the opposition to ordering the previous question. That Member, because he then controls the time, may offer an amendment to the rule, or yield for the purpose of amendment.”

In Deschler’s Procedure in the U.S. House of Representatives, the subchapter titled “Amending Special Rules” states: “a refusal to order the previous question on such a rule [a special rule reported from the Committee on Rules] opens the resolution to amendment and further debate.” (Chapter 21, section 21.2) Section 21.3 continues: “Upon rejection of the motion for the previous question on a resolution reported from the Committee on Rules, control shifts to the Member leading the opposition to the previous question, who may offer a proper amendment or motion and who controls the time for debate thereon.”

Clearly, the vote on the previous question on a rule does have substantive policy implications. It is one of the only available tools for those who oppose the Republican majority’s agenda and allows those with alternative views the opportunity to offer an alternative plan.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time, and I move the previous question on the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on ordering the previous question.

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 9 of rule XX, the Chair will reduce to 5 minutes the minimum time for any electronic vote on the question of adoption.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 226, nays 193, not voting 11, as follows:

[Roll No. 563]

YEAS—226

Amash	Chabot	Fleischmann
Amodei	Chaffetz	Fleming
Bachmann	Coble	Flores
Bachus	Coffman	Forbes
Barletta	Cole	Fortenberry
Barr	Collins (GA)	Foxx
Barton	Collins (NY)	Franks (AZ)
Benishek	Conaway	Frelinghuysen
Bentivolio	Cook	Gardner
Bilirakis	Cotton	Garrett
Bishop (UT)	Cramer	Gerlach
Black	Crawford	Gibbs
Blackburn	Crenshaw	Gibson
Boustany	Culberson	Gingrey (GA)
Brady (TX)	Daines	Gohmert
Bridenstine	Davis, Rodney	Goodlatte
Brooks (AL)	Denham	Gosar
Brooks (IN)	Dent	Gowdy
Broun (GA)	DeSantis	Granger
Buchanan	DesJarlais	Graves (GA)
Bucshon	Diaz-Balart	Graves (MO)
Burgess	Duffy	Griffin (AR)
Calvert	Duncan (SC)	Griffith (VA)
Camp	Duncan (TN)	Grimm
Cantor	Ellmers	Guthrie
Capito	Farenthold	Hall
Carter	Fincher	Hanna
Cassidy	Fitzpatrick	Harper

Harris	Meehan	Ryan (WI)
Hartzler	Messer	Salmon
Hastings (WA)	Mica	Scalise
Heck (NV)	Miller (FL)	Schock
Hensarling	Miller (MI)	Schweikert
Holding	Miller, Gary	Scott, Austin
Hudson	Mullin	Sensenbrenner
Huelskamp	Mulvaney	Sessions
Huizenga (MI)	Murphy (PA)	Shimkus
Hultgren	Neugebauer	Shuster
Hunter	Noem	Simpson
Hurt	Nugent	Smith (MO)
Issa	Nunes	Smith (NE)
Jenkins	Nunnelee	Smith (NJ)
Johnson (OH)	Olson	Smith (TX)
Johnson, Sam	Palazzo	Southerland
Jones	Paulsen	Stewart
Jordan	Pearce	Stivers
Joyce	Perry	Stockman
Kelly (PA)	Petri	Stutzman
King (IA)	Pittenger	Terry
King (NY)	Pitts	Thompson (PA)
Kingston	Poe (TX)	Thornberry
Kinzinger (IL)	Pompeo	Tiberi
Kline	Posey	Tipton
Labrador	Price (GA)	Turner
LaMalfa	Radel	Upton
Lamborn	Reed	Valadao
Lance	Reichert	Wagner
Lankford	Renacci	Walberg
Latham	Ribble	Walden
Latta	Rice (SC)	Walorski
LoBiondo	Rigell	Weber (TX)
Long	Roby	Webster (FL)
Lucas	Roe (TN)	Wenstrup
Luetkemeyer	Rogers (AL)	Westmoreland
Lummis	Rogers (KY)	Whitfield
Marchant	Rogers (MI)	Williams
Marino	Rohrabacher	Wilson (SC)
Massie	Rokita	Wittman
McCarthy (CA)	Rooney	Wolf
McCaul	Ros-Lehtinen	Womack
McClintock	Roskam	Woodall
McHenry	Ross	Yoder
McKeon	Rothfus	Yoho
McKinley	Royce	Young (AK)
McMorris	Runyan	Young (IN)
Rodgers		

NAYS—193

Andrews	Duckworth	Levin
Barber	Edwards	Lewis
Barrow (GA)	Ellison	Lipinski
Beatty	Engel	Loeb sack
Becerra	Enyart	Lofgren
Bera (CA)	Eshoo	Lowenthal
Bishop (GA)	Esty	Lowey
Bishop (NY)	Farr	Lujan Grisham (NM)
Blumenauer	Fattah	Lujan, Ben Ray (NM)
Bonamici	Foster	Lynch
Brady (PA)	Fudge	Maffei
Braley (IA)	Gabbard	Maloney,
Brown (FL)	Gallego	Carolyn
Brownley (CA)	Garamendi	Maloney, Sean
Bustos	Garcia	Matheson
Butterfield	Grayson	Matsui
Capps	Green, Al	McCollum
Capuano	Green, Gene	McDermott
Cárdenas	Grijalva	Hahn
Carney	Gutiérrez	McGovern
Carson (IN)	Hahn	McIntyre
Cartwright	Hanabusa	McNerney
Castor (FL)	Hastings (FL)	Meeks
Castro (TX)	Heck (WA)	Meng
Chu	Higgins	Michaud
Cicilline	Himes	Miller, George
Clarke	Hinojosa	Moore
Clay	Holt	Moran
Cleaver	Honda	Murphy (FL)
Clyburn	Horsford	Nadler
Cohen	Hoyer	Napolitano
Connolly	Huffman	Neal
Conyers	Israel	Negrete McLeod
Costa	Jackson Lee	Nolan
Courtney	Jeffries	O’Rourke
Crowley	Johnson, E. B.	Owens
Cuellar	Kaptur	Pallone
Cummings	Keating	Pascarell
Davis (CA)	Kelly (IL)	Peters (AZ)
Davis, Danny	Kennedy	Payne
DeFazio	Kildee	Pelosi
DeGette	Kilmer	Perlmutter
Delaney	Kind	Peters (CA)
DelLauro	Kirkpatrick	Peters (MI)
DeBene	Kuster	Peterson
Deutch	Langevin	Pingree (ME)
Dingell	Larsen (WA)	Pocan
Doggett	Larson (CT)	Polis
Doyle	Lee (CA)	

Price (NC)	Schwartz	Titus
Quigley	Scott (VA)	Tonko
Rahall	Scott, David	Tsongas
Rangel	Serrano	Van Hollen
Richmond	Sewell (AL)	Vargas
Roybal-Allard	Shea-Porter	Veasey
Ruiz	Sherman	Vela
Ruppersberger	Sinema	Velázquez
Ryan (OH)	Sires	Vislousky
Sánchez, Linda T.	Slaughter	Walz
Sanchez, Loretta	Smith (WA)	Waters
Sarbanes	Speier	Watt
Schakowsky	Swalwell (CA)	Waxman
Schiff	Takano	Welch
Schneider	Thompson (CA)	Wilson (FL)
Schrader	Thompson (MS)	Yarmuth
	Tierney	

NOT VOTING—11

Aderholt	Frankel (FL)	Rush
Bass	Herrera Beutler	Sanford
Campbell	Johnson (GA)	Wasserman
Cooper	McCarthy (NY)	Schultz

□ 1409

So the previous question was ordered. The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated against:

Ms. FRANKEL of Florida. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 563, had I been present, I would have voted “no.”

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. WOMACK). The question is on the resolution.

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

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 230, noes 188, not voting 12, as follows:

[Roll No. 564]

AYES—230

Amash	Culberson	Harris
Amodei	Daines	Hartzler
Bachmann	Davis, Rodney	Hastings (WA)
Bachus	Denham	Heck (NV)
Barber	Dent	Hensarling
Barletta	DeSantis	Holding
Barr	DesJarlais	Hudson
Barton	Duffy	Huelskamp
Benishek	Duncan (SC)	Huizenga (MI)
Bentivolio	Duncan (TN)	Hultgren
Bilirakis	Ellmers	Hunter
Bishop (UT)	Farenthold	Hurt
Black	Fincher	Issa
Blackburn	Fitzpatrick	Jenkins
Boustany	Fleischmann	Johnson (OH)
Brady (TX)	Fleming	Johnson, Sam
Bridenstine	Flores	Jones
Brooks (AL)	Forbes	Jordan
Brooks (IN)	Fortenberry	Joyce
Broun (GA)	Foxx	Kelly (PA)
Buchanan	Franks (AZ)	King (IA)
Bucshon	Frelinghuysen	King (NY)
Burgess	Gardner	Kingston
Calvert	Garrett	Kinzinger (IL)
Camp	Gerlach	Kline
Cantor	Gibbs	Labrador
Capito	Gibson	LaMalfa
Carter	Gingrey (GA)	Lamborn
Cassidy	Gohmert	Lance
Chabot	Goodlatte	Lankford
Chaffetz	Gosar	Latham
Coble	Gowdy	Latta
Coffman	Granger	LoBiondo
Cole	Graves (GA)	Long
Collins (GA)	Graves (MO)	Lucas
Collins (NY)	Griffin (AR)	Luetkemeyer
Conaway	Griffith (VA)	Lummis
Cook	Grimm	Marchant
Costa	Guthrie	Marino
Cotton	Hall	Massie
Crawford	Hanna	McCarthy (CA)
Crenshaw	Harper	McCaul

McClintock Posey  
 McHenry Price (GA)  
 McIntyre Radel  
 McKeon Reed  
 McKinley Reichert  
 McMorris Renacci  
 Rodgers Ribble  
 Meadows Rice (SC)  
 Meehan Rigell  
 Messer Roby  
 Mica Roe (TN)  
 Miller (FL) Tiberi  
 Miller (MI) Rogers (AL)  
 Miller, Gary Rogers (KY)  
 Mullin Rogers (MI)  
 Mulvaney Rohrabacher  
 Murphy (FL) Rokita  
 Murphy (PA) Rooney  
 Neugebauer Ros-Lehtinen  
 Noem Roskam  
 Nugent Ross  
 Nunes Rothfus  
 Nunnelee Royce  
 Olson Runyan  
 Owens Salmon  
 Palazzo Scalise  
 Paulsen Schock  
 Pearce Schweikert  
 Perry Scott, Austin  
 Peters (CA) Sensenbrenner  
 Petri Sessions  
 Pittenger Shimkus  
 Pitts Shuster  
 Poe (TX) Simpson  
 Pompeo Smith (MO)

Smith (NE) Walz  
 Smith (NJ) Waters  
 Smith (TX) Watt  
 Southernland Welch  
 Stewart NOT VOTING—12  
 Stivers Diaz-Balart  
 Stockman Wasserman  
 Stutzman Schultz  
 Terry McCarthy (NY)  
 Thompson (PA) Rush  
 Thornberry Sanford  
 Tiberi  
 Tipton  
 Turner  
 Upton  
 Valadao  
 Wagner  
 Walberg  
 Walden  
 Walorski  
 Weber (TX)  
 Webster (FL)  
 Wenstrup  
 Westmoreland  
 Whitfield  
 Williams  
 Wilson (SC)  
 Wittman  
 Wolf  
 Womack  
 Woodall  
 Yoder  
 Yoho  
 Young (AK)  
 Young (IN)

(2) By striking “during those months when there is no other discharge therefrom, but this release may be reduced for brief temporary periods by the Secretary whenever he may find that release of the full ten cubic feet per second is harmful to the primary purpose of the project”.

(3) By adding at the end the following: “Without further action by the Secretary, and as determined necessary for any given year by the City of Prineville, up to seven of the 17 cubic feet per second minimum release shall also serve as mitigation for City of Prineville groundwater pumping, pursuant to and in a manner consistent with Oregon State law, including any shaping of the release of the up to seven cubic feet per second to coincide with City of Prineville groundwater pumping as may be required by the State of Oregon. As such, the Secretary is authorized to make applications to the State of Oregon in conjunction with the City to protect these supplies instream. The City shall make payment to the Secretary for that portion of the minimum release that actually serves as mitigation pursuant to Oregon State law for the City in any given year, with the payment for any given year equal to the amount of mitigation in acre feet required to offset actual City groundwater pumping for that year in accordance with Reclamation ‘Water and Related Contract and Repayment Principles and Requirements’, Reclamation Manual Directives and Standards PEC 05-01, dated 09/12/2006, and guided by ‘Economic and Environmental Principles and Guidelines for Water and Related Land Resources Implementation Studies’, dated March 10, 1983. The Secretary is authorized to contract exclusively with the City for additional amounts in the future at the request of the City.”

#### SEC. 4. FIRST FILL PROTECTION.

The Act of August 6, 1956 (70 Stat. 1058), as amended by the Acts of September 14, 1959 (73 Stat. 554), and September 18, 1964 (78 Stat. 954), is further amended by adding at the end the following:

“SEC. 6. Other than the 17 cubic feet per second release provided for in section 4, and subject to compliance with the Army Corps of Engineers’ flood curve requirements, the Secretary shall, on a ‘first fill’ priority basis, store in and release from Prineville Reservoir, whether from carryover, infill, or a combination thereof, the following:

“(1) 68,273 acre feet of water annually to fulfill all 16 Bureau of Reclamation contracts existing as of January 1, 2011, and up to 2,740 acre feet of water annually to supply the McKay Creek lands as provided for in section 5 of this Act.

“(2) Not more than 10,000 acre feet of water annually, to be made available to the North Unit Irrigation District pursuant to a Temporary Water Service Contract, upon the request of the North Unit Irrigation District, consistent with the same terms and conditions as prior such contracts between the District and the Bureau of Reclamation.

“SEC. 7. Except as otherwise provided in this Act, nothing in this Act—

“(1) modifies contractual rights that may exist between contractors and the United States under Reclamation contracts;

“(2) amends or reopens contracts referred to in paragraph (1); or

“(3) modifies any rights, obligations, or requirements that may be provided or governed by Oregon State law.”

#### SEC. 5. OCHOCO IRRIGATION DISTRICT.

(a) EARLY REPAYMENT.—Notwithstanding section 213 of the Reclamation Reform Act of 1982 (43 U.S.C. 390mm), any landowner within Ochoco Irrigation District in Oregon, may repay, at any time, the construction costs of

So the resolution was agreed to.  
 The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

□ 1418

#### ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

Record votes on postponed questions will be taken later.

#### CENTRAL OREGON JOBS AND WATER SECURITY ACT

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 2640) to amend the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act to adjust the Crooked River boundary, to provide water certainty for the City of Prineville, Oregon, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 2640

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

#### SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the “Central Oregon Jobs and Water Security Act”.

#### SEC. 2. WILD AND SCENIC RIVER; CROOKED, OREGON.

Section 3(a)(72) of the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act (16 U.S.C. 1274(a)(72)) is amended as follows:

(1) By striking “15-mile” and inserting “14.75-mile”.

(2) In subparagraph (B)—

(A) by striking “8-mile” and all that follows through “Bowman Dam” and inserting “7.75-mile segment from a point one-quarter mile downstream from the toe of Bowman Dam”; and

(B) by adding at the end the following: “The developer for any hydropower development, including turbines and appurtenant facilities, at Bowman Dam, in consultation with the Bureau of Land Management, shall analyze any impacts to the Outstandingly Remarkable Values of the Wild and Scenic River that may be caused by such development, including the future need to undertake routine and emergency repairs, and shall propose mitigation for any impacts as part of any license application submitted to the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission.”

#### SEC. 3. CITY OF PRINEVILLE WATER SUPPLY.

Section 4 of the Act of August 6, 1956 (70 Stat. 1058), (as amended by the Acts of September 14, 1959 (73 Stat. 554), and September 18, 1964 (78 Stat. 954)) is further amended as follows:

(1) By striking “ten cubic feet” the first place it appears and inserting “17 cubic feet”.

#### NOES—188

Andrews Garcia  
 Barrow (GA) Grayson  
 Beatty Green, Al  
 Becerra Green, Gene  
 Bera (CA) Grijalva  
 Bishop (NY) Gutiérrez  
 Bishop (GA) Hahn  
 Blumenauer Hanabusa  
 Bonamici Hastings (FL)  
 Brady (PA) Heck (WA)  
 Braley (IA) Higgins  
 Brown (FL) Himes  
 Brownley (CA) Hinojosa  
 Bustos Holt  
 Butterfield Honda  
 Capps Horsford  
 Capuano Hoyer  
 Cárdenas Huffman  
 Carney Israel  
 Carson (IN) Jackson Lee  
 Cartwright Jeffries  
 Castor (FL) Johnson (GA)  
 Castro (TX) Johnson, E. B.  
 Chu Kaptur  
 Cicilline Keating  
 Clarke Kelly (IL)  
 Clay Kennedy  
 Cleaver Kildee  
 Clyburn Kilmer  
 Cohen Kind  
 Connolly Kirkpatrick  
 Conyers Kuster  
 Courtney Langevin  
 Crowley Larsen (WA)  
 Cuellar Larson (CT)  
 Cummings Lee (CA)  
 Davis (CA) Levin  
 Davis, Danny Lewis  
 DeFazio Lipinski  
 DeGette Loeb sack  
 Delaney Lofgren  
 DeLauro Lowenthal  
 DelBene Lowey  
 Deutch Lujan Grisham  
 Dingell (NM)  
 Doggett Luján, Ben Ray  
 Doyle (NM)  
 Duckworth Lynch  
 Edwards Maffei  
 Ellison Maloney,  
 Engel Carolyn  
 Enyart Maloney, Sean  
 Eshoo Matheson  
 Esty Matsui  
 Farr McCollum  
 Fattah McDermott  
 Foster McGovern  
 Frankel (FL) McNerney  
 Fudge Meeks  
 Gabbard Meng  
 Gallego Michaud  
 Garamendi Miller, George

Moore  
 Moran  
 Nadler  
 Napolitano  
 Neal  
 Negrete McLeod  
 Nolan  
 O'Rourke  
 Pallone  
 Pascrell  
 Pastor (AZ)  
 Payne  
 Pelosi  
 Perlmutter  
 Peters (MI)  
 Peterson  
 Pingree (ME)  
 Pocan  
 Polis  
 Price (NC)  
 Quigley  
 Rahall  
 Rangel  
 Richmond  
 Roybal-Allard  
 Ruiz  
 Ruppertsberger  
 Ryan (OH)  
 Sánchez, Linda  
 T.  
 Sanchez, Loretta  
 Sarbanes  
 Schakowsky  
 Schiff  
 Schneider  
 Schrader  
 Schwartz  
 Scott (VA)  
 Scott, David  
 Serrano  
 Sewell (AL)  
 Shea-Porter  
 Sherman  
 Sinema  
 Sires  
 Slaughter  
 Smith (WA)  
 Speier  
 Swalwell (CA)  
 Takano  
 Thompson (CA)  
 Thompson (MS)  
 Tierney  
 Titus  
 Tonko  
 Tsongas  
 Van Hollen  
 Vargas  
 Veasey  
 Vela  
 Velázquez  
 Visclosky

the project facilities allocated to that landowner's lands within the district. Upon discharge, in full, of the obligation for repayment of the construction costs allocated to all lands the landowner owns in the district, those lands shall not be subject to the ownership and full-cost pricing limitations of the Act of June 17, 1902 (43 U.S.C. 371 et seq.), and Acts supplemental to and amendatory of that Act, including the Reclamation Reform Act of 1982 (43 U.S.C. 390aa et seq.).

(b) CERTIFICATION.—Upon the request of a landowner who has repaid, in full, the construction costs of the project facilities allocated to that landowner's lands owned within the district, the Secretary of the Interior shall provide the certification provided for in subsection (b)(1) of section 213 of the Reclamation Reform Act of 1982 (43 U.S.C. 390mm(b)(1)).

(c) CONTRACT AMENDMENT.—On approval of the district directors and notwithstanding project authorizing legislation to the contrary, the district's reclamation contracts are modified, without further action by the Secretary of the Interior, to—

(1) authorize the use of water for instream purposes, including fish or wildlife purposes, in order for the district to engage in, or take advantage of, conserved water projects and temporary instream leasing as authorized by Oregon State law;

(2) include within the district boundary approximately 2,742 acres in the vicinity of McKay Creek, resulting in a total of approximately 44,937 acres within the district boundary;

(3) classify as irrigable approximately 685 acres within the approximately 2,742 acres of included lands in the vicinity of McKay Creek, where the approximately 685 acres are authorized to receive irrigation water pursuant to water rights issued by the State of Oregon and have in the past received water pursuant to such State water rights; and

(4) provide the district with stored water from Prineville Reservoir for purposes of supplying up to the approximately 685 acres of lands added within the district boundary and classified as irrigable under paragraphs (2) and (3), with such stored water to be supplied on an acre-per-acre basis contingent on the transfer of existing appurtenant McKay Creek water rights to instream use and the State's issuance of water rights for the use of stored water.

(d) LIMITATION.—Except as otherwise provided in subsections (a) and (c), nothing in this section shall be construed to—

(1) modify contractual rights that may exist between the district and the United States under the district's Reclamation contracts;

(2) amend or reopen the contracts referred to in paragraph (1); or

(3) modify any rights, obligations or relationships that may exist between the district and its landowners as may be provided or governed by Oregon State law.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Alaska (Mr. YOUNG) and the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. GRIJALVA) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Alaska.

#### GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. 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 under consideration.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

H.R. 2640, sponsored by our colleague, Mr. WALDEN of Oregon, is an important step towards restoring water and power abundance and jobs to a rural area that has been devastated by Federal logging restrictions.

This bill is a reflection of years of negotiation, and it is identical to the bill this Chamber passed last year without opposition. Its supporters include those who would normally be water adversaries in most parts of the West. Municipalities, irrigators, the Warm Spring tribes, utilities, organized labor, and an environmental organization have all come together to support this legislation.

I want to commend my friend, the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. WALDEN), for his good work to bring all these parties together and urge adoption of this legislation.

I reserve the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. GRIJALVA. Mr. Speaker, H.R. 2640, as my colleague described, does several things, including providing water and economic certainty to the City of Prineville and the Ochoco Irrigation District. The legislation also outlines how reclamation is to operate and manage the Prineville Reservoir through the first fill provision and removes some flexibility on reclamation's part to mitigate and adapt to changing conditions.

We do not fully support the first fill provision but understand that there are ongoing negotiations that look at providing the certainty that the city needs while protecting the environment. Stakeholder-driven processes are the best way to address local needs.

We look forward to working with our colleagues in the Senate and on the other side of the aisle to ensure that all of the needs are met and protected.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. WALDEN).

Mr. WALDEN. I thank Chairman YOUNG, and thank you for your help on this, and Chairman HASTINGS as well. Mr. GRIJALVA, thank you for your comments, and I want to thank Representative DEFAZIO for his work on this, among many others.

Mr. Speaker, as was pointed out, in 2012 this bill passed the House unanimously, and I am glad to see this legislation is once again before this Chamber. The legislation is a collaborative effort between the City of Prineville, Crook County, local farmers, the Deschutes River Conservancy, the Confederated Tribes of Warm Springs, among others. I am grateful for their efforts in creating and moving this legislation forward. This bill we have be-

fore us will create jobs in central Oregon and will remove government red tape.

This is actually a photo of Bowman Dam. This is what we are talking about. When the "wild and scenic" designation was passed by Congress, they sort of arbitrarily and temporarily, at the time—this was decades ago—placed the wild and scenic designation line right here in the yellow stripe of the road. Now, I have told people that the only thing wild and scenic about a dam is if you are falling over the face of it and tumbling down, then it might be wild and scenic.

What we seek to do is move this boundary off the center of this dam and go down about a quarter of a mile where the river really becomes natural. As a result of that, then we are pretty well convinced that a company will come in and add clean, renewable hydropower through a generation facility on the dam. The result of that, then, is the water will come out with less gasification so it will be better for fish.

So we will get about 50 construction jobs for 2 years, good-paying construction jobs for 2 years as they install this hydropower facility. We will get enough hydroelectricity to light, I think it is, 500 homes. So you get clean hydropower and you get construction jobs. The water will come out from a different place and actually be better for the fish going forward, and all we do is move the scenic boundary down to where, frankly, probably everyone would agree, it should have been, not on the center line at the top of the dam where cars drive over it, but rather down about a quarter of a mile.

In addition to that, this facility, about 20 miles upriver from Prineville, is a reclamation project that holds about 80,000 acre-feet of uncontracted water. That is part of the discussion: What do you do with that uncontracted water? This is rare in the Federal Government to have a facility where all of the water hasn't been determined. That is an issue that can be dealt with down the road. We don't deal with that here other than to make sure that Prineville has access to that 6 percent, about 5,100 acre-feet, of water.

And why is that important? Because the City of Prineville, right now, is constricted. They don't have enough water. And this is a small, rural community with high unemployment in the county. We would make sure that they get about 5,100 acre-feet of water. They would pay fair market price for the value of the water, and that extra water would allow the city to not only meet its residential needs, which it cannot do today, but also allow it to engage in more economic development, which it desperately needs to do.

This water issue came to our attention initially because Facebook was planning, and has since constructed, a data center which they have now doubled in size. Apple is also constructing a data center there. Both of them need water for cooling. They have been able

to be more efficient about how they do that, but they still need water. And others will.

Because the city would access the water through the ground and not from directly behind the dam, the water actually flows downstream in excess of about 20 miles, which is better for the fish to have that much more water going and released down the dam, and then the city would, through their underground pumps, pump the water out. In dry years, particularly in the winter, this higher release requirement would benefit fish and wildlife, including the Blue Ribbon trout fishery below Bowman Dam. And as I said, it fixes this problem with the wild and scenic designation and creates 50 jobs.

Additionally, the bill expedites the McKay Creek restoration project. This is something we worked closely with the Warm Springs tribal leaders on because it would increase water flows for redband trout and summer steelhead. This project has long been supported by the Warm Springs tribes and the Deschutes River Conservancy, and so I want to thank both Warm Springs and Deschutes Conservancy for their work on this issue and on, especially, McKay Creek. It is a very good, commonsense conservation project.

So this is a good, commonsense, job-creating bill. It is the culmination of years of work in a collaborative effort.

I want to thank the mayor of Prineville. Mayor Roppe has testified before the committee on a couple of occasions. Judge McCabe has been terrific in helping us, as have been many others as we have moved this forward.

So this is a jobs bill that doesn't cost the government anything. It is a good, clean water bill that helps the community provide jobs and take care of its citizens, and it resolves a longstanding issue that has been a problem for this area. Actually, this debate has gone on since Mark Hatfield was in the Senate back in the 1970s. So I appreciate the committee's diligent efforts on this and the bipartisan way we are moving forward on this piece of legislation.

With that, Mr. Speaker, I ask for your unanimous support of this bill.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. I thank the gentleman for his presentation. He has done an excellent job.

I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. I have no further speakers.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Alaska (Mr. YOUNG) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 2640.

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

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

□ 1430

#### ALASKA NATIVE TRIBAL HEALTH CONSORTIUM LAND TRANSFER ACT

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 623) to provide for the conveyance of certain property located in Anchorage, Alaska, from the United States to the Alaska Native Tribal Health Consortium, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 623

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

##### SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

*This Act may be cited as the "Alaska Native Tribal Health Consortium Land Transfer Act".*

##### SEC. 2. CONVEYANCE OF PROPERTY.

(a) DEFINITIONS.—*In this section:*

(1) ANTHC.—*The term "ANTHC" means the Alaska Native Tribal Health Consortium.*

(2) PROPERTY.—*The term "property" means the property described in subsection (d).*

(3) SECRETARY.—*The term "Secretary" means the Secretary of Health and Human Services.*

(b) CONVEYANCE.—*As soon as practicable after the date of enactment of this Act, but not later than 90 days after that date, the Secretary shall convey to ANTHC all right, title, and interest of the United States in and to the property for use in connection with health and related programs. The Secretary's conveyance of title by warranty deed under this section shall, on its effective date, supersede and render of no future effect any quitclaim deed to the property described in subsection (d) executed by the Secretary and ANTHC.*

(c) CONDITIONS.—*The conveyance of the property under this Act—*

(1) *shall be made by warranty deed;*

(2) *shall not require any consideration from ANTHC for the property;*

(3) *shall not impose any obligation, term, or condition on ANTHC; and*

(4) *shall not allow for any reversionary interest of the United States in the property.*

(d) DESCRIPTION OF PROPERTY.—*The property (including all improvements thereon and appurtenances thereto) to be conveyed under this Act is described as follows: Tract A-3A, Tudor Centre, according to plat no. 2013-43, recorded on June 20, 2013 in Anchorage recording district, Alaska.*

(e) ENVIRONMENTAL LIABILITY.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—*Notwithstanding any other provision of Federal law, ANTHC shall not be liable for any soil, surface water, groundwater, or other contamination resulting from the disposal, release, or presence of any environmental contamination, including any oil or petroleum product, any hazardous substance, hazardous material, hazardous waste, pollutant, toxic substance, solid waste, or any other environmental contamination or hazard as defined in any Federal or State law, on the property on or before the date on which the property was conveyed by quitclaim deed.*

(2) EASEMENT.—*The Secretary shall be accorded any easement or access to the property as may be reasonably necessary to satisfy any retained obligation or liability of the Secretary.*

(3) NOTICE OF HAZARDOUS SUBSTANCE ACTIVITY AND WARRANTY.—*In carrying out this Act, the Secretary shall comply with subparagraphs (A) and (B) of section 120(h)(3) of the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act of 1980 (42 U.S.C. 9620(h)(3)).*

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Alaska (Mr. YOUNG) and the gentleman

from Arizona (Mr. GRIJALVA) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Alaska.

GENERAL LEAVE

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

H.R. 623 transfers by warranty deed a 2.79-acre parcel of federal land located in Anchorage, Alaska, from the Indian Health Service to the Alaska Native Tribal Health Consortium. This consortium is a nonprofit authorized by Congress to render health services to Alaska Natives under a contract with the Indian Health Service.

The land has been used for parking to accommodate nearby facilities run by the consortium and the Indian Health Service. It will be used to construct a patient housing facility, thereby expanding its capacity to offer vital health services for Alaska Native patients, some of whom travel great distances from rural areas to receive care.

Following a subcommittee hearing on the bill in May, the Indian Health Service administratively conveyed the land to the consortium by quitclaim deed. H.R. 623 remains necessary because transferring the land by warranty deed provides cleaner title to the property than by quitclaim deed.

The bill was also referred to the Committee on Energy and Commerce. The chairman of that committee, Mr. UPTON, has kindly foregone action on the bill in the interest of expediting it for consideration on the House floor. I thank him for his cooperation and have an exchange of letters memorializing our agreement. CBO estimates that H.R. 623 would have no significant impact on the Federal budget and would not affect direct spending on revenues.

H.R. 623 is non-controversial, and I hope the House will pass it.

I reserve the balance of my time.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,  
COMMITTEE ON ENERGY AND COMMERCE,  
Washington, DC, October 1, 2013.

Hon. DOC HASTINGS,  
Chairman, Committee on Natural Resources,  
Longworth House Office Building, Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN HASTINGS, I write concerning H.R. 623, Alaska Native Tribal Health Consortium Land Transfer Act, which was ordered to be reported out of your Committee on July 31, 2013. I wanted to notify you that the Committee on Energy and Commerce will forgo action on H.R. 623 so that it may proceed expeditiously to the House floor for consideration.

This is done with the understanding that the Committee on Energy and Commerce is not waiving any of its jurisdiction, and the Committee will not in any way be prejudiced with respect to the appointment of conferees

or its jurisdictional prerogatives on this or similar legislation.

I would appreciate your response to this letter, confirming this understanding, and ask that a copy of our exchange of letters on this matter be included in the Congressional Record during consideration of H.R. 623 on the House floor.

Sincerely,

FRED UPTON,  
Chairman.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,  
COMMITTEE ON NATURAL RESOURCES,  
Washington, DC, October 10, 2013.

Hon. FRED UPTON,  
Chairman, Committee on Energy and Commerce,  
Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you for your letter regarding H.R. 623, the Alaska Native Tribal Health Consortium Land Transfer Act. As you know, the Committee on Natural Resources ordered reported the bill, as amended, on July 31, 2013. I appreciate your support in bringing this legislation before the House of Representatives, and accordingly, understand that the Committee on Energy and Commerce will forego action on the bill.

The Committee on Natural Resources concurs with the mutual understanding that by foregoing consideration of H.R. 623 at this time, the Committee on Energy and Commerce does not waive any jurisdiction over the subject matter contained in this or similar legislation. In addition, should a conference on the bill be necessary, I would support your request to have the Committee on Energy and Commerce represented on the conference committee. Finally, I would be pleased to include your letter and this response in the bill report filed by the Committee on Natural Resources, as well as in the Congressional Record during floor consideration, to memorialize our understanding.

Thank you for your cooperation.

Sincerely,

DOC HASTINGS,  
Chairman.

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

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

Mr. GRIJALVA. Mr. Speaker, the Alaska Native Tribal Health Consortium was established in 1997 to provide health services to Alaska Natives. Based in Anchorage, the consortium now serves over 130,000 patients from all over the State.

H.R. 623 conveys 2.79 acres of Federal land in Anchorage, Alaska, to the consortium. The parcel will be used to construct patient housing for visiting patients, allowing continued growth so that the Anchorage facilities can meet the health care needs of more and more people from rural Alaska. Some patients travel long distances to access health care facilities in Anchorage. H.R. 623 helps ensure that traveling patients are not burdened with finding their own accommodations. This is an important component of making sure that all Native Alaskans have access to equitable health care.

I am happy to report that the Indian Health Service transferred the parcel in question by quitclaim deed on June 20 of this year.

While the consortium is now able to start planning and preparation for pa-

tient housing, H.R. 623 transfers the parcel to the consortium by warranty deed. This removes future complications and guarantees there will be no hiccups in the development of additional patient housing at the Anchorage site.

We support H.R. 623 and urge its passage by the House today.

I yield back the balance of my time. Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman for commenting on this bill and supporting it, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Alaska (Mr. YOUNG) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 623, as amended.

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

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### DISTINGUISHED FLYING CROSS NATIONAL MEMORIAL ACT

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 330) to designate a Distinguished Flying Cross National Memorial at the March Field Air Museum in Riverside, California.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 330

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

#### SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Distinguished Flying Cross National Memorial Act".

#### SEC. 2. DESIGNATION OF DISTINGUISHED FLYING CROSS NATIONAL MEMORIAL IN RIVERSIDE, CALIFORNIA.

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress finds the following:

(1) The most reliable statistics regarding the number of members of the Armed Forces who have been awarded the Distinguished Flying Cross indicate that 126,318 members of the Armed Forces received the medal during World War II, approximately 21,000 members received the medal during the Korean conflict, and 21,647 members received the medal during the Vietnam War. Since the end of the Vietnam War, more than 203 Armed Forces members have received the medal in times of conflict.

(2) The National Personnel Records Center in St. Louis, Missouri, burned down in 1973, and thus many more recipients of the Distinguished Flying Cross may be undocumented. Currently, the Department of Defense continues to locate and identify members of the Armed Forces who have received the medal and are undocumented.

(3) The United States currently lacks a national memorial dedicated to the bravery and sacrifice of those members of the Armed Forces who have distinguished themselves by heroic deeds performed in aerial flight.

(4) An appropriate memorial to current and former members of the Armed Forces is under construction at March Field Air Museum in Riverside, California.

(5) This memorial will honor all those members of the Armed Forces who have dis-

tinguished themselves in aerial flight, whether documentation of such members who earned the Distinguished Flying Cross exists or not.

(b) DESIGNATION.—The memorial to members of the Armed Forces who have been awarded the Distinguished Flying Cross, located at March Field Air Museum in Riverside, California, is hereby designated as the Distinguished Flying Cross National Memorial.

(c) EFFECT OF DESIGNATION.—The national memorial designated by this section is not a unit of the National Park System, and the designation of the national memorial shall not be construed to require or permit Federal funds to be expended for any purpose related to the national memorial.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Alaska (Mr. YOUNG) and the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. GRIJALVA) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Alaska.

GENERAL LEAVE

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

H.R. 330 designates the memorial located at March Field Air Museum in Riverside, California, as the Distinguished Flying Cross National Memorial in honor of current and former members of the Armed Forces who have been awarded the Distinguished Flying Cross.

This national memorial will not be a unit of the National Park System, and the designation does not require or permit any expenditures of Federal funds.

I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 330, which has passed the House as part of the most recent Department of Defense authorization bill, as well as a stand-alone bill in the 112th Congress by a vote of 392-1.

I reserve the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. GRIJALVA. H.R. 330, designates the memorial at the March Field Air Museum in Riverside, California, as the Distinguished Flying Cross National Memorial.

The memorial to recipients of the U.S. Air Force's Distinguished Flying Cross was dedicated on October 27, 2010, and since then, it stands as a proud symbol of remembrance and honor for all members of the U.S. Armed Forces who have demonstrated heroism or extraordinary achievement.

The Distinguished Flying Cross is the oldest military award for aviation, but there is no national memorial to recognize the sacrifice and commitment of these brave men and women.

We support H.R. 330 and urge its passage by the House today.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Speaker, I yield as much time as he may consume to the gentleman from California (Mr. CALVERT), the author of the bill, an outstanding Member from California.

Mr. CALVERT. I thank the gentleman from Alaska.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 330, a bill to designate a national Distinguished Flying Cross memorial in Riverside, California.

The memorial honors all current and former members of the Armed Forces who have been awarded the Distinguished Flying Cross.

For the past two Congresses, the House has overwhelmingly passed this bill, and today I stand again in support of H.R. 330, which would designate the memorial at March Field Air Museum as the Distinguished Flying Cross National Memorial.

The legislation is supported by the Distinguished Flying Cross Society, the Military Officers Association of America, the Air Force Association, the Air Force Sergeants Association, the Association of Naval Aviation, the Vietnam Helicopter Pilots Association, and the China-Burma-India Veterans Association. I would like to point out that the language in the bill specifically states that the designation shall not be construed to require or permit Federal funds to be expended for any purpose related to the national memorial. Funds have been and will continue to be raised through private means for these purposes.

Distinguished Flying Cross recipients have received the prestigious medal for their heroism or extraordinary achievement while participating in aerial flight while serving in any capacity within the United States Armed Forces. There are many well-known people that have played a vital role in the history of military aviation that have received the award. This renowned group includes Captain Charles L. Lindbergh, former President George H.W. Bush, Brigadier General Jimmy Doolittle, General Curtis LeMay, Senator JOHN MCCAIN, Senator George McGovern, Jimmy Stewart, and Admiral Jim Stockdale, just to name a few.

The March Air Reserve Base, which hosts the C-17As of the 452nd Air Mobility Wing, is adjacent to the location of the memorial at March Field Air Museum. Visitors are able to witness active operational air units providing support to our troops around the world, which is an appropriate setting that honors the many aviators who have distinguished themselves by deeds performed in aerial flight.

I would like to thank those who have worked tirelessly to ensure this memorial was built and is properly designated in honor of the distinguished aviators who have served this great Nation. In particular, I would like to recognize Jim Champlin; his late wife, Trish; Distinguished Flying Cross Soci-

ety's president, Chuck Sweeney; and the society's historian, Dr. Barry Lanman, who was instrumental in this effort.

Again, I hope you will join me in supporting the designation of the Distinguished Flying Cross National Memorial at the March Field Air Museum and H.R. 330.

Mr. GRIJALVA. Mr. Speaker, I yield as much time as he may consume to the gentleman from Riverside, California (Mr. TAKANO), an original sponsor of this legislation.

Mr. TAKANO. I thank the gentleman from Arizona for yielding time.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to support the Distinguished Flying Cross National Memorial Act, which would designate the Distinguished Flying Cross Memorial currently under construction at March Air Field Museum in Riverside County as a national memorial.

Established by Congress in 1926, the Distinguished Flying Cross has been awarded to tens of thousands of Americans and gives recognition to members of our Armed Forces for heroism in aerial flight. This legislation could not be more important as there is no national memorial for these brave men and women. I believe that it is our duty to properly honor our heroes for their service.

In addition to its bipartisan support, this legislation also has the backing of countless veterans and military organizations, including the Distinguished Flying Cross Society, the Military Officers Association of America, the Air Force Association, the Air Force Sergeants Association, the Association of Naval Aviation, and the Vietnam Helicopter Pilots Association.

I was proud to introduce this legislation with my Republican colleague from the Inland Empire, Representative KEN CALVERT, and hope we can continue to work together on issues such as this because our region has deep military roots.

I would also like to express my gratitude to California Senators BARBARA BOXER and DIANNE FEINSTEIN, along with Senator BILL NELSON of Florida, who introduced the Senate version of this bill.

Let's honor these heroes, Mr. Speaker, and pass the Distinguished Flying Cross National Memorial Act.

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

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Alaska (Mr. YOUNG) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 330.

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

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

## LAKE HILL ADMINISTRATIVE SITE AFFORDABLE HOUSING ACT

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 2337) to provide for the conveyance of the Forest Service Lake Hill Administrative Site in Summit County, Colorado.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 2337

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

### SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Lake Hill Administrative Site Affordable Housing Act".

### SEC. 2. DEFINITIONS.

In this Act:

(1) COUNTY.—The term "County" means Summit County, Colorado.

(2) LAKE HILL ADMINISTRATIVE SITE.—The term "Lake Hill Administrative Site" means the parcel of approximately 40 acres of National Forest System land in the County, as depicted on the map entitled "Lake Hill Administrative Site" and dated June 2012.

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

### SEC. 3. CONVEYANCE OF FOREST SERVICE LAKE HILL ADMINISTRATIVE SITE, SUMMIT COUNTY, COLORADO.

(a) CONVEYANCE AUTHORITY.—Upon receipt of an offer from the County in which the County agrees to the condition imposed by subsection (c), the Secretary shall use the authority provided by the Forest Service Facility Realignment and Enhancement Act of 2005 (Public Law 109-54; 16 U.S.C. 580d note) to convey to the County all right, title, and interest of the United States in and to the Forest Service Lake Hill Administrative Site.

(b) APPLICATION OF LAW.—

(1) TREATMENT AS ADMINISTRATIVE SITE.—The Lake Hill Administrative Site is considered to be an administrative site under section 502(1)(A) of the Forest Service Facility Realignment and Enhancement Act of 2005 (Public Law 109-54; 16 U.S.C. 580d note).

(2) EXCEPTION.—Section 502(1)(C) of that Act does not apply to the conveyance of the Lake Hill Administrative Site.

(c) COSTS.—The County shall be responsible for processing and transaction costs related to the direct sale under subsection (a).

(d) PROCEEDS.—Proceeds received from the conveyance pursuant to subsection (a) shall be available, without further appropriation and until expended, for capital improvement and maintenance of Forest Service facilities in Region 2 of the United States Forest Service.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Alaska (Mr. YOUNG) and the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. GRIJALVA) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Alaska.

#### GENERAL LEAVE

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

H.R. 2337 authorizes the Forest Service to convey approximately 40 acres of the White River National Forest to Summit County, Colorado.

The parcel, sandwiched between Interstate 70 and a local highway and largely isolated from the rest of the White River National Forest, would be utilized by Summit County to construct affordable workforce housing. This conveyance would benefit both the county and the Forest Service by eliminating the agency's management over this isolated parcel.

I urge my colleagues to support this legislation and reserve the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. GRIJALVA. Mr. Speaker, H.R. 2337 conveys the approximately 40-acre Forest Service Lake Hill administrative site in the White River National Forest to Summit County, Colorado. The Forest Service has established that the site has lost its national forest character and is severed from the rest of the White River National Forest.

Summit County will use the site to construct workforce housing, a need identified by the county. Summit County will cover all costs associated with the conveyance, and the Forest Service will be able to use any proceeds to address regional forest management issues.

H.R. 2337 is a great example of the Federal government working with local governments to identify and solve common problems.

□ 1445

Congressman POLIS is to be commended for his leadership in addressing the needs of his constituents using a commonsense, practical solution. We support the legislation and urge its passage.

Mr. GRIJALVA. Mr. Speaker, I yield as much time as he may consume to the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. POLIS), the sponsor of this legislation.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the chair and the ranking member for their hearing, as well as the support of this bill.

For those of us who represent areas of the country where the Federal Government is a major landowner, it is absolutely critical to be able to work with this body to have the flexibility we need to meet the needs of our community.

This legislation is the product of a community-driven effort in Summit County where they were able to take a look at the 40-acre parcel, saw that it no longer had the characteristics of wildlife habitat or recreation, but it was ideally situated for housing for a community, which is a real need in Summit County.

People who work in our thriving mountain communities need to be able to live near where they work, to be able to get their cars and vehicles off the road. For families to be able to afford to live in the area, it is an absolutely critical need that the Summit County Commissioners, as well as our municipalities, as well as others, have come to the table around finding a real-life solution.

This bill is the first step. H.R. 2337 conveys a 40-acre parcel in the White River National Forest, known as the Lake Hill site, to Summit County for fair market value. Summit County will pay for all of the administrative costs associated with the conveyance.

As a result, the Congressional Budget Office estimates that this bill has no cost. In fact, proceeds from the sale will support much-needed U.S. Forest Service facility improvements and maintenance, which is absolutely critical to be able to do their job as stewards of our Federal lands, which is one of our main economic drivers for jobs, as well as a quality lifestyle in Summit County.

This bill had input from a variety of local stakeholders, received broad community support from the towns of Dillon and Frisco, from Summit County, from local environmental organizations and businesses.

In July, the House Natural Resources Committee approved the bill by unanimous consent; and our Senators, MARK UDALL and MICHAEL BENNET, have introduced a companion bill, S. 1305, which, hopefully, will be considered in committee in the weeks ahead.

This Lake Hill site was selected for sale because the property no longer has national forest character. The parcel is isolated from other U.S. Forest Service land. It sits between an interstate to the north, a highway to the south, and condominiums to the west.

The parcel was heavily logged and has unsightly infrastructure. As a result, it is no longer suitable for wildlife habitat or recreation purposes, but it is ideally suitable for additional housing to reflect the needs of our growing community.

Fortunately, Lake Hill can provide a great community purpose. Affordable housing availability is a critical problem in Summit County. Increasingly, families that work in Summit County are having a harder and harder time living in Summit County.

During the winter, approximately one-third of the Summit County workforce has to commute into the county, sometimes 45-minute, hour-long commutes, because local housing prices are too high for many people who work in the community to be able to afford to live there. In fact, nearly 40 percent of Summit County residents are paying more for housing than they can afford.

There is also a substantial housing gap in the face of a growing population. Over the last decade, the number of seniors increased faster in Summit County than any other county in Colo-

rado. Latino households have doubled during the last decade, now comprising 15 percent of the county's population.

There is a real need for affordable housing options to meet the demands of our growing workforce and the needs of our economy, a need that will only become more urgent over time.

A lot of work remains to be done to put together the community partnership to look at the design elements and how this will work for the community, but this critical step can only occur here in the United States Congress, which is the transference of the Lake Hill site.

It will be a perfect setting for affordable housing. The property is located in the heart of Summit County, between the towns of Frisco and Dillon, and near free public transit that is already available.

This bill is a win-win. It adds affordable housing options, while providing funding for the U.S. Forest Service to improve Forest Service administrative facilities.

I urge my colleagues to support this essential legislation that contributes to the well-being of Summit County and our greater community.

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

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Alaska (Mr. YOUNG) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 2337.

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

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### RETAIL INVESTOR PROTECTION ACT

Mr. HENSARLING. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 391, I call up the bill (H.R. 2374) to amend the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 to provide protections for retail customers, and for other purposes, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 391, in lieu of the amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on Financial Services printed in the bill, an amendment in the nature of a substitute consisting of the text of Rules Committee Print 113-23 is adopted, and the bill, as amended, is considered read.

The text of the bill, as amended, is as follows:

H.R. 2374

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

#### SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

*This Act may be cited as the "Retail Investor Protection Act".*

**SEC. 2. STAY ON RULES DEFINING CERTAIN FIDUCIARIES.**

After the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Labor shall not prescribe any regulation under the Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974 (29 U.S.C. 1001 et seq.) defining the circumstances under which an individual is considered a fiduciary until the date that is 60 days after the Securities and Exchange Commission issues a final rule relating to standards of conduct for brokers and dealers pursuant to the second subsection (k) of section 15 of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 (15 U.S.C. 78o(k)).

**SEC. 3. AMENDMENTS TO THE SECURITIES EXCHANGE ACT OF 1934.**

The second subsection (k) of section 15 of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 (15 U.S.C. 78o(k)), as added by section 913(g)(1) of the Dodd-Frank Wall Street Reform and Consumer Protection Act (12 U.S.C. 5301 et seq.), is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(3) REQUIREMENTS PRIOR TO RULEMAKING.—The Commission shall not promulgate a rule pursuant to paragraph (1) before—

“(A) identifying if retail customers (and such other customers as the Commission may by rule provide) are being systematically harmed or disadvantaged due to brokers or dealers operating under different standards of conduct than those standards that apply to investment advisors under section 211 of the Investment Advisers Act of 1940 (15 U.S.C. 80b-11); and

“(B) identifying whether the adoption of a uniform fiduciary standard of care for brokers or dealers and investment advisors would adversely impact retail investor access to personalized investment advice, recommendations about securities, or the availability of such advice and recommendations.

“(4) REQUIREMENTS FOR PROMULGATING A RULE.—The Commission shall publish in the Federal Register alongside the rule promulgated pursuant to paragraph (1) formal findings that such rule would reduce the confusion of a retail customer (and such other customers as the Commission may by rule provide) about standards of conduct applicable to brokers, dealers, and investment advisors.

“(5) REQUIREMENTS UNDER INVESTMENT ADVISERS ACT OF 1940.—In proposing rules under paragraph (1) for brokers or dealers, the Commission shall consider the differences in the registration, supervision, and examination requirements applicable to brokers, dealers, and investment advisors.”.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. After 1 hour of debate on the bill, as amended, it shall be in order to consider the further amendment printed in House Report 113-253, if offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. GEORGE MILLER) or his designee, which shall be considered read and shall be separately debatable for 20 minutes equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent.

The gentleman from Texas (Mr. HENSARLING) and the gentlewoman from California (Ms. WATERS) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. HENSARLING. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material in the RECORD on H.R. 2374, currently under consideration.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, at a time that the American people demand and deserve that Democrats and Republicans work together to fix real problems in our Nation, today this body has the opportunity to do just that.

Today the House will consider H.R. 2374, the Retail Investor Protection Act. The bill has strong support from both Democrats and Republicans. In fact, it passed the Financial Services Committee earlier this year on a strong bipartisan recorded vote, including half-half of our committee's Democrats.

H.R. 2374 will ensure that hard-working families and individuals throughout our country who are trying to save for their retirements, save for their children's college education, saving for their first home are not harmed by confusing, costly regulations coming out of Washington.

Mr. Speaker, all Americans know that a flood of Washington red tape has hurt our economy. That is why tens of millions of our fellow countrymen remain either unemployed or underemployed. Unfortunately, even more regulations are on the way.

Specifically, today, Mr. Speaker, we are here speaking about the Securities Exchange Commission and the Department of Labor, which are headed toward proposing two massive and inconsistent rulemakings that are going to hurt the ability of retail investors to get financial advice that they need for their portion of the American Dream.

Mr. Speaker, retail investors are not big-time professionals on Wall Street. Retail investors had no role in causing the financial crisis, and they should not be punished for it which, regrettably, this rulemaking could do.

Rather, retail investors are ordinary, hardworking citizens from all of our congressional districts who buy and sell securities for themselves, their families and their futures, not for a company.

And in this struggling economy, when people who need help most, what are the SEC and the Department of Labor planning to do? They are planning to make it harder and more expensive for these Americans to get the financial advice that they both want and need.

Perhaps even more incredibly, the SEC, the Securities and Exchange Commission, is moving forward with this new regulation even though the agency has failed to provide any evidence that it would better protect investors.

So the Securities and Exchange Commission apparently is going to regulate first, ask questions later. This makes no sense for millions of struggling Americans trying to save for the future.

Mr. Speaker, again, we know that millions of middle class families are

sitting around their kitchen tables struggling to save and invest in order to make ends meet. Every day, millions of them turn to financial professionals for advice.

Yet here comes from Washington regulations that will make that advice either unavailable or unaffordable, so fewer Americans will get the advice they need. That is unfair.

Let me provide you just a couple of examples, Mr. Speaker. Under the current suitability standard, an investor can have an account with a low-cost, online broker with whom he or she can both make trades and get investment advice.

Due to technological advances and the relatively low costs associated with operating an online platform, these brokers can offer trades and investment advice for as little as \$7.

But should a fiduciary standard be applied to these online brokers, the impact on investors could be one or all of the following: higher fees per trade, higher fees for investment advice, or brokers may simply stop providing this investment advice to less affluent customers altogether. That is not fair.

Take the example of the single mother who supports her mother and wants to save for her daughter's college education. She has finally saved enough money to open up an IRA with \$2,000 in savings.

But we know that should these rules continue to be promulgated, with these new Washington regulations, well, this lady may just be told she now needs \$25,000 in order to open up the very same account.

Again, Mr. Speaker, patently unfair.

How about a middle-aged father who works with a financial professional. He wants the professional to get him access to products and ideas, instead of managing his investment portfolio for him. He wants to trade individual bonds, but potential regulations might not allow the financial professional to offer him bonds on a principal basis.

So the result? The father either gets worse execution prices or ends up paying a whole lot more for his investments.

Fortunately, one of our colleagues has stepped up to the table. The gentlelady from Missouri (Mrs. WAGNER) has introduced a commonsense bill, the Retail Investor Protection Act, and I and the rest of the committee who have voted for it congratulate her for her great work.

This bill would require the SEC to first consider the potential impacts its proposed regulation will have on investors, especially those with low and moderate incomes who would lose access to personalized investment advice that they need.

Second, the bill would require coordination between the SEC and the Department of Labor. These Washington agencies will have to sequence their rulemakings, with the SEC going first, so there will be no inconsistent rules that end up confusing and costing investors.

The Retail Investor Protection Act that we are debating today will avoid regulatory conflict between the SEC and the Department of Labor. It is as simple as that.

Mr. Speaker, even the SEC itself acknowledges that the cost of its regulation could ultimately be passed on to retail investors in the form of higher fees or lost access to services and products—yet, again, unfair.

It is not what Americans need. It is not what they deserve, especially as our economy remains in the throes of the weakest, slowest nonrecovery of the last 70 years.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to pass this bipartisan bill, again, a bipartisan bill that passed with half of the Democrats on the Financial Service Committee choosing to support this commonsense legislation. H.R. 2374 will help struggling American families get the financial assistance they want and deserve.

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

□ 1500

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

I strongly oppose H.R. 2374, the bill inappropriately entitled the Retail Investor Protection Act. Quite the opposite. H.R. 2374 hinders the Labor Department and the Securities and Exchange Commission from protecting the average retail investor when they save for retirement.

For the last 2 years, the Labor Department has been updating an outdated rule regarding the fiduciary responsibility owed to employee benefit plans under the Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974, ERISA, and for Individual Retirement Accounts, IRAs, under the Tax Code.

Today retirees are more likely to rely on 401(k)s than IRAs and are less likely to have defined benefit plans from their employers. At the same time, financial products have become increasingly complex. The cost of rules governing the rights of investors and the responsibilities of advisers are more than 35 years old. DOL is attempting to modernize these rules in order to reflect the changing nature of the retirement marketplace.

Given these realities, it is necessary for the Department to make sure that the professionals offering retirement advice have a duty to put their clients' interests first before their own or, at the very least, tell their customers that they may be conflicted.

At the same time, the SEC is considering moving forward on a rulemaking that would impose a uniform fiduciary standard of conduct for broker-dealers and investment advisers consistent with the Dodd-Frank Act. This would ensure that whatever the business model, if an individual is providing personalized investment advice about securities to a retail customer, they would have a duty to put that customer's interests before their own.

This is particularly important as many retail customers are unaware of the differences in the standards of care that various professionals owe them.

Both agencies have been making progress with their rules, collecting the necessary data and responding to stakeholder concerns about preserving access to investment advice, particularly for individuals with small accounts.

Given these facts, H.R. 2374 is the wrong approach. This legislation makes it significantly more difficult for both the SEC and the Department to move forward.

First, the provision requiring the SEC to do a new study, another study documenting that investors are being systematically harmed or disadvantaged under the existing standard, creates a high hurdle for the Commission to overcome. The purpose of this provision is to impose further roadblocks before the Commission can take any action, providing another avenue for industry to sue the SEC.

Secondly, H.R. 2374 would prohibit the Labor Department from modernizing the fiduciary duty standard under ERISA and the Tax Code until the SEC issued their rule. This provision would represent a historic abrogation of the Department's unique authority, and in spite of whatever pressing need for an updated rule.

Finally, H.R. 2374 seems premised on the faulty notion that the Department and the SEC are not coordinating when, in fact, staff have regular ongoing SEC-DOL staff meetings; in addition, leadership meetings, as well as a memorandum of understanding to share information on retirement and investment matters.

On behalf of millions of consumers, retirees, and investors, several organizations, including the AARP, the Consumer Federation of America, the AFL-CIO, and Americans for Financial Reform all oppose this legislation. A coalition of financial planning professionals wrote that H.R. 2374 is a backdoor attempt to undermine investor protection provisions in Dodd-Frank. In addition, SEC Chair White said in a letter to the committee that H.R. 2374 would make it difficult for the Commission to adopt such a rule.

Simply put, H.R. 2374 just goes too far. The bill holds the Labor Department hostage while throwing out roadblocks for the SEC. Mr. Speaker, for these reasons, I urge a "no" vote on this bill.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HENSARLING. Mr. Speaker, it is now my pleasure to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. KLINE), the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

Mr. KLINE. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, it has been 4 years since the recession ended, yet economic growth is still anemic, job creation remains sluggish, and wages are flat.

With each passing day, countless Americans feel they are falling further behind. In these difficult times, working families shouldn't need to fear yet another regulatory scheme that will make it more difficult to rebuild their retirement savings. That is why I support the Retail Investor Protection Act, legislation that will force the Department of Labor to hit the brakes on sweeping changes to the way workers save for retirement.

For many Americans, investing in a retirement plan can be confusing and, frankly, intimidating. Workers want to know their hard-earned dollars are managed wisely and in a way that could lead to financial security in their retirement years.

Investment professionals provide a crucial service to those who want to plan for their retirement yet lack the time and expertise to manage an investment portfolio. All investment advisers should be well trained, adhere to the highest ethical standards, and promote the best interests of their clients. Rules governing the actions of particular investment advisers, also known as fiduciaries, have helped provide workers with certainty for decades. However, since 2010, the Labor Department has tried to expand the definition and duties of a fiduciary and, in the process, diminished that certainty.

While we support looking for ways to modernize current fiduciary regulations, the Department's recent proposal threatens to drive up costs, restrict investment opportunities, and harm efforts to educate workers about responsible retirement planning.

Despite bipartisan concerns, Department officials are still pursuing this flawed approach behind closed doors. H.R. 2374 will force the Department of Labor to abandon this misguided effort and help ensure any future attempt to redefine "fiduciary" promotes the retirement security of America's workers.

I want to thank Representative WAGNER, Chairman HENSARLING, and members of the House Financial Services Committee for their strong bipartisan leadership on this important issue.

I urge my colleagues to support the Retail Investor Protection Act.

Ms. WATERS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. LYNCH), a member of the Financial Services Committee.

Mr. LYNCH. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in opposition to H.R. 2374, the so-called Retail Investor Protection Act. Despite its innocuous-sounding title, the intent of this bill is not to protect investors, but to protect an outdated system that systematically weakens the average American's retirement savings protections.

When Americans sit down across the table from a financial adviser and entrust their retirement nest egg, they expect the advice they receive to be

the best financial advice for them. That is why when Congress created the Employee Retirement Income Security Act in 1974, it did so with the express purpose of protecting employees and their dependents through robust disclosure requirements and fiduciary standards of care.

But the quality of advice they receive is often dependent on whether their adviser is an investment adviser or a broker-dealer, a distinction which is really a reflection of an accident of chance that retail investors typically are not aware of and do not fully understand.

Moreover, as employers have come to back away from defined benefit pension plans to defined contribution plans like 401(k)s, average workers more often are on their own to weigh advice received directly from their financial adviser about how best to invest their retirement. The result is a retirement savings system in which many workers often are unaware that they are turning over their savings to advisers who may have no legal requirement whatever to act in the worker's best interest.

This bill before us today will make it harder for the Department of Labor and the Securities and Exchange Commission to protect workers' retirement savings at a time when expanding and strengthening those retirement savings and protections has never been more important.

The average Social Security beneficiary receives about \$1,200 per month, or just under \$15,000 per year, representing just 41 percent of required pre-retirement income. With the cost of services for retirees—such as health care, food, and other essentials—continuing to go up, it is more important than ever that Americans have robust retirement savings to supplement the modest benefit that Social Security now guarantees.

Unfortunately, this bill before the House today takes us in the opposite direction in order to protect its status quo. That is why AARP opposes this bill. That is why the AFL-CIO opposes this bill. That is why the Consumer Federation of America opposes this bill. That is why Americans for Financial Reform opposes this bill. That is why I will vote "no" on this bill, and I urge my colleagues to do the same.

Mr. HENSARLING. Mr. Speaker, it is now my pleasure to yield 6 minutes to the gentlewoman from Missouri (Mrs. WAGNER), the sponsor of the legislation and an outstanding freshman member of our committee who has led on this issue.

Mrs. WAGNER. Mr. Speaker, I first want to thank Chairman HENSARLING and Chairman GARRETT for their leadership in bringing this bill to the floor today. I also want to thank my Financial Services Committee colleagues on both sides of the aisle for their work and support of this bill.

Mr. Speaker, in recent weeks, we have been caught up in a fierce debate

over the imperiled balance sheet of our Nation. It goes without saying that for a Nation that is \$17 trillion in debt, getting our Federal balance sheet under control remains of extreme importance for future generations of Americans.

We must also keep in mind these days that it is not just the Federal balance sheet that is upside down. Indeed, the household balance sheet of American families is under some of the greatest stress we have seen in decades. Median household income has declined by \$2,400 since the previous recession ended in June of 2009. Millions of Americans remain out of work, and an alarming number of our fellow citizens have flat-out given up on their search to find a job. Recent studies have shown that an alarming percentage of Americans do not have adequate savings set aside for their retirement. The fact is that many families in Missouri and all across the country are struggling just to make it to the 15th and the 30th of every month, let alone finding the ability to put something away for retirement or for a rainy day.

Regrettably, despite all of these economic challenges, two Federal agencies are on a path towards making it even harder for our fellow citizens to save and invest money for the future. At issue are attempts by the Department of Labor and the SEC to increase the liability of financial professionals that provide services to hardworking families all across our country. These new rules are likely to impose tremendous new burdens on Main Street businesses and will take choices away from hardworking families who understand better than anyone else what investments are in their "best interest."

For example, when the Department of Labor originally proposed the new "fiduciary" rules in 2010, it was pointed out by several commentators and by Republicans and Democrats in Congress that the likely result would not have been enhanced investor protection. Rather, scores of low- and moderate-income Americans would have suddenly found themselves unable to work with a financial professional and unable to make investments that would help them achieve financial security for their future.

Similar dynamics are at play with the SEC. Without providing any evidence of investor harm, the SEC is heading towards a rulemaking that could disrupt the valuable relationship that Americans have with their financial professionals. Perhaps most concerning, these two agencies appear to be on a collision course with one another and could end up issuing two very different and conflicting rules.

Recently, the SEC issued a 72-page request for information to support a rulemaking, but nowhere, nowhere in this request did the SEC mention the Department of Labor's fiduciary project or its effect on the SEC's work. So despite the claims we have heard from both agencies, it doesn't appear

that there is much coordination going on at all. This suggests that we are heading toward a situation where rules come into conflict with one another, creating a great amount of confusion and cost for businesses and retail investors.

That brings us to H.R. 2374, the Retail Investor Protection Act, which passed the House Financial Services Committee in June by a bipartisan vote of 44-13. To those who are just tuning in to this debate, it may help to understand exactly who it is we are talking about when we use the term "retail investor."

"Retail investor" could describe two young working parents that are trying to figure out ways to save for that first home. It could describe a single mother who has scraped together \$1,000 to open up an IRA or an educational account for her child. Or it could describe a new dad looking to set up an insurance policy for his family.

□ 1515

It is these Americans that will be hurt the most by overbearing and misguided rules that prohibit them from making investments they both want and desperately need.

So the underlying legislation is quite simple. First, it requires that the Department of Labor wait for the SEC to act before issuing new fiduciary rules. I would note that a recent letter from 10 Democratic Senators to the Office of Management and Budget made this very same request.

Second, the legislation requires that the SEC identify whether investors are being harmed or disadvantaged under current regulations. In other words, the SEC would have to identify a problem it is trying to address. The SEC would also have to identify whether new rules would restrict investor access to financial products and services and show that any final rule would actually reduce any confusion investors have over standards of conduct within the industry.

In short, this bill brings much-needed checks and balances to a regulatory process gone bad.

We must remember what is at stake here. Americans invest trillions of dollars through IRAs, education accounts, and other investment vehicles. The Retail Investor Protection Act would require that Federal agencies act in the best interest of all investors and would go a long way towards preserving access to financial services for Americans of all income levels.

I thank my colleagues again for their support, and I urge passage of the bill.

CHAMBER OF COMMERCE  
UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,  
Washington, DC, October 28, 2013.

TO THE MEMBERS OF THE U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES: The U.S. Chamber of Commerce, the world's largest business federation representing the interests of more than three million businesses of all sizes, sectors, and regions, as well as state and local chambers and industry associations, and dedicated to promoting, protecting, and

defending America's free enterprise system, strong supports H.R. 2374, the "Retail Investor Protection Act." The Chamber believes that ensuring retail investors have continued access to their choice of financial products and services that best meet their needs will help meet investment objectives, secure retirement security, and bolster long-term economic growth.

If enacted, the Retail Investor Protection Act would require that the Securities and Exchange Commission ("SEC") complete a rulemaking on fiduciary standards for broker dealers before the Department of Labor ("DOL") finalizes its rule redefining a fiduciary under the Employee Retirement Income Security Act, as the two agencies have shown to work at cross-purposes on their fiduciary initiatives. Due to the increasing overlap between the DOL and SEC in the area of retirement plans and the related nature of each agency's fiduciary initiative, the Chamber believes that the two agencies should coordinate and work in a systematic manner, allowing the SEC to complete its rules first to avoid investor confusion, regulatory conflict, and one rule being usurped by the other.

H.R. 2374 would also require that before the SEC promulgates new rules expanding the fiduciary standard in the retail investor context, it must first (1) identify any issues with the current fiduciary structure; and (2) identify whether uniform fiduciary standards for broker dealers and investment advisors would have any adverse impact, resulting in reduced products and services for retail investors. These are all common sense measures that would ensure the appropriate balance in investor protection while mitigating potentially harmful consequences.

The Chamber also opposes an amendment expected to be offered by Rep. George Miller and Rep. John Conyers, which would completely undermine the intent of a provision in H.R. 2374 by giving DOL free reign to promulgate rules without prioritization and consideration of the SEC's fiduciary initiative. Moreover, the Miller-Conyers Amendment would also deprive owners, directors, and shareholders of the ability to manage a business by authorizing the DOL to set compensation for investment advisors and financial services providers, thus shifting some securities oversight away from the SEC and to the DOL.

The Chamber strongly supports the Retail Investor Protection Act and opposes the Miller-Conyers Amendment. The Chamber may consider including votes on, or in relation to, this bill and the Miller-Conyers Amendment in our How They Voted scorecard.

Sincerely,

R. BRUCE JOSTEN,  
*Executive Vice President.*

NATIONAL ASSOCIATION  
OF PLAN-ADVISORS,  
Arlington, VA, September 25, 2013.  
Congresswoman ANN WAGNER,  
Re ASPPA Support of H.R. 2374, the Retail  
Investor Protection Act  
Cannon House Office Building,  
Washington, DC.

DEAR CONGRESSWOMAN WAGNER: On behalf of the 6,700 members of the National Association of Plan Advisors (NAPA), I would like to express our support for H.R. 2374, the Retail Investor Protection Act. We commend you for your leadership on this important issue.

As you know, both the Department of Labor (DOL) and the Securities and Exchange Commission (SEC) have indicated they are moving forward with proposed rules that would expand "fiduciary" responsibilities to more investment professionals.

NAPA is especially concerned that these proposed regulations could increase costs and limit availability of products and advice for retail investors, especially those with low or moderate incomes. Additionally, NAPA is concerned that the regulations could result in retail investors not receiving assistance from their trusted investment professionals based on whether their accounts are after-tax retail accounts or tax-favored IRAs.

Your legislation includes two provisions that NAPA especially supports. First, it prohibits the DOL from issuing any new fiduciary rules until sixty (60) days after the SEC finalizes its rule. Second, it requires the SEC to identify whether expanded fiduciary standards would result in less access to investment products and advice for retail investors and to submit formal findings that any final rule would reduce retail investor confusion about standards of care that apply to brokers, dealers and investment advisors.

Again, thank you for your leadership on this issue. We look forward to working with you on passage of this important legislation in both the House and the Senate.

Sincerely,

BRIAN H. GRAFF, ESQ., APM,  
*Executive Director/CEO.*

SEPTEMBER 30, 2013.

Hon. ANN WAGNER,  
House of Representatives, 435 Cannon House  
Office Building, Washington, DC.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE WAGNER: On behalf of the Association for Advanced Life Underwriting ("AALU"),<sup>1</sup> thank you for all of your hard work on H.R. 2374, "The Retail Investor Protection Act of 2013." This bipartisan legislation, which you introduced and led through the Financial Services Committee, will help ensure that any rulemaking undertaken by the Securities and Exchange Commission ("SEC") to modify the standards of conduct and other regulatory requirements applicable to brokers, dealers, and investment advisers<sup>2</sup> is sufficiently supported by empirical information and focused principally on remedying the identified problem of investor confusion without raising costs and reducing choices for investors.<sup>3</sup>

The SEC is considering whether to engage in a rulemaking that would impose a "uniform fiduciary duty" on all brokers, dealers, and investment advisers providing personalized investment advice about securities to retail customers. The sole impetus for such a rule is the SEC's concern about investor confusion over the roles and legal obligations of financial professionals. The SEC appears to be operating from a presumption that the regulatory regime governing brokers and dealers is disproportionately responsible for creating this investor confusion and is seeking to address it by imposing a broad principles-based fiduciary duty on broker-dealers, breaking with eighty years of rules-based regulation.

The problem of investor confusion does not dictate a regulatory solution of this sort. There is no evidence to suggest that such a rule would provide consumers with better or clearer information about the roles and obligations of the financial professionals that serve them, nor is there reason to believe that it would enable consumers to make better-informed investment decisions.

Indeed, because, as the SEC has acknowledged, a "pure fiduciary duty" is unworkable in the context of the broad activities of a broker-dealer, any new fiduciary duty imposed on the industry will include exceptions for various types of activities—leaving investors even more confused as to what the legal obligations of their financial professionals might be. For this reason, the AALU has urged the SEC to directly address the problem of confusion through enhanced disclo-

sure, not to do so through an entirely new regulatory approach that purports to apply uniformly to financial professionals—when, in practice, it does not.

H.R. 2374 would build into the rulemaking process important safeguards to ensure that the SEC adequately justifies any rule prescribed to improve investor confusion and that it appropriately tailors such a rule in a way that remedies the identified problem, but does not adversely affect consumers in the process of doing so. Specifically, the legislation requires the SEC to identify, prior to any rulemaking, if: current differences in the legal and regulatory obligations of brokers, dealers, and investment advisers actually produce harmful outcomes for retail customers—and—whether the adoption of the "uniform fiduciary duty" as proposed by the SEC could in fact have an adverse impact on consumers by limiting access to investment advice, raising costs, and adding to investor confusion.

Should the SEC proceed with a rulemaking, H.R. 2374 would require the SEC to publish alongside a proposed rule formal findings that demonstrate how the rule would reduce investor confusion. Finally, the legislation imposes a stay on the promulgation of conduct regulations by the Department of Labor ("DOL"), which is currently considering a rulemaking that would redefine the term "fiduciary" for purposes of the Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974 ("ERISA"). This provision would allow the SEC to freely carry out the congressional objective underlying Section 913 of the Dodd-Frank Act<sup>4</sup> without concern over any potential interference from the DOL, which, through its anticipated rulemaking, may or may not encroach upon marketplace activity traditionally governed by the securities laws and overseen by securities regulators.

If enacted, H.R. 2374 will ensure a thorough fact finding by the SEC and, if necessary, will result in regulation targeted to address the problem originally contemplated by Congress when it provided the SEC with this rulemaking authority. We believe that such an outcome would greatly benefit investors.

Again, we thank you for introducing H.R. 2374 and we look forward to working with you and your staff as the 113th Congress continues.

Sincerely,

DAVID J. STERTZER,  
*Chief Executive Officer.*

<sup>1</sup>The AALU is a nationwide organization comprised of more than two thousand life insurance agents and professionals primarily engaged in sales of life insurance used as part of estate, charitable, retirement, and deferred compensation and employee benefit services. The AALU is organized behind a mission to promote, preserve and protect advanced life insurance planning for the benefit of our members, their clients, the industry and the general public.

<sup>2</sup>Pursuant to Section 913(g)(1) of the Dodd-Frank Wall Street Reform and Consumer Protection Act ("Dodd-Frank Act").

<sup>3</sup>For additional information on the AALU's support of H.R. 2374, see Legislative Proposals to Relieve the Red Tape Burden on Investors and Job Creators: Hearing Before the H. Subcomm. on Capital Mkts. and Gov't Sponsored Enters. of the H. Comm. on Fin. Servs., 113th Cong. (2013) (statement of Ken Ehinger, President and CEO, M Securities, Inc.), available at <http://financialservices.house.gov/UploadedFiles/HHRG-113-BA16-WState-KEhinger20130523.pdf>.

<sup>4</sup>Namely, an evaluation of the need for a new standard(s) of conduct and harmonization of the regulation of brokers, dealers, and investment advisers—and, if warranted by the SEC's findings, the promulgation of rules to establish new requirements.

INDEPENDENT INSURANCE AGENTS  
& BROKERS OF AMERICA, INC.  
September 30, 2013.

Hon. JOHN BOEHNER,  
Speaker, House of Representatives, Washington,  
DC.

Hon. NANCY PELOSI,  
Minority Leader, House of Representatives,  
Washington, DC.

DEAR SPEAKER BOEHNER AND MINORITY LEADER PELOSI: On behalf of the Independent Insurance Agents & Brokers of America (IIABA or the Big "I"), I write today in support of H.R. 2374, the "Retail Investor Protection Act" introduced Rep. Ann Wagner (R-MO). With over a quarter of a million agents and employees nationwide, the Big "I" is the largest association of insurance producers in the United States.

The IIABA is greatly concerned that agents, brokers and the consumers they serve would be adversely affected by the establishment of a universal fiduciary standard of care. An expansion of the fiduciary duty promises to create undue compliance burdens and increased liability for our small business membership, thereby increasing costs for consumers and restricting access to quality investment advice for those most in need. Furthermore, simultaneous and possibly overlapping rulemakings by the Department of Labor (DOL) and the Securities and Exchange Commission (SEC) have the potential to create confusion in the marketplace and even more liability concerns for marketplace participants.

Rep. Wagner's bill would create a number of important checks and balances on the rulemaking process to ensure that consumers are not harmed by an expansion of the fiduciary duty. First, it would require the DOL to wait until 60 days after the SEC finalizes any fiduciary rule before issuing its rule. The measure would also require the SEC to determine that any new mandate would not harm consumers or restrict access to investment advice, and would require the completion of a cost-benefit analysis.

The IIABA thanks you for scheduling H.R. 2374 for consideration this week and urges all members to support this important legislation.

Sincerely,

CHARLES SYMINGTON,  
Senior V.P. of External & Government Affairs.

UNITED STATES SENATE,  
Washington, DC, August 2, 2013.

Hon. SYLVIA MATTHEWS BURWELL,  
Director, Office of Management and Budget,  
Washington, DC.

DEAR DIRECTOR BURWELL: We write with regard to the work the Securities Exchange Commission (SEC) is currently undertaking to implement Section 913 of the Dodd-Frank Act, and its intersection with the work the Department of Labor (DOL) is currently engaged in to redefine the term "fiduciary" under the Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974 (ERISA). We remain very concerned that uncoordinated efforts undertaken by the agencies could work at cross-purposes in a way that could limit investor access to education and increase costs for investors, most notably Main Street investors.

The fundamental purpose of Section 913 of the Dodd-Frank Act is to provide for the establishment of a uniform fiduciary standard that applies equally to Broker-Dealers and Registered Investment Advisors for the benefit of investors when personalized investment advice is provided. While it is unclear what the Department of Labor's re-proposal in this area will look like, the Department's 2010 proposal could have caused all Broker-Dealers that service Individual Retirement Accounts (IRAs) to be ERISA fiduciaries, which would have as a practical matter eliminated access to meaningful investment services for millions of IRA holders.

We believe that Congress clearly intended that a single standard should apply to retail accounts, including retirement accounts, based on the specific guidelines enumerated in Section 913. We are concerned that while the SEC is proceeding in accordance with its Congressional mandate, the DOL seems poised to issue a regulation that could directly conflict with the SEC's work.

Given the Office of Management and Budget's role in coordinating and streamlining Agency regulations, we write to make you aware of the potential conflict between these regulations. We would also encourage you to promote regulations that are workable and encourage, rather than limit professional investment education and guidance. We believe that, at a minimum, the Department of Labor should not issue final regulations in this area until the SEC has completed its work and that any regulation the DOL ultimately may propose should be carefully crafted so that it does not upend the SEC's work.

We urge you to review any regulation proposed by the DOL to be sure it does not undermine the SEC's implementation of a fiduciary standard for the benefit of retail investors. We know that you share our goal of ensuring that any regulations issued in the area are consistent rather than working at cross-purposes and we look forward to working with you in furtherance of this goal.

Sincerely,

JON TESTER,  
United States Senator.  
CLAIRE McCASKILL,  
United States Senator.  
TOM CARPER,  
United States Senator.  
MARK BEGICH,  
United States Senator.  
BEN CARDIN,  
United States Senator.  
MARK WARNER,  
United States Senator.  
KAY HAGAN,  
United States Senator.  
AMY KLOBUCHAR,  
United States Senator.  
MARK PRYOR,  
United States Senator.  
KIRSTEN GILLIBRAND,  
United States Senator.

Ms. WATERS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. ELLISON), cochair of the Progressive Caucus, a member of the Financial Services Committee, and Democratic whip.

Mr. ELLISON. I want to thank the ranking member, Congresswoman WATERS, for the time, and I thank the chairman.

We have a crisis in our country, and the crisis has to do with retirement. This retirement crisis is huge. We literally have about \$6.6 trillion between what people have for retirement and what they need for retirement.

And so the Labor Department is doing what makes sense: making sure that when a person representing themselves as a financial adviser is going to a person who wants to retire—rollover a 401(k) or whatever—they are getting the best advice for them, and if the adviser is making money off the products they are pushing, that that would not be all right.

But you know what? The Labor Department is not even done with the rule. They are still writing it. But before they ever do, this shoddy piece of legislation is going to try to interrupt that process. This bad piece of legisla-

tion is going to interrupt the Department of Labor as they are pulling together a rule to protect retirees.

We have a record amount of more than \$10 trillion invested in retirement accounts, and yet median retirement account balances are about \$45,000. That is a huge gap. Part of the reason this amount is so low is due to the high fees and hidden commissions. An annual fee of 1 percent could lower the amount of an account by 21 percent over more than 30 years.

I am grateful to the Department of Labor for their efforts to come together to do a good plan. Too often, workers leave jobs and are contacted by people who urge them to rollover their 401(k) investment into an IRA. Too often, workers do not know that these callers are salespeople who can put investors into accounts with high fees and hidden commissions, yet this bill would not protect the public from such rip-offs. Investors lose 3, 4, or 5 percent of the value of their savings without even knowing about it.

This bill, H.R. 2374, is harmful. It prevents the Department of Labor from taking steps to ensure advisers do not have conflicts of interest. Why would anybody want to say, yes, have all the conflicts of interest you want as you are messing with our retirees' accounts?

Taking the unprecedented step to stop an agency midprocess in protecting workers is bad. That is why AARP, the National Council of La Raza, the Consumer Federation of America, and many, many people representing Americans oppose it.

This antigovernment rhetoric and all this stuff about government regulation we hear all the time is the same rhetoric that led to the shutdown that undermined the interests of American workers. Let's just shut this bill down. It is not good.

#### STATEMENT OF ADMINISTRATION POLICY

The Administration strongly opposes passage of H.R. 2374 because it would derail important rulemakings underway at the Securities Exchange Commission (SEC) and the Department of Labor that are critical to protecting Americans' hard-earned savings and preserving their retirement security.

H.R. 2374 prohibits Labor from issuing a rule to protect investors until the SEC engages in and completes further study of the effect of a rulemaking on retail investors. The bill ignores the fact that significant work has already been conducted in both agencies and that the agencies have included and continue to include the public, industry, and numerous stakeholders in their rulemaking processes. Moreover, the two agencies are already working closely to avoid conflicting requirements for the regulated community, and this legislation would hamper effective coordination between the two agencies. The bill would hinder efforts to protect consumers from conflicts of interest among brokers, dealers, financial advisors, and others whose incentives may be misaligned with investors, potentially leading to deceptive and abusive practices.

The Administration is committed to ensuring that American workers and retirees are

able to receive advice about how to invest their money in safe, secure, and transparent financial products that is free from harmful conflicts of interest. These ongoing rulemakings are designed to protect trillions of dollars in retirement savings of millions of workers and retirees by ensuring that paid advisors and other entities do not place their own financial interests over those of their customers. This legislation would place an unnecessary obstacle in the way of these efforts to prevent such harmful conflicts of interest, which hurt businesses, consumers, and retirees and their families.

If the President were presented with H.R. 2374, his senior advisors would recommend that he veto the bill.

Mr. HENSARLING. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Tennessee, Dr. ROE, a distinguished member of the Education and the Workforce Committee.

Mr. ROE of Tennessee. I thank the chairman.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the Retail Investor Protection Act and preserving access to financial advice to all Americans.

The Department of Labor's efforts to redefine the fiduciary standards is classic Washington. It is a solution in search of a problem. The DOL has yet to present tangible evidence—beyond anecdotes—that workers are being hurt by current law, nor has the Department conducted a sufficient cost-benefit analysis.

This is not to say that the fiduciary standards must never be changed. All of us, Republicans and Democrats, want to strengthen workers' retirement security and perhaps need to modernize the longstanding fiduciary standard; but instead of working with Congress, the Department of Labor has single-mindedly pursued a course that would actually drive up the cost of retirement planning and restrict access to important investment advice. Millions of Americans could potentially be left to prepare for retirement on their own. How on Earth could this be a good thing?

The 2007 recession wreaked havoc on the retirement savings of American workers. We should work together on responsible solutions that will help workers enjoy their retirement years with financial security and peace of mind.

I am privileged to serve as chairman of the Subcommittee on Health, Employment, Labor, and Pensions, and that is precisely what we are trying to do in the area of multiemployer pension reform. The subcommittee has convened numerous bipartisan hearings to closely examine the problems plaguing the multiemployer pension system and potential solutions. In fact, we held such a hearing earlier today. Will we all agree on every point? Of course not. However, we remain committed to working together on real solutions that will promote the best interests of American families.

I hope the Department of Labor will reconsider its ill-conceived approach to revising Federal fiduciary standards and work with Congress, interested

stakeholders, and other Federal agencies to strengthen the retirement security of hardworking Americans. Until the Department does what is right and changes course, I urge my colleagues to support the Retail Investor Protection Act.

Ms. WATERS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlelady from New York (Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY), who serves as the ranking member on the Subcommittee on Capital Markets and Government Sponsored Enterprises of the Financial Services Committee.

Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York. I thank the ranking member for yielding and for all her hard work, and I thank the chairman.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to H.R. 2374. The bill would require the Securities and Exchange Commission to conduct yet another cost-benefit analysis of a fiduciary duty rule, apparently in the attempt and hope of derauling a new fiduciary duty rule to protect consumers. The Securities and Exchange Commission has already completed a lengthy study on whether or not to propose a fiduciary duty rule for brokers. That study included an extensive cost-benefit analysis.

So, my colleagues, outside of trying to derail a new consumer safeguard, what could possibly be the purpose of requiring the SEC to do yet another cost-benefit analysis on the exact same issue again? How about we just take the first one and make two copies?

The rule also prohibits the Labor Department from even proposing a rule until 60 days after the SEC finalizes its final rule. And what is the harm, my colleagues, in allowing an agency—in this case, the Labor Department—to release the proposed rule for public discussion, for public input? Since when has Congress been afraid of a debate?

If my colleagues believe that the proposed rule gets it wrong, then they have every opportunity to say so, as does the public, as do businesses, and that is exactly what the public comment period is for. That is what happened the last time the Labor Department proposed a fiduciary rule; there were questions raised. They have recalled it to reconsider it, and they are withdrawing that proposal and working on a new one.

If the SEC has a better idea for a fiduciary duty rule, then let's debate that one and have that released, but preventing an agency from even putting out a regulatory proposal for public debate is flat-out dead wrong.

This bill would delay and possibly derail important rulemaking at the Securities and Exchange Commission and the Labor Department to protect retirement security and investor protection rights. This is a transparent attempt to slow down the rulemaking process and possibly derail the whole rulemaking process for protections for consumers.

For these reasons, I urge my colleagues to vote "no."

Mr. HENSARLING. Mr. Speaker, I am now pleased to yield 3 minutes to

the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. GARRETT), chairman of the Financial Services Subcommittee on Capital Markets and GSEs.

Mr. GARRETT. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman for advancing this bill to the floor. I also congratulate the sponsor of the bill, Mrs. WAGNER, for leading forward with a piece of legislation that has, at its heart, to work in a bipartisan manner to protect American investors big and small, senior citizens, and regular people across this country who are concerned about their investment, concerned about what they pay for their advice and for their transactions. So I commend both of them for moving this legislation along.

The other side of the aisle likes to get engaged with name-calling, like "shoddy," "bad," "rip-off," and throw out numbers which, I guess, are just sort of pulled out of the air when they say, "If it is 1 percent for this, how much over 30 years? If it is a commission of X, I don't know, how much is it over 40 years?"

I always wonder when I hear comments from the other side of the aisle if they really actually sit and read the bill or do they just pull these numbers out of a hat. But I did hear one of their comments which went to the point of trying to help investors, which is: How do we help Americans, and how do we do it in a bipartisan manner?

Well, this was one of the most bipartisan bills that we have ever had coming out of our committee. Over half of the Democrats on the committee said they are going to stand with Americans, stand with investors. I will share some of those.

Mr. SHERMAN voted "yes"; Ms. MOORE said "yes," stand with Americans; Mr. PERLMUTTER said "yes"; Mr. HIMES said "yes"; Mr. PETERS said "yes." Messrs. CARNEY, FOSTER, KILDEE, DELANEY, Mrs. BEATTY, and Mr. HECK, to name just a few, joined with Republicans to work in a bipartisan manner to stand with Americans and stand with American investors, realizing that, at the end of the day, part of the problem in Washington is too many agencies that are not communicating with each other. Lack of communication is one of the problems that we have seen in this country in the last few weeks and months.

All we are suggesting is that the various agencies, like the SEC and the Department of Labor, actually coordinate and work together for investors. How will they do that? Well, the SEC is principally charged with the responsibility of looking at the areas of broker-dealers and investment advisers. And you know there is a difference on how they are treated right now, and there is a reason for that. They have been treated differently for eight decades, I guess, or so.

The SEC will be looking at this. As the gentlelady from New York has indicated, there is a study outstanding right now. They are getting comments

in already for that study. We are saying let's make sure we hear all the information, collect all the data, and before we go forward, let's have communication between these two agencies.

Let the SEC take the first step here. Nothing in here prevents them from taking any final actions or final steps. Nothing in this bill prevents the investor from being protected as these various agencies see fit.

All we are really asking for is the SEC, the agency principally charged with this, to take the first action, make sure they have the data, then work in harmony with the Department of Labor, and at the end of the day, we will be helping the American investors in a completely bipartisan manner.

□ 1530

Ms. WATERS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from California, Congressman GEORGE MILLER, who is the ranking member on the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

(Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. I thank the ranking member for all of her work on this legislation and for her yielding me the time.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to H.R. 2374. This bill is very bad news for working families. It protects the loophole in the law that allows conflicted brokers and advisers to rip off ordinary Americans who are trying to save for their retirements.

The 2008 financial crisis wiped out trillions of dollars of Americans' retirement accounts. Working families now need help in rebuilding those nest eggs, and they need better protection for their savings. The SEC and the Labor Department have moved to provide these protections, proposing to close the harmful loophole, but this bill would scuttle those efforts. Here is what is at stake.

Millions of Americans are putting money aside every day in their 401(k)s and in their IRAs to save for retirement. They have to make these investment choices, and Wall Street is more than happy to advise, but some of those advisers and brokers have conflicts of interest, often undisclosed conflicts of interest. The brokers know about their conflicts of interest, and the brokerage houses know about their conflicts of interest, but the person who is handing over his hard-earned retirement funds doesn't know about the conflicts of interest. The workers think they can trust this investment advice.

But what they don't know is that their advisers may get paid more for, in fact, in actual cases, steering them into high-cost funds with the worst performing of the family of funds. It is very good for the family of funds, but it is very bad for that individual worker who is now handing over his retirement nest egg. That product might have higher fees than other products.

It might underperform compared to other products. In other words, the product is not in the worker's best interest, but it certainly is in the broker's best interest.

The SEC and the Labor Department are trying to close this loophole that allows this rip-off to continue to happen, and it is, indeed, a rip-off of ordinary Americans. I know my friend from New Jersey doesn't like the term "rip-off," but that is what is happening to these hardworking American families. Multiple studies—not conjecture—have found that these conflicts of interest cost these retirees, these workers, very real money.

In 2009, the GAO found that, when a pension consultant has conflicts of interest, a defined benefit retirement plan underperforms by 130 basis points. If a conflicted broker in the defined contribution world recommends funds at a similar rate of underperformance, a 40-year-old worker who rolls over his \$20,000 401(k) balance into an IRA will see his retirement savings cut by a third over 30 years. If he normally earns 6 percent returns, he would now only be making a 4.7 percent return. The bottom line is he is \$35,000 poorer by the time he reaches 70. Thank you for that conflicted advice.

This year, researchers found that the funds recommended by conflicted brokers in 401(k) plans underperformed by an average of 3.6 percent. That translates into workers losing \$1 billion every month from their retirement funds because of these conflicts of interest. As a result, consumers are getting bad advice and are putting their retirement savings at stake.

Where do those figures come from?

They come from the founders of the Vanguard funds, who worked out the differences between these funds, conflicted funds, and other funds. That is why the Dodd-Frank law directs the SEC to transition brokers to a fiduciary standard, and, separately, the Department of Labor is trying to align the protections as well.

Brokers need to either act solely in the best interests of investors or otherwise disclose who they work for and how they are paid, but some on Wall Street have cried out, claiming that they will not be able to offer investment advice, especially to working people, if they cannot offer conflicted advice. They can't tell you how to invest your money unless they can offer you conflicted advice wherein they are getting paid more to offer you a substandard product. With the knowledge of that and the higher fees, they somehow can't make money. Let's remember that 75 percent of the brokers can't beat the S&P 500 that is on automatic pilot.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Ms. WATERS. I yield the gentleman an additional 1 minute.

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. I thank the gentlewoman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, is that what they are really saying? Is that what American

workers want to know—if I don't give you money, for which you can keep secret conflicts of interests that you have with the investment of my money, I have to give you my money anyway if I am looking for this investment? That is absolutely wrong.

The American worker deserves better than that. These people work hard to make the decisions to try to save, to add to their 401(k)s, and you want to talk about, oh, we should educate them about the value of a 401(k) and about the value of an IRA. You can educate them until the cows come home, but if they know that somebody is stealing their money because someone can conceal a conflict of interest, all of that education won't make a damned bit of difference because the fact of the matter is they've worked too hard to hand over their money to those conflicted advisers.

That is what this bill is about. This bill would continue those conflicts, make every effort to delay and stop this rulemaking—or we change the law, we go forward, we protect working families, we protect the retirees, and we make sure that the financial marketplace is free of these conflicts of interest.

Again, I thank the gentlewoman for all of her effort on this legislation.

Mr. HENSARLING. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased now to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. MCHENRY), the chairman of the Financial Services Subcommittee on Oversight and Investigations.

Mr. MCHENRY. I want to thank the committee chairman as well, Mr. HENSARLING, for yielding to me, and I want to thank my colleague ANN WAGNER from Missouri for putting together this very wise bill.

Mr. Speaker, I would say to my Democrat colleagues on the other side of the aisle who are speaking out with loud voices that the only rip-off here is when retail investors and the American people have two different government agencies writing rules. When they are not coordinating with each other and when they are not talking to one another, they are not writing rules that work together. In fact, you could be a retail investor and be complying with the Department of Labor's rules but could be running counter to the Securities and Exchange Commission's rules if this coordination is not done as required by this legislation.

So the Retail Investor Protection Act is just that. It protects retail investors. It reconciles uncoordinated efforts between the Securities and Exchange Commission and the U.S. Department of Labor, and it says that they have to work together and also use a cost-benefit analysis when they are writing these rules.

I think that is a very wise thing. In fact, the court system has agreed that it is a wise thing, and 44 members of the House Financial Services Committee thought it was a wise thing, while only 13 opposed passing this out.

Also, we have 10 Democrat United States Senators who have written to the Office of Management and Budget, making an identical request as this bill to the SEC, stating that the SEC act first in writing these rules before they come together.

So, today, it is not only a bipartisan vote but also a bicameral vote, both the House and the Senate. I would ask my colleagues to support this bipartisan bill coming out of Financial Services in order to make sure that our government agencies actually coordinate when they write rules. Let's actually protect retail investors and do that first.

Ms. WATERS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia, Mr. BOBBY SCOTT, who is on the Judiciary Committee and who is the ranking member on its Subcommittee on Crime, Terrorism, Homeland Security, and Investigations.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. I thank the gentlelady for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to H.R. 2374, the so-called Retail Investor Protection Act. H.R. 2374 delays the Department of Labor's rulemaking process that would protect investors from unscrupulous investment scams.

Now, in past generations, pension plans were what were called "defined benefit plans" in which there were defined benefits. You would look at the number of years, your last salary, and the multiple, and you could calculate what your pension would be. But more and more we are seeing defined contribution plans in which the employer just makes a contribution, and the final benefit would be whatever happens to the money over the years with the investment advice that you would be given. The trend has had a profound impact on ultimate retirement benefits and security.

Two people investing the same amount—for example, \$100 a month over 30 years—could see very different retirement savings over that same period of time based on the investments they chose. Those investment choices could be the difference between a savings at the end of \$100,000 or as much as \$500,000 depending on which strategies were used. Now, most employees are not sophisticated investors, and therefore they need advice on what investment strategies should be used. How much should be in stocks? how much in bonds? how much in mutual funds, and which mutual funds? They seek advice.

The rule that the Department of Labor introduced in 2010 and will most likely reintroduce this fall simply requires that an investment adviser provide advice as a fiduciary responsibility to the investor, consistent, therefore, with the best interest of the investor, not with what would ultimately be most profitable to the adviser. That is, he has a duty to give primary consideration to the investor, not to his own profit. There are a lot of different products. A lot of mutual funds have extremely high fees when com-

parable funds—even better funds—have lower fees. Often the adviser will push products that are totally inappropriate for the investor, which is compromising the investor's retirement security in the long run but which is maximizing the profits for the adviser.

The bill we are considering today will allow investments to be sold which are laden with conflicts of interest and would immunize advisers who give self-serving, unscrupulous advice from any liability. There is an apparent belief that investment advice that is self-serving and full of conflicts of interest is better than no investment advice at all. That is absolutely absurd. There is nothing wrong with those selling investment products to be required to give primary consideration to the investors they are purporting to advise.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Ms. WATERS. I yield the gentleman an additional 1 minute.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, the bill that we are considering today would delay the rulemaking that would take the necessary steps to protect employees and retirees who are currently being taken advantage of by investment advisers who are giving this unscrupulous advice.

Millions of Americans look to financial advisers for advice. There is nothing wrong with requiring them to have a fiduciary responsibility to those they are advising. It is about time that we make sure the investors are getting the good advice that they deserve. Therefore, we should defeat this bill.

Mr. HENSARLING. Mr. Speaker, I now yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. HURT), the vice chairman of the Financial Services Subcommittee on Capital Markets and GSEs.

Mr. HURT. Thank you to the chairman of this committee, and thank you to the sponsor for your leadership on this issue.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the Retail Investor Protection Act.

Fifth District Virginians and Americans across the country are working hard to save for their futures, whether it be for their retirements or college tuitions for their children. Unfortunately, these hardworking Americans are being faced with the prospect of increased costs and fewer choices for the financial products that they currently rely on for their investments.

Currently, the Department of Labor and the Securities and Exchange Commission have indicated they will move forward with rulemakings to make changes to the fiduciary standards that would decrease the availability of financial advice for retail investors and increase the cost of financial advice for retail investors.

We must protect the ability of these Americans to choose the financial professionals who best meet their investment needs, and this bill is an important step in that direction. The Retail Investor Protection Act ensures that

retail investors, including many American families, are not affected by unnecessary regulations that have been put in place without sufficient economic analysis or regulatory coordination.

I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting this important bill so that Washington does not stand in the way of Americans' ability to seek the best financial advice for their needs.

Ms. WATERS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. ANDREWS), who is an expert on retirement savings. He is the ranking member on the Education and the Workforce Subcommittee on Health, Employment, Labor, and Pensions. He is also the cochair of the Steering and Policy Committee.

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

Mr. ANDREWS. I thank my very good friend for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, so you are in the lunchroom at work. This guy comes in from the investment house, and he shows 18 slides about the red fund—smiling people who are on fishing trips and on European vacations. They are really happy people.

□ 1545

He shows one slide about the blue fund at the very end and finishes his presentation. The red fund looks pretty good. What he doesn't tell you is that he gets 2½ percent of every dollar you put into the red fund, but ½ of 1 percent of every dollar you put in the blue fund. He neglects to mention that. So people rush and put their money in the red fund.

Now, should his interest be aligned with you or should his interest be aligned with his own interest? That is the question that is raised by this bill.

The Department of Labor is writing a rule that for the first time would say that that person standing in front of you in that room has a fiduciary obligation to the person listening, that is to say that he has to put the interest of the listener ahead of his own financial interest.

Self-interest is the malignancy that brought the U.S. economy to its knees 5 years ago. People who made mortgage transactions and insurance transactions benefited them and not the people they are supposed to be representing. To permit the cancer of self-interest to invade the second most important asset people have in their lifetime, which is their pension, would be an enormous mistake. That is a mistake that this Department of Labor rule is trying to avoid. This bill is a mistake because it rolls back those efforts and protections for the American people.

John Bogle, the founder and patron of Vanguard, has estimated that nearly 30 percent of people's pension funds have evaporated because of unnecessary fees. If people want to choose a high-fee plan, that is their choice; but

they should make that choice only after receiving the advice that is fiduciary, that is directed to their own best interest, from a competent professional.

The Department of Labor rule promotes that result; this bill undercuts that result. For that reason, we should oppose this bill.

Mr. HENSARLING. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. LUETKEMEYER), another distinguished member of the Financial Services Committee.

Mr. LUETKEMEYER. Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank Chairman HENSARLING for all his fine work on this issue, as well as other financial services issues.

I also would like to thank my good friend and neighbor in Missouri, Mrs. WAGNER, for introducing this legislation and all her hard work on it. What she is trying to do here is propose legislation that tries to solve a problem that we have got in the situation here with these two agencies—DOL and SEC—trying to coordinate and propose a regulation which they don't seem to be willing to do or do it in the right way.

As usual, when the bureaucracy tries to propose things, there always are unintended consequences of those actions and those rulings. We have here some of those unintended consequences, which Mrs. WAGNER in her legislation is trying to mitigate.

This proposal has the potential to drive up the cost and availability of investment services and products for investors, particularly those with low and moderate incomes. I will give you an example. I recently spoke to a broker-dealer in rural Missouri who I represent, who is one of only a handful of small brokers in a two-county radius. If the Department of Labor rule moves forward, he, like many other small broker-dealers, will have no choice, because of the way this rule is written or being proposed, that they will stop offering his services to clients, and many Missourians are going to be without or have limited access to financial products and advice.

This hurts not only the big investors, but this hurts the small investors. As I said earlier, you are talking about the low- and moderate-income folks and, particularly, one of the most basic investments that we have, which is the IRA. How basic can you get to not allow people to be able to utilize an IRA if this goes into force?

So it is important today that we take this action. I, again, thank the gentleman from Missouri for her efforts, and I urge my colleagues for support.

Ms. WATERS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to inquire as to how much time we have remaining on this side.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from California has 5½ minutes remaining. The gentleman from Texas has 5 minutes remaining.

Ms. WATERS. I am prepared to close. However, I will reserve the balance of

my time if the chairman has other Members that he would like to put forth at this time.

Mr. HENSARLING. We have one more speaker, and then we would allow the gentleman to close.

Then I believe I have the right to close, Mr. Speaker. Is that correct?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. HENSARLING. At this time, Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. MULVANEY).

Mr. MULVANEY. Mr. Speaker, I have been sitting here for the past 45–50 minutes watching the debate. It strikes me that with all of the financial terms and with some of the heated rhetoric—and it has been heated—I never thought I would see the day where enlightened self-interest was called a cancer in this Nation. I wonder what Alexis de Tocqueville would think about that. But in any event, with all of that, Mr. Speaker, it strikes me that we have lost sight of what we are talking about. We are talking about a bill, what the bill specifically does, and why.

Let's talk first about why we are here. We have a situation where Dodd-Frank has given authority to the SEC to make some rules. The Department of Labor also thinks it has the authority to make rules in the same area.

I hope we can all agree that there is a potential for conflict there. We all know what it is. We have seen it a hundred times before. We don't want the SEC to come out and say that you can't do X and have the Department of Labor come out the next week and say, but you have to do X.

There are hundreds of examples like that in the Federal Government, and this bill is simply trying to address that. How is it trying to do that? What does the bill do?

Number one, it asks the two agencies to work together. Someone please tell me how that is a bad thing—and a cancer of all things—on this Nation.

It then requires the two agencies to actually try and figure out if there is a problem—to ask them to identify a problem before they come up with a solution. Again, I think this makes a good bit of sense. The questions that we require them to ask in this bill are pretty simple: Are investors being systematically harmed? Would new rules limit people's access to investment advice? What are the costs and benefits of the rule?

How is this controversial? And I would suggest to you, Mr. Speaker, that it is not. That is the reason that it came out of committee on a bipartisan basis, the reason it is going to pass today on a bipartisan basis, and the reason that it has the bipartisan basis that it does in the Senate.

Too often I think we get sidetracked by coming in here and giving big speeches, and perhaps sometimes I am as guilty of that as anybody else. But today we have completely lost sight of

why we are here. I hope we can come together and pass this bill this afternoon.

Ms. WATERS. I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker and Members, H.R. 2374 is yet another attempt by Republicans to prevent our regulators from doing their job, this time protecting the average retail investor when they try to save for retirement.

Under this bill, the Securities and Exchange Commission would have to navigate new obstacles to harmonize the standard of care broker-dealers and investment advisers have when providing investment advice. The Department of Labor would have to wait possibly forever to update its rules protecting 401(k) and IRA plan participants.

H.R. 2374's restrictions put additional work in the way, stopping brokers from SEP dealing when selling investment products to Main Street.

Several studies have demonstrated that Americans do not understand that a broker does not necessarily have the investor's best interest when pushing financial products. The line between advisers and brokers has blurred over the last few decades, and this bill makes it harder to bring clarity for investments.

Mr. Speaker and Members, this administration has taken a strong stand against this bill. Let me read to you from the letter that they have sent to us, and I would like to offer this for the RECORD:

The administration strongly opposes passage of H.R. 2374 because it would derail important rulemakings under way at the Securities and Exchange Commission and the Department of Labor that are critical to protecting Americans' hard-earned savings and preserving their retirement security.

They further say:

H.R. 2374 prohibits Labor from issuing a rule to protect investors until the SEC engages in and completes further study of the effect of a rulemaking on retail investors.

Of course, there is a lot said here, but I think this says it all:

The bill would hinder efforts to protect consumers from conflicts of interest among brokers, dealers, financial advisers, and others whose incentives may be misaligned with investors, potentially leading to deceptive and abusive practices.

The administration is committed to ensuring that American workers and retirees are able to receive advice about how to invest their money in safe, secure, and transparent financial products that is free from harmful conflicts of interest.

Mr. Speaker and Members, I would just bring this to your attention: the Department of Labor is working to protect investors. My friends on the opposite side of the aisle are working to protect broker-dealers who may not have the best interest of these small individuals who want to invest, who want to earn money for retirement.

My friends on the opposite side of the aisle are putting all of this energy out to protect them no matter if they may be in a conflict of interest with those

who are simply trying to save for retirement.

I have watched as we have been through the subprime meltdown in this country. People lose money in their 401(k)s. I have watched people lose money in their IRAs. I have watched single women in their 60s losing their entire investment retirement savings who can't go back to work because they are too old—they can't find a job.

Whose side are we on? Are we on the side of broker-dealers who will have no fiduciary responsibility, who can tell you any old thing, direct you any old place? They get higher commissions and the people lose money. Whose side are we on? Why are we here in the Congress of the United States of America, voted on by our constituents to come here to advocate for their best interest?

The gentlelady from Missouri talked about what a hard time families are having. She is right. Families are having a hard time. I want to tell you, families are having a hard time even when my friends on the opposite side of the aisle would deny them food stamps when they lose their jobs, even when they stand here in the Congress of the United States and support sequestration that denied that family the ability to send their child to Head Start. They don't have money for fancy early childhood education. Head Start is all they have, but they are losing the ability to do that because my friends on the opposite side of the aisle support cutting back every agency.

My friends on the opposite side of the aisle can't care about families in the way that they say they do because they shut down this government and they caused families to lose money to stay at home, to not know when they were going to get paid, or how to pay their bills. Not only did they harm these families; they harmed many of our agencies that are trying to help the families. I could go on and on and on.

But let me say that consumer protection is advocated by some organizations we are all familiar with: AARP, AAUW, AFL-CIO, AFSCME, Alliance for Retired Americans, Americans for Financial Reform, the Association of BellTell Retirees, on and on and on. These are the people who protect consumers.

I will submit this for the RECORD.  
I yield back the balance of my time.

EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT,  
OFFICE OF MANAGEMENT AND BUDGET,

Washington, DC, October 28, 2013.

STATEMENT OF ADMINISTRATION POLICY  
H.R. 2374—RETAIL INVESTOR PROTECTION ACT  
(Rep. Wagner, R-MO, and Rep. Murphy, D-FL)

The Administration strongly opposes passage of H.R. 2374 because it would derail important rulemakings underway at the Securities Exchange Commission (SEC) and the Department of Labor that are critical to protecting Americans' hard-earned savings and preserving their retirement security.

H.R. 2374 prohibits Labor from issuing a rule to protect investors until the SEC en-

gages in and completes further study of the effect of a rulemaking on retail investors. The bill ignores the fact that significant work has already been conducted in both agencies and that the agencies have included and continue to include the public, industry, and numerous stakeholders in their rule-making processes. Moreover, the two agencies are already working closely to avoid conflicting requirements for the regulated community, and this legislation would hamper effective coordination between the two agencies. The bill would hinder efforts to protect consumers from conflicts of interest among brokers, dealers, financial advisors, and others whose incentives may be misaligned with investors, potentially leading to deceptive and abusive practices.

The Administration is committed to ensuring that American workers and retirees are able to receive advice about how to invest their money in safe, secure, and transparent financial products that is free from harmful conflicts of interest. These ongoing rulemakings are designed to protect trillions of dollars in retirement savings of millions of workers and retirees by ensuring that paid advisors and other entities do not place their own financial interests over those of their customers. This legislation would place an unnecessary obstacle in the way of these efforts to prevent such harmful conflicts of interest, which hurt businesses, consumers, and retirees and their families.

If the President were presented with H.R. 2374, his senior advisors would recommend that he veto the bill.

GROUPS IN OPPOSITION TO H.R. 2374

1. AARP
2. AAUW
3. AFL-CIO
4. AFSCME
5. Alliance For Retired Americans
6. Americans for Financial Reform (AFR)-over 200 signatories
7. The Association of BellTell Retirees, Inc.
8. Certified Financial Planner Board (CFP)
9. Consumer Federation of America
10. Financial Planning Association
11. Fund Democracy
12. Investment Advisor Association (IAA)
13. National Council of La RAZA
14. The National Association of Personal Financial Advisors (NAPFA)
15. The National Association of Professional Geriatric Care Managers
16. North American Securities Administrators Association (NASAA)
17. OWL-The Voice of Midlife and Older Women
18. Pensions Rights Center
19. ProtectSeniors.org
20. Public Citizen
21. Wider Opportunities for Women

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

Mr. Speaker, I must admit in the time that I have served as a Member of Congress, I have noticed the more shrill the debate the less defensible the position. As I have listened closely to what appears to be a very shrill debate, it certainly buttresses that position.

I hear my friends talk about us on the other side of the aisle. I have heard the phrase "my friends on the other side of the aisle" consistently. But I would say perhaps the debate has to be between my friends on that side of the aisle, since the ranking member well knows that half-half-of her caucus on the Financial Services Committee supported this bill by the gentlelady of Missouri. As was pointed out earlier, it

is not only bipartisan; it is also bicameral.

I am sitting here, Mr. Speaker, with a letter signed by no fewer than 10—10 Democratic Senators imploring that the very same provisions of the Wagner bill be enforced: JON TESTER, MARK WARNER, CLAIRE MCCASKILL, KAY HAGAN, and the list goes on and on. I would say to my friends on that side of the aisle, perhaps they ought to finish the debate amongst themselves before they carry it on over here.

Then, again, we all know that people are entitled to their own opinions; they are not entitled to their own facts. There have been a number of misstatements of facts from my friends on that side of the aisle, particularly that broker-dealers have no standard whatsoever in disclosing conflicts of interest; but that is not true. Within the antifraud provisions, sections 9, 10, 15(c)(1) and (2), it prohibits misstatements, misleading omissions of material facts; and, indeed, broker-dealers must fully disclose any conflicts of interest, yet another huge section of debate that was totally misleading and false by friends on that side of the aisle.

□ 1600

And I must admit, it is a very disappointing debate; but, it is in some respects illuminating to see the cynical position of those who simply believe that everyone appears to be a crook unless you are a government worker. The phrase "cancer of self-interest" is working mothers have a self-interest to invest in their children's education. If the guy at the Pepsi bottling plant that I represent is trying to invest so he can buy a home and put a roof over his family's head, that is the cancer of self-interest?

All we are trying to do here is preserve investment advice and investment opportunities for working Americans, and I would encourage all Members, all Members of this body, to vote for the Wagner bill.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. CRENSHAW. Mr. Speaker, as the Chairman of the Appropriations Subcommittee on Financial Services and General Government, my Subcommittee directly oversees the Securities and Exchange Commission's budget. And since 2001 the SEC's budget has increased by over 200 percent . . . this is a larger increase than almost any other agency in our government.

As the agency tasked with protecting investors and ensuring fair and orderly capital markets, you would think they would carefully coordinate with all agencies involved to ensure much needed certainty and to provide clear guidance to a trillion dollar industry. However, this again is not the case and we are here today to ensure that the SEC and the Department of Labor coordinate and work in a systematic manner to avoid investor confusion, regulatory conflict, and decrease costs for retail investors.

This is why I rise today to put my support for H.R. 2374, the "Retail Investor Protection Act."—common sense legislation, requiring the

SEC complete a rulemaking on standards of care governing broker dealers and investment advisers before the Department of Labor finalizes their rule redefining the definition of a person providing investment advice under the Employee Retirement Income Security Act. Plain and simple, ensuring collaboration between the two agencies that are trying to reach the same goal.

In addition H.R. 2374 requires that before the SEC writes one new rule on expanding fiduciary standards, they need to identify whether investors are being harmed under current standards of care. We all need to remember what's at stake here. American families invest trillions of dollars in IRAs and through mutual funds, stocks, and bonds. The Retail Investor Protection Act will ensure that federal regulators will not lose focus on the impact these rules could have on retail investors and must consider all other options first, before moving forward with broad new regulatory mandates.

The lack of regulatory coordination between these two financial regulators does not provide a cohesive landscape for investors and will be difficult for service providers to follow. These rules affect the lives of many and have profound and far reaching effects on our economy. The SEC itself has acknowledged that the costs of this action could "ultimately be passed on to retail investors in the form of higher fees or lost access to services and products.

We in Congress have an obligation to amend or fix provisions whose costs outweigh purported benefits. Therefore, as we move forward with the fiscal year 2014 budget in my Appropriations Subcommittee I plan to address with Chairwoman White whether a more thorough economic analysis of these rules are needed to ensure the SEC does not harm families who are investing to build up their retirement or to save for college—the very investors the SEC is supposed to protect. I urge my colleagues to vote in favor of H.R. 2374.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Speaker, I am an advocate for consumer choice and appreciate the value of a variety of different business models in a competitive financial services marketplace. I also support full transparency regarding compensation arrangements and believe investors have a right to recommendations based on their best interests when receiving investment advice from financial services professionals.

Consistent with these principles, the Securities and Exchange Commission (SEC) and the Department of Labor (DOL) are currently in the process of coordinating a harmonized "fiduciary" standard of care for financial services professionals offering investment advice to their clients. Rather than allowing the SEC and the DOL to complete their work, today's legislation would prejudice the outcome of the ongoing rulemakings and have the practical effect of delaying implementation of final harmonized rules to protect consumers' retirement savings from conflict of interests and potentially deceptive or abusive practices.

Accordingly, I urge a "no" vote.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. All time for debate on the bill has expired.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. GEORGE MILLER OF CALIFORNIA

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, I have an amendment at the desk.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 1, line 5, strike "After" and insert "(a) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in subsection (b), after".

Page 1, after line 14, insert the following:

(b) EXCEPTION.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of Labor may issue a rule that—

(A) establishes standards of care to improve investment advice provided to participants and beneficiaries under the Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974 (29 U.S.C. 1001 et seq.);

(B) requires that personalized investment advice is provided in a fiduciary capacity that is in the best interests of such participants and beneficiaries;

(C) requires that, before receiving investment advice, the compensation of investment advisors and financial service providers is clearly disclosed to such participants and beneficiaries; and

(D) satisfies the requirements of paragraph (3).

(2) PROCESS.—The Secretary of Labor may issue a rule pursuant to paragraph (1)—

(A) after coordination and consultation with the Securities and Exchange Commission; and

(B) after considering surveys and data on investment education and investment advice.

(3) PARTICIPANT INVESTMENT EDUCATION; APPRAISALS.—The rule issued pursuant to paragraph (1) shall provide standards of conduct for—

(A) participant investment education;

(B) access to reliable investment education and investment advice to traditionally underserved communities;

(C) reasonable compensation for investment advisors and financial service providers; and

(D) fair market value appraisals of stock held by employee stock ownership plans to employers, participants, and beneficiaries under the Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974 (29 U.S.C. 1001 et seq.).

At the end of the bill, insert the following:

**SEC. 4. REPORTS ON THE IMPACT OF PRACTICES OF PERSONS WHO PROVIDE INVESTMENT ADVICE.**

(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 90 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Labor shall report to Congress on how certain practices of persons who provide investment advice affect the standard of care exercised in relation to investors.

(b) REPORT REQUIREMENTS.—Such report shall—

(1) describe how the structure of compensation for persons who provide investment advice affects the standard of care exercised by such persons, including—

(A) practices involving fees paid from investment vehicles to such persons; and

(B) other forms of compensation paid to such persons that are not dependent upon the investor's return;

(2) compare the standards of care exercised by persons who provide investment advice to low-income and middle-class investors with the standards of care exercised by persons who provide investment advice to high-income investors, and the effect such standards of care have on the investment vehicles selected by investors; and

(3) evaluate the extent to which the standard of care used by persons who provide investment advice affects the adequacy of investment returns to provide for retirement for investors.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 391, the gentleman from California (Mr. GEORGE

MILLER) and a Member opposed each will control 10 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California.

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 3 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, the amendment that I am offering along with Mr. CONYERS is the way H.R. 2374 should have been drafted. Instead of short-circuiting the regulatory process on behalf of Wall Street profits, this represents the appropriate and balanced way forward to advise the Department of Labor in their current rulemaking on investment advice.

First, Congress should not be in the business of shutting down any and all efforts by the Department of Labor to make rules for fiduciaries. The fiduciary rule is the cornerstone of pension law. It is what makes sure that, when you hand your money over to someone else to invest it for you, they are going to act in your best interest. Stopping any and all regulatory action to ensure that people's retirement nest eggs are protected is irresponsible. My amendment would allow the Department to proceed.

At the same time, it addresses concerns that have been raised with the Department of Labor's proposed rules. Under my amendment, Congress would send a message to the Department of Labor that we want investors protected, not Wall Street brokers or advisers trying to protect their gravy train.

This amendment makes it clear that the Department may proceed with better protections for retirement investors in a way that provides for unbiased investment education, ensures that underserved communities are not unduly harmed by basic financial protections for investors, ensures reasonable competition to advisers, and protects employee stock ownership plan appraisals.

We want investment advice to be provided in consumers' best interests, not in whatever way makes advisers and brokers the most money.

Studies show that most Americans who save think their investment advisers are acting in their best interests. In fact, AARP found that overwhelming majorities of consumers thought all advisers were required to act in their best interests. But, in fact, they are not, under the current law. They are not required to disclose that they have a conflict of interest.

With poll after poll showing that most Americans are worried about their retirement, they should have the confidence that their investment adviser is working in their best interest, and not conflicted in the advice he gives that person because he may receive additional fees or higher commissions because of recommending a product that is not in their best interest.

This amendment is a no-brainer. It supports consumers and their retirement savings. It supports unbiased investment education. It supports reasonable compensation for advisers for

the important duties they perform. This is a proper and balanced way forward. I urge my colleagues to support the Miller-Conyers amendment.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HENSARLING. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to this amendment.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Texas is recognized for 10 minutes.

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

Again, I urge opposition to this amendment which would absolutely eviscerate this bill that we are considering now from the gentlelady from Missouri.

Number one, we have speaker after speaker who come up and seem to ignore the fact that broker-dealers already are subject to a suitability standard, including antifraud provisions that prohibit misstatements, misleading omissions of material facts, and fraudulent and manipulative acts and practices in connection with the purchase and sale of securities. They have a duty of fair dealing, which include the duty to execute orders promptly, disclose certain material information that the customer would consider important as an investor, charge prices reasonably related to the prevailing market, and fully disclose any conflict of interest.

I could go on and on.

The proponents of this amendment, as speakers before them, seemed to ignore this set of facts. And so again, it is interesting to me how the American people are demanding that their Congress work on a bipartisan basis; and so out of our committee, the Financial Services Committee, we have gone above and beyond the call of duty, and now we have a bill that has been supported by half of the Democratic members of the Financial Services Committee. And I just read a letter where 10 Democratic U.S. Senators are urging the exact same language as the Wagner bill and, thus, oppose the Miller amendment.

So, again, Mr. Speaker, I urge the proponent of the amendment to first have the debate with his own Caucus, and then we can have a fuller, richer debate on the floor.

What is really happening here is that all we are doing is saying to the Securities and Exchange Commission and the Department of Labor that this is an economy that is being crushed—crushed—by a red tape burden, that at least justify it. Make sure that the person you claimed you are going to protect, that you actually protect; and instead, we, quite honestly, fear they will not be protected, that instead they will be harmed, that all of a sudden, people who have access to \$7 trades won't have access to them.

Now, again, for the affluent, that is no big deal, but for working mothers struggling to make ends meet, it is a very big deal.

To be denied the opportunity to open up an IRA with \$2,000? No, I think now

Congress has deigned that the Department of Labor can institute a fiduciary standard, and now you are going to need \$25,000. Well, what the heck, let's make it \$50,000. And so the very people they claim they want to protect very well could be harmed by this standard.

We understand the talk, but where is the proof? Where is the proof? Because what is going to happen if this fiduciary standard is imposed? All of a sudden investment advice that working Americans count on is either going to disappear or become far more expensive.

So, again, maybe it helps the trial lawyer; maybe it helps the labor union bosses; but it doesn't help the working mothers. It doesn't help the struggling fathers. It doesn't help low- and moderate-income people struggling in this economy where tens of millions remain underemployed and unemployed under this administration's economic policies, and so I urge that we reject this amendment.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 15 seconds.

I just want to say that it is an interesting concept that the only way the investment community can continue to survive and offer advice is if they can have the right to have conflicted advice—conflicted advice—be protected by the law, as opposed to representing the person that they are taking the money from to invest.

I now yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. CONYERS), coauthor of the amendment.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank GEORGE MILLER for the work he has done, along with the ranking member of the Financial Services Committee.

The Miller-Conyers amendment simply encourages the Department of Labor to issue a rule that requires investment advisers to provide advice in a fiduciary capacity and protect access to investment education, ensure reasonable compensation to advisers, and ensure the availability of ESOP appraisals.

This is what we are seeking so badly, and this is the comment that has been made about the inaccurate drafting of the bill. The Department of Labor should issue a proposed rule that seeks to protect workers, provide access to investment education, and ensure that advisers are reasonably paid.

Under current rules, investment advisers may hold themselves out as acting in workers' best interests even though they are not. I repeat: under current rules, investment advisers may hold themselves out as acting in workers' best interests even though they are not.

Workers in these types of plans often are required to choose between dozens of investment choices and need the advice on their investment options from people who do not have secret conflicts. Over 70 million workers and retirees depend upon 401(k) retirement

plans and IRAs for their retirement savings. If there is any hope for this measure at all, H.R. 2374, it would have to have this amendment on it. I plead with those who enthusiastically support this measure to please support this amendment.

Mr. HENSARLING. Mr. Speaker, I am now pleased to yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Missouri (Mrs. WAGNER), the author of the Retail Investor Protection Act.

Mrs. WAGNER. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the amendment. The language of the amendment attempts to sound benign, but its inclusion would undermine a key tenet of the legislation, which is a requirement that the Department of Labor wait for the SEC to finish any rulemaking in this area.

It has been noted time and time again by Chairman HENSARLING and others that 10 Democratic Senators recently sent a letter to the Office of Management and Budget requesting that Labor wait on the SEC. So there seems to be bipartisan and, as we have stated before, bicameral consensus for the process here.

I also must say that I find some of the terms in the amendment particularly troubling. The amendment would allow the Department of Labor to define what constitutes a "financial services provider," a term that I believe is broad and which I am not sure the Department of Labor has either the expertise or the jurisdiction to rule upon.

Paragraph 3 of the amendment also states that the Department of Labor's rules should provide for "reasonable compensation" within the industry. I, for one, do not believe that it is up to the Federal Government to determine what constitutes reasonable compensation. That is a determination that belongs to consumers and to investors who I believe are more than capable of determining for themselves what is reasonable.

The Retail Investor Protection Act would require that Federal agencies act in the best interest of all investors and would go a long way towards preserving access to financial services for Americans of all income levels. This, Mr. Speaker, is about access. It is about availability. It is about affordability for hardworking American families and investors.

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. ANDREWS).

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

Mr. ANDREWS. I thank my friend for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, my friend, the chairman from Texas, asked, I think, a couple of very important questions about this amendment, and he really points out why I support it. First, he asked: Where is the proof that American pensioners have suffered because of conflicted investment advice?

□ 1615

Mr. Speaker, we can all look to the Government Accountability Office, which looked at that very question a few years ago, at Mr. MILLER's request and mine and several others, and found that upwards of 27 percent of people's accounts evaporated because of high fees in plans in which they put their money in defined contribution accounts. That is pretty significant proof.

As I said earlier on the floor, they could look to the opinion of someone who is not political at all, I think, someone who is an expert in this field, Jack Bogle, from Vanguard, who uses the number 30 percent in unnecessary fees that have gone up here. Proof is ample that many Americans have rather paltry retirement accounts because of the very high fees that they are paying.

Second, Mr. Speaker, the chairman talked about the suitability standard under the securities law. That is kind of the point. The suitability standard is not a fiduciary standard. The suitability standard assumes an arm's-length transaction between people of equal or similar competence, where it is every investor for him- or herself.

The pension situation is very different. This is a situation where someone is driving a bus or building houses or teaching school or working in a software company, and that is what they do. They don't do investment all the time. So when they turn to someone for advice, they are assuming that that someone is on their side, that the advice that someone is giving them is in their best interests. That is the very nature of a fiduciary relationship.

So I think the questions that were raised point out the reasons to support Mr. MILLER's amendment. There is ample evidence of harm that has been done to America's investors; and, secondly, the suitability standard is wholly insufficient to protect the interests of those investors.

For those reasons, I urge a "yes" vote on this amendment, and a "no" vote on the bill.

Mr. HENSARLING. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire as to how much time each side has remaining?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Texas has 4 minutes remaining, and the gentleman from California has 1¾ minutes remaining.

Mr. HENSARLING. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. GARRETT).

Mr. GARRETT. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman for yielding me time.

How you ended your comments was, Let's move this bipartisan amendment to this bill, and what I was trying to do in a bipartisan manner was to ask the question: Is simply what you are trying to do is to require that investment advisers, that they would have to have, you are saying, a fiduciary duty going forward? That is what you are trying to do to add to this bill? I heard you say that, and I heard Mr. MILLER say that. That was my question to you.

You said it once. Mr. MILLER said it twice. I made a note of it each time. That is my question. That is what you basically want us to do. You want us to make it the law that an investment adviser would have to have a fiduciary standard to do in the best interest, if you will?

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GARRETT. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. Do I believe that advisers have a fiduciary relationship to the people that they are taking money from to invest? I do. I think the law should reflect that, absolutely.

Mr. GARRETT. Earlier I said that I often wonder whether people who come to the floor to oppose some of our bills ever actually read the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. HENSARLING. I yield the gentleman an additional 30 seconds.

Mr. GARRETT. Now I am going to go a step further. I wonder whether the people who oppose this bill actually know what the law is.

The law is and has been for decades that, if you are an investment adviser, you already have a fiduciary standard with regard to your client. That is the current law. Already the investment adviser, going through an ERISA plan, has a fiduciary standard. I think what you are talking about is a broker-dealer.

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GARRETT. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. That is what the amendment addresses.

Mr. GARRETT. Exactly. That is why I asked both of you twice what you said. What you said on the floor and what you just said a moment ago is, you were talking about broker-dealers, but you said it was investment advisers. It just points out, Mr. Speaker, that they come to the floor with absolutely no understanding of what the law is.

Once again, we encourage the bill to go unamended.

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

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, does the gentleman from Texas have additional speakers?

Mr. HENSARLING. I have no further speakers, Mr. Speaker, and I believe I have the right to close.

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, let me get this straight. You can talk about the advisers having a fiduciary responsibility and obligation under the law, but then you can have the broker-dealers come in and close the deal, and they can provide conflicted advice and, in fact, conflicted products—in the best interest of this retired individual who is trying to invest their funds? Very clever.

But this comes from an industry where we saw the banks sell a tranche

of mortgages to their best friends and customers and then immediately bid against the success of that tranche of mortgages. So conflicted advice can be very profitable. They worked it to a fare-thee-well among the big players.

Now you come in with your \$100,000, your \$80,000, your retirement funds, and you want to make an investment and you want some advice and you want to talk to a broker, and the broker says, Oh, yes, we have exactly the product for you. In fact, he or she has been told to sell this product, even though it is not the best-performing product, it may not be a match for this couple, but it has the highest commissions for the firm and for the broker. That is what they do.

What you are suggesting is that should be written into the law, that conflict of interest, and you talk about all the terrible things that happen. But when the adviser fiduciary study was done in 2013, 68 percent said the fiduciary—this is of the investment industry—68 percent said the fiduciary standard will not reduce products or services; 79 percent said it does not cost more to work as a fiduciary; and 65 percent said the fiduciary standard will not price investors out of the market. So the industry says that, but you have a whole theory how this is doomsday for the small investor. It is just not so.

What you are doing is protecting the right of brokers to give you conflicted advice about the investment of your money, and they knowingly do it. You are saying that the industry cannot continue unless they are allowed to continue to give conflicted advice. That is why we have conflict of interest laws, because we don't allow people to do this when they have a responsibility.

We should vote for this amendment and vote against the bill.

I yield back the balance of my time. Mr. HENSARLING. Mr. Speaker, how much time do I have remaining?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Texas has 2½ minutes remaining.

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

I think the audio system on the House floor is working quite well, and so I continue to be somewhat amazed by the number of speakers who get up and claim that broker-dealers can engage in conflicts of interest.

Again, I will give the citation for the duty to disclose conflicts of interest, FINRA's Suitability Rule 2111. I would encourage those who haven't read it to actually read it so that we can actually have facts on the House floor.

Mr. Speaker, what is truly radical here is the proponents of this amendment trying to upset 80 years of settled law, without any evidence that is compelling, to somehow believe that all of a sudden we are going to help a universe of people, who most of us believe, including half of the Democrats on the

Financial Services Committee, instead will be hurt, including a number of prominent Democratic senators who believe they will be hurt, these working moms and pops trying to provide for their family, trying to manage their nest eggs, having a new standard forced upon people they rely on. So all of a sudden, that investment advice is either going to get more expensive, it is going to disappear. All of a sudden, IRAs for working moms at prices they can afford will disappear all because we hear rhetoric about Wall Street.

Well, I don't think I have had any letters of endorsement from anybody on Wall Street. We can talk about something else that is not applicable. Perhaps we can talk about ObamaCare. I am always happy to have that discussion once again.

Again, this is a bipartisan bill. All we are trying to do is ensure, if 80 years of settled law that has helped working families is about to be upset, then we better have proof it is going to help the people that it claims to help. The amendment from the gentleman from California would totally eviscerate that.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the previous question is ordered on the bill, as amended, and on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. GEORGE MILLER).

Pursuant to clause 1(c) of rule XIX, further consideration of H.R. 2374 is postponed.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess for a period of less than 15 minutes.

Accordingly (at 4 o'clock and 25 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1637

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. COLLINS of Georgia) at 4 o'clock and 37 minutes p.m.

RETAIL INVESTOR PROTECTION ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 1(c) of rule XIX, further consideration of H.R. 2374 will now resume.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. GEORGE MILLER).

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 9 of rule XX, this 15-minute vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California will be followed by 5-minute votes on a motion to recommit, if ordered, and passage of the bill, if ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 174, nays 243, not voting 13, as follows:

[Roll No. 565]

YEAS—174

Andrews  
Barber  
Bass  
Beatty  
Becerra  
Bera (CA)  
Bishop (GA)  
Bishop (NY)  
Blumenauer  
Bonamici  
Brady (PA)  
Braley (IA)  
Brown (FL)  
Brownlee (CA)  
Bustos  
Butterfield  
Capps  
Capuano  
Cárdenas  
Carson (IN)  
Cartwright  
Castor (FL)  
Castro (TX)  
Chu  
Ciilline  
Clarke  
Clay  
Cleaver  
Clyburn  
Cohen  
Connolly  
Conyers  
Courtney  
Crowley  
Cummings  
Davis (CA)  
Davis, Danny  
DeFazio  
DeGette  
DeLauro  
DelBene  
Deutch  
Dingell  
Doggett  
Doyle  
Duckworth  
Edwards  
Ellison  
Engel  
Enyart  
Eshoo  
Esty  
Farr  
Fattah  
Frankel (FL)  
Fudge  
Gabbard  
Garamendi  
Garcia  
Green, Al

Green, Gene  
Grijalva  
Gutiérrez  
Hahn  
Hanabusa  
Hastings (FL)  
Heck (WA)  
Higgins  
Hinojosa  
Holt  
Honda  
Horsford  
Hoyer  
Huffman  
Israel  
Jackson Lee  
Jeffries  
Johnson (GA)  
Johnson, E. B.  
Keating  
Kelly (IL)  
Kennedy  
Kildee  
Kirkpatrick  
Kuster  
Langevin  
Larsen (WA)  
Larsen (CT)  
Lee (CA)  
Levin  
Lewis  
Lipinski  
Lofgren  
Lowenthal  
Lowe  
Lujan Grisham (NM)  
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)  
Lynch  
Maloney, Carolyn  
Maloney, Sean  
Matsui  
McCollum  
McDermott  
McGovern  
McIntyre  
McNerney  
Meeks  
Meng  
Michaud  
Miller, George  
Moore  
Moran  
Nadler  
Napolitano  
Neal  
Negrete McLeod  
Nolan

NAYS—243

Amash  
Amodei  
Bachmann  
Bachus  
Barletta  
Barr  
Barrow (GA)  
Barton  
Benishek  
Bentivolio  
Bilirakis  
Bishop (UT)  
Black  
Blackburn  
Boustany  
Brady (TX)  
Bridenstine  
Brooks (AL)  
Brooks (IN)  
Broun (GA)  
Buchanan

Bucshon  
Burgess  
Calvert  
Camp  
Cantor  
Capito  
Carney  
Carter  
Cassidy  
Chabot  
Chaffetz  
Coble  
Coffman  
Cole  
Collins (GA)  
Collins (NY)  
Conaway  
Cook  
Costa  
Cotton  
Cramer

Forbes  
Fortenberry  
Foster  
Fox  
Franks (AZ)  
Frelinghuysen  
Gallego  
Gardner  
Garrett  
Gerlach  
Gibbs  
Gibson  
Gingrey (GA)  
Gohmert  
Goodlatte  
Gosar  
Gowdy  
Granger  
Graves (GA)  
Graves (MO)  
Griffin (AR)  
Griffith (VA)  
Grimm  
Guthrie  
Hall  
Hanna  
Harper  
Harris  
Hartzler  
Hastings (WA)  
Heck (NV)  
Hensarling  
Himes  
Holding  
Hudson  
Huelskamp  
Huizenga (MI)  
Hultgren  
Hunter  
Hurt  
Issa  
Jenkins  
Johnson (OH)  
Johnson, Sam  
Jones  
Jordan  
Joyce  
Kelly (PA)  
Kilmer  
Kind  
King (IA)  
King (NY)  
Kingston  
Kinzinger (IL)  
Kline  
Labrador  
LaMalfa  
Lamborn  
Lance  
Lankford  
Latham

Latta  
LoBiondo  
Loeb  
Long  
Lucas  
Luetkemeyer  
Lummis  
Maffei  
Marchant  
Marino  
Massie  
Matheson  
McCarthy (CA)  
McCaul  
McClintock  
McHenry  
McKeon  
McKinley  
McMorris  
Rodgers  
Meadows  
Meehan  
Messer  
Mica  
Miller (FL)  
Miller (MI)  
Miller, Gary  
Mullin  
Mulvaney  
Murphy (FL)  
Murphy (PA)  
Neugebauer  
Noem  
Nugent  
Nunes  
Nunnelee  
Olson  
Owens  
Palazzo  
Paulsen  
Pearce  
Perry  
Peters (MI)  
Peterson  
Petri  
Pittenger  
Pitts  
Poe (TX)  
Pompeo  
Posey  
Price (GA)  
Radel  
Reed  
Reichert  
Renacci  
Ribble  
Rice (SC)  
Rigell  
Roby  
Roe (TN)  
Rogers (AL)

NOT VOTING—13

Aderholt  
Campbell  
Cooper  
Diaz-Balart  
Grayson

Herrera Beutler  
Kaptur  
McCarthy (NY)  
Rogers (MI)  
Ros-Lehtinen

Rush  
Sanford  
Wasserman  
Schultz

□ 1706

Messrs. FRELINGHUYSEN, STIVERS, ROSKAM, RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois, REED, RIGELL, GARY G. MILLER of California, HUNTER, CAMP, and ROKITA changed their vote from "yea" to "nay."

Messrs. HORSFORD, LEVIN, Ms. MOORE, and Ms. JACKSON LEE changed their vote from "nay" to "yea."

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

MOTION TO RECOMMIT

Mr. TIERNEY. Mr. Speaker, I have a motion to recommit at the desk.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. TIERNEY. I am opposed to it in its current form.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. Tierney moves to recommit the bill H.R. 2374 to the Committee on Education and the Workforce and the Committee on Financial Services with instructions to report the same back to the House forthwith with the following amendment:

Add at the end the following new section:  
**SEC. 4. PROTECTING RETIREMENT SAVINGS FROM INVESTMENT FRAUD.**

Nothing in this Act shall limit the authority of the Secretary of Labor to issue regulations to—

(1) prevent fraud in regard to pensions, 401k plans, and other retirement savings accounts of seniors, veterans, and other American workers;

(2) require that financial service providers, when advising employers or employees about pensions, 401k plans, or other retirement savings accounts, clearly disclose any fees or other charges; or

(3) promote investment education and sound financial advice to employers and employees with regards to pensions, 401k plans, and other retirement savings accounts.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Massachusetts is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. TIERNEY. Mr. Speaker, this is the final amendment to the bill. It will not kill the bill. It will not send it back to committee. If adopted, the bill will immediately proceed to final passage, as amended.

Mr. Speaker, over 70 million Americans and their families depend on 401(k)s and similar retirement plans for their retirement security. Veterans, seniors, and middle class workers and families in my district in Massachusetts—in fact, in those districts of all of my colleagues—are concerned about their pensions, 401(k) plans, and retirement savings.

A retired worker from Danvers, Massachusetts, in my district, recently called my office and shared concerns about her pension. She believed it is at risk, and she has no other means of income.

That constituent of mine shares the same situation as do many across this country, believing that their retirement is at risk and that they have no other means of income. Millions of Americans are worried that they won't have adequate resources to retire with dignity after decades of work, and those who are retired, like that constituent from Danvers, feel that what they have won't last.

Retirement plans can also be subject to fraud and abuse. Last year, the Department of Labor recovered almost \$1.3 billion that was misappropriated from retirement plans. It included over \$800 million in prohibited transactions. The Department of Labor reportedly filed indictments against 117 persons for crimes related to employee benefit plans.

In 401(k) and similar plans, workers have to make investment decisions,

and to do so, they need access to reliable investment advice.

The motion to recommit is straightforward. It simply states that the bill does not prohibit action from being taken on the following three things:

It does not prohibit the Secretary of Labor from using regulations to prevent fraud in regard to pensions, 401(k) plans, and other retirement savings accounts for seniors, veterans, and other Americans;

It does not prohibit the Secretary of Labor from using regulations to require the disclosure of any fees so as to promote transparency and accountability;

It would promote investment education and sound financial advice.

Veterans, seniors, and the over 70 million investors who depend on 401(k)s and IRAs for their future security deserve to know that these kinds of responsible actions can be taken on their behalf. I think everyone here agrees.

I ask my colleagues for their support of this motion to recommit, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. HENSARLING. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the motion.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Texas is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. HENSARLING. Mr. Speaker, I rise again in opposition. I don't even find how this is relevant to the underlying bill, the Retail Investor Protection Act. It simply says that it shouldn't prohibit something that apparently the Secretary of Labor already has the right to do. And given that the Obama administration has had a Secretary of Labor for 5 years, I suppose, if they already wanted to do what was the subject of the gentleman's MTR, they would have already done it. I suppose the gentleman certainly has a right, if he hasn't already done it, to introduce legislation.

Again, Mr. Speaker, it is simply irrelevant. There are lots of things that the Retail Investor Protection Act does not prohibit.

□ 1715

It does not prohibit the Secretary of State from holding somebody accountable for the tragedy in Benghazi, when there were 29 systemic failures and four dead.

There is nothing in the underlying bill that prohibits the Secretary of the Treasury from holding somebody accountable at the Internal Revenue Service for targeting Americans for exercising their First Amendment rights.

There is nothing in the bill that prohibits the Secretary of HHS from holding somebody accountable for the ObamaCare Web site, which was 3½ years in the making for a half a billion dollars and still crashed.

There is nothing in the bill that prohibits the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development from holding somebody responsible at the Federal Housing Administration for receiving its first-ever taxpayer bailout and

being in violation of the law for almost 5 straight years for failing to adhere to its statutory minimum capital standards.

No, there are a lot of things that this bill doesn't prohibit, but let me tell you what the bill does, Mr. Speaker.

The Retail Investor Protection Act, sponsored by the gentlelady from Missouri (Mrs. WAGNER), requires the Department of Labor and the Securities and Exchange Commission to coordinate a rulemaking. I know that is a radical departure for many, but, yes, they should coordinate a rulemaking.

Then we actually require justification. If you are going to pass a rule that you claim is going to help retail investors, then actually help them.

On a more fundamental level—and it is why we should oppose the motion to recommit—the bill preserves that \$7 online trade for the working mom who is trying to send a child to college. It preserves the \$2,000 startup IRA for somebody who has worked 20 years at Walmart and is trying to have a retirement savings. It allows low-cost access to ideas and products to people who want to manage their own investments so they can finally buy their own homes.

Mr. Speaker, it does it all on a bipartisan basis because half of the Democrats on the Financial Services Committee supported this commonsense legislation. I would urge all of them now and the entirety of the House to vote down the motion to recommit and to vote in favor of retail investors and to vote "aye" on the Retail Investor Protection Act.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the previous question is ordered on the motion to recommit.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to recommit.

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

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. TIERNEY. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 195, noes 223, not voting 12, as follows:

[Roll No. 566]

AYES—195

Andrews	Capps	Costa
Barber	Capuano	Courtney
Barrow (GA)	Cardenas	Crowley
Bass	Carney	Cuellar
Beatty	Carson (IN)	Cummings
Becerra	Cartwright	Davis (CA)
Bera (CA)	Castor (FL)	Davis, Danny
Bishop (GA)	Castro (TX)	DeFazio
Bishop (NY)	Chu	DeGette
Blumenauer	Cicilline	Delaney
Bonamici	Clarke	DeLauro
Brady (PA)	Clay	DelBene
Braley (IA)	Cleaver	Deutch
Brown (FL)	Clyburn	Dingell
Brownley (CA)	Cohen	Doggett
Bustos	Connolly	Doyle
Butterfield	Conyers	Duckworth

Duncan (TN)	Lee (CA)	Quigley	Nugent	Rokita	Terry	Hultgren	Moore	Scalise
Edwards	Levin	Rahall	Nunes	Rooney	Thompson (PA)	Hunter	Mullin	Schneider
Ellison	Lewis	Rangel	Nunnelee	Ros-Lehtinen	Thornberry	Hurt	Mulvaney	Schock
Engel	Lipinski	Richmond	Olson	Roskam	Tiberi	Issa	Murphy (FL)	Schrader
Enyart	Loebsack	Roybal-Allard	Palazzo	Ross	Tipton	Jenkins	Murphy (PA)	Schweikert
Eshoo	Lofgren	Ruiz	Paulsen	Rothfus	Turner	Johnson (OH)	Neugebauer	Scott, Austin
Esty	Lowenthal	Ruppersberger	Pearce	Royce	Upton	Johnson, Sam	Noem	Sensenbrenner
Farr	Lowey	Perry	Perry	Runyan	Valadao	Jordan	Nugent	Sessions
Fattah	Lujan Grisham	Petri	Ryan (OH)	Ryan (WI)	Wagner	Joyce	Nunes	Sherman
Foster	(NM)	Pittenger	Sánchez, Linda	Salmon	Walberg	Kelly (PA)	Nunnelee	Shimkus
Frankel (FL)	Luján, Ben Ray	Pitts	T.	Scalise	Walden	Kilmer	Olson	Shuster
Fudge	(NM)	Poe (TX)	Sanchez, Loretta	Schock	Walorski	Kind	Owens	Simpson
Gabbard	Lynch	Pompeo	Sarbanes	Schweikert	Weber (TX)	King (IA)	Palazzo	Sinema
Galleo	Maffei	Price (GA)	Schakowsky	Scott, Austin	Webster (FL)	King (NY)	Paulsen	Smith (MO)
Garamendi	Maloney,	Radel	Schiff	Sensenbrenner	Westrup	Kingston	Pearce	Smith (NE)
Garcia	Carolyn	Reed	Schneider	Sessions	Westmoreland	Kinzinger (IL)	Perlmutter	Smith (NJ)
Green, Al	Maloney, Sean	Reichert	Schrader	Shimkus	Whitfield	Kline	Perry	Smith (TX)
Green, Gene	Matheson	Rush	Schwartz	Shuster	Williams	Labrador	Peters (CA)	Southerland
Grijalva	Matsui	Herrera Beutler	Scott (VA)	Simpson	Wilson (SC)	LaMalfa	Peters (MI)	Stewart
Gutiérrez	McCollum		Scott, David	Smith (MO)	Wittman	Lamborn	Peterson	Stivers
Hahn	McDermott		Serrano	Smith (NE)	Wolf	Lance	Petri	Stockman
Hanabusa	McGovern		Sewell (AL)	Smith (NJ)	Womack	Lankford	Pittenger	Stutzman
Hastings (FL)	McIntyre		Shea-Porter	Smith (TX)	Woodall	Larsen (WA)	Pitts	Terry
Heck (WA)	McNerney		Sherman	Southerland	Yoder	Latham	Poe (TX)	Thompson (PA)
Higgins	Meeks		Sinema	Stewart	Yoho	Latta	Pompeo	Thornberry
Himes	Meng		Sires	Stivers	Young (AK)	LoBiondo	Posey	Tiberi
Hinojosa	Michaud		Slaughter	Stockman	Young (IN)	Long	Price (GA)	Tipton
Holt	Miller, George		Smith (WA)	Stutzman		Lucas	Radel	Turner
Honda	Moore		Speier			Lucas	Reed	Upton
Horsford	Moran		Swalwell (CA)			Lucas	Reichert	Valadao
Hoyer	Murphy (FL)		Takano			Maffei	Renacci	Vela
Huffman	Nadler		Thompson (CA)			Marchant	Ribble	Wagner
Israel	Napolitano		Thompson (MS)			Marino	Rice (SC)	Walberg
Jackson Lee	Neal		Tierney			Massie	Rigell	Walden
Jeffries	Negrete McLeod		Titus			Matheson	Roby	Walorski
Johnson (GA)	Nolan		Tonko			McCarthy (CA)	Roe (TN)	Weber (TX)
Johnson, E. B.	O'Rourke		Tsongas			McCaul	Rogers (AL)	Webster (FL)
Jones	Owens		Vargas			McClintock	Rogers (KY)	Wenstrup
Kaptur	Pallone		Veasey			McHenry	Rogers (MI)	Westmoreland
Keating	Pascrell		Vela			McIntyre	Rohrabacher	Whitfield
Kelly (IL)	Pastor (AZ)		Velázquez			McKinley	Rokita	Williams
Kennedy	Payne		Visclosky			McMorris	Rooney	Wilson (SC)
Kildee	Perlmutter		Walz			Rodgers	Ros-Lehtinen	Wittman
Kilmer	Peters (CA)		Walters			Meadows	Roskam	Wolf
Kind	Peters (MI)		Watt			Meehan	Ross	Womack
Kirkpatrick	Peterson		Waxman			Messer	Rothfus	Woodall
Kuster	Pingree (ME)		Welch			Mica	Royce	Yoder
Langevin	Pocan		Wilson (FL)			Miller (FL)	Runyan	Yoho
Larsen (WA)	Polis		Yarmuth			Miller (MI)	Ryan (WI)	Young (AK)
Larson (CT)	Price (NC)					Miller, Gary	Salmon	Young (IN)

NOT VOTING—12

Jenkins Van Hollen  
 McCarty (NY) Wasserman  
 Pelosi Schultz  
 Rush  
 Sanford

□ 1726

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the bill.

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

RECORDED VOTE

Ms. WATERS. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered. The SPEAKER pro tempore. This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 254, noes 166, not voting 10, as follows:

[Roll No. 567]

AYES—254

Amash	DesJarlais	Hurt	Andrews	Enyart	Lujan Grisham
Amodei	Diaz-Balart	Issa	Barber	Eshoo	(NM)
Bachmann	Duffy	Johnson (OH)	Bass	Esty	Luján, Ben Ray
Bachus	Duncan (SC)	Johnson, Sam	Beatty	Farr	(NM)
Barletta	Ellmers	Jordan	Becerra	Fattah	Lynch
Barr	Farenthold	Joyce	Bera (CA)	Frankel (FL)	Maloney,
Barton	Fincher	Kelly (PA)	Bishop (GA)	Fudge	Carolyn
Benishek	Fitzpatrick	King (IA)	Bishop (NY)	Gabbard	Maloney, Sean
Bentivolio	Fleischmann	King (NY)	Blumenauer	Garamendi	Matsui
Bilirakis	Fleming	Kingston	Bonamici	Green, Al	McCollum
Bishop (UT)	Flores	Kinzinger (IL)	Brady (PA)	Green, Gene	McDermott
Black	Forbes	Kline	Braley (IA)	Grijalva	McGovern
Blackburn	Fortenberry	Labrador	Brown (FL)	Gutiérrez	McNerney
Boustany	Fox	LaMalfa	Brownley (CA)	Hahn	Meeks
Brady (TX)	Franks (AZ)	Lamborn	Bustos	Hanabusa	Meng
Bridenstine	Frelinghuysen	Lance	Butterfield	Hastings (FL)	Michaud
Brooks (AL)	Gardner	Lankford	Capps	Higgins	Miller, George
Brooks (IN)	Garrett	Latham	Capuano	Hinojosa	Moran
Broun (GA)	Gerlach	Latta	Cárdenas	Holt	Nadler
Buchanan	Gibbs	LoBiondo	Carson (IN)	Honda	Napolitano
Bucshon	Gibson	Long	Cartwright	Horsford	Neal
Burgess	Gingrey (GA)	Lucas	Castor (FL)	Hoyer	Negrete McLeod
Calvert	Gohmert	Luetkemeyer	Castro (TX)	Huffman	Nolan
Camp	Goodlatte	Lummis	Chu	Israel	O'Rourke
Cantor	Gosar	Marchant	Cicilline	Jackson Lee	Pascrell
Capito	Gowdy	Marino	Clarke	Jeffries	Pastor (AZ)
Carter	Granger	Massie	Clay	Johnson (GA)	Payne
Cassidy	Graves (GA)	McCarthy (CA)	Cleaver	Johnson, E. B.	Pelosi
Chabot	Graves (MO)	McCaul	Clyburn	Cohen	Pingree (ME)
Chaffetz	Griffin (AR)	McClintock	Cohen	Conyers	Kaptur
Coble	Griffith (VA)	McHenry	Courtney	Griffith (VA)	Keating
Coffman	Grimm	McKeon	Crowley	Grimm	Kelly (IL)
Cole	Guthrie	McKinley	Cummings	Guthrie	Kennedy
Collins (GA)	Hall	McMorris	Davis (CA)	Hall	Kildee
Collins (NY)	Hanna	Rodgers	Davis, Danny	Hanna	Kirkpatrick
Conaway	Harper	Meadows	DeFazio	Harper	Kuster
Cook	Harris	Meehan	DeGette	Harris	Richardson
Cotton	Hartzler	Messer	DeLauro	Hartzler	Ruiz
Cramer	Hastings (WA)	Mica	DelBene	Hastings (WA)	Ruppersberger
Crawford	Heck (NV)	Miller (FL)	Dingell	Heck (NV)	Levin
Crenshaw	Hensarling	Miller (MI)	Doggett	Heck (WA)	Ryan (OH)
Culberson	Holding	Miller, Gary	Doyle	Hensarling	Sánchez, Loretta
Daines	Hudson	Mullin	Duckworth	Himes	Sarbanes
Davis, Rodney	Huelskamp	Mulvaney	Edwards	Holding	Schakowsky
Denham	Huizenga (MI)	Murphy (PA)	Ellison	Hudson	Schiff
Dent	Hultgren	Neugebauer	Engel	Huelskamp	
DeSantis	Hunter	Noem		Huizenga (MI)	

NOES—223

NOES—166

Schwartz	Swalwell (CA)	Veasey
Scott (VA)	Takano	Velázquez
Scott, David	Thompson (CA)	Visclosky
Serrano	Thompson (MS)	Walz
Sewell (AL)	Tierney	Waters
Shea-Porter	Titus	Watt
Sires	Tonko	Waxman
Slaughter	Tsongas	Welch
Smith (WA)	Van Hollen	Wilson (FL)
Speier	Vargas	Yarmuth

## NOT VOTING—10

Aderholt	Herrera Beutler	Sanford
Campbell	McCarthy (NY)	Wasserman
Cooper	McKeon	Schultz
Grayson	Rush	

□ 1736

Messrs. PAYNE, ISRAEL, and BISHOP of Georgia changed their vote from “aye” to “no.”

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### RESIGNATION AS MEMBER OF COMMITTEE ON OVERSIGHT AND GOVERNMENT REFORM

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following resignation as a member of the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,  
October 29, 2013.

Hon. JOHN BOEHNER,  
Speaker, House of Representatives,  
Washington, DC.

DEAR SPEAKER BOEHNER: I write to inform you of my resignation from the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform. It was an honor to serve on this important committee and I remain committed to promoting a government that is transparent and accountable to the American people.

Sincerely,

MARK POCAN,  
Member of Congress.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the resignation is accepted. There was no objection.

#### ELECTING A MEMBER TO A CERTAIN STANDING COMMITTEE OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Mr. BECERRA. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Democratic Caucus, I offer a privileged resolution and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 393

*Resolved*, That the following named Member be and is hereby elected to the following standing committee of the House of Representatives:

(1) COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND THE WORKFORCE.—Mr. Pocan.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### DISAPPROVAL RESOLUTION RELATING TO DEBT LIMIT INCREASE

Mr. YOUNG of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 391 and

section 1002(e) of the Continuing Appropriations Act, 2014, I have a motion at the desk.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. Young of Indiana moves that the House proceed to consider House Joint Resolution 99.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to section 1002(e)(2)(B) of the Continuing Appropriations Act, 2014, the motion is not debatable.

The question is on the motion.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the title of the joint resolution.

The Clerk read the title of the joint resolution.

The text of the joint resolution is as follows:

H.J. RES. 99

*Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled*, That Congress disapproves of the President's exercise of authority to suspend the debt limit, as exercised pursuant to the certification under section 1002(b) of the Continuing Appropriations Act, 2014.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 391 and section 1002(e)(2)(C) of the Continuing Appropriations Act, 2014, the joint resolution is considered as read, and the previous question is considered as ordered on the joint resolution to its passage without intervening motion, except 1 hour of debate, equally divided and controlled by the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. YOUNG) as the proponent and the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. LEVIN) as the opponent.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Indiana.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. YOUNG of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and to include extraneous material on the subject of the joint resolution under consideration.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. YOUNG of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Some people may be wondering why we find ourselves here today. Some people may be confused as to why we are voting on a resolution to disapprove of the debt limit suspension 2 weeks after the fact. And some people may be asking why I introduced this resolution of disapproval on behalf of some people who voted “yes” and others who voted “no” to give the President the authority to suspend the debt limit.

The answers to these questions are much simpler than they might appear.

We are here today because the United States of America carries a debt load of over \$17 trillion and counting.

We are voting on this resolution today because this is the procedure that was put in place by the Senate when they crafted a package to end the government shutdown. Many of us voted for that Senate legislation largely because we didn't think it was responsible to risk defaulting on our national debt.

However, I introduced this resolution, and a majority of House Members will vote to disapprove, because it is also not responsible to ignore the problems created by our long-term debt.

Mr. Speaker, despite the fact that a large number in this body voted to avoid default, it would be a gross mischaracterization to say that we approve of a debt limit suspension absent adoption of bold policy reforms that will set our Nation on a sustainable fiscal trajectory.

We must break the habit of negotiating these fiscal deals at the last minute. We must stop kicking the can down the road, proverbially skipping along from crisis to crisis.

Simply put: enough is enough. Let's start talking across party lines about how to fix our debt problems now, not the end of a deadline.

We know that programs like Medicare and Social Security are on unsustainable footing. That is why a Democratic President and Republican House have both offered up reforms for these programs. So if we agree there is a problem, why must we wait until the next crisis to address it?

We know that our Tax Code is outdated and that it has become too larded up with narrowly tailored provisions that benefit only a small number of special interests. That is why our House Ways and Means chairman has met weekly with the Senate Finance chairman to discuss how best to achieve a fairer, flatter Tax Code in a bipartisan way.

If there is agreement here, then why are we looking to self-imposed fiscal deadlines in hopes of getting a deal? I could go on and on, but I think the point is clear: Washington missed an opportunity during our most recent fiscal showdown.

This resolution sends a message that ignoring our problems does not make them go away. It sends a message that we should not wait until the last minute, but should reach across the aisle to face these challenges now; and it sends a message that we take these issues very seriously because they bear directly on job creation, personal income levels, and our collective faith in America's enduring exceptionalism.

I urge my colleagues to support this resolution of disapproval.

I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Just a short time ago, a number of us joined many others in paying tribute to Speaker Tom Foley. There was a commemoration ceremony just 100 feet or so from here.

There was a lot of discussion, appropriately, of the need for bipartisanship.

There was much reference to the role that Tom Foley played in that in trying to reach across the aisle.

Bob Michel, the former leader on the Republican side, spoke so eloquently as to how there was a level of trust and how there was an effort at bipartisanship.

□ 1745

I think what has happened in this House is that the increased polarization has really twisted this institution and has even, to some extent, twisted the ability to have close relationships. I say this because I think this resolution is not within that spirit.

It was only the week before last that 87 House Republicans joined 198 House Democrats to pull this Nation back from the brink of a default that would have magnified the economic damage inflicted by the Republican shutdown of this government. That was a bipartisan effort with leadership support from both sides of the aisle.

And I can understand why those who voted “no” on October 16 might vote “yes” on this bill in order to be consistent. And while I disagree with the policy, at least their vote would be consistent. I think the vote would be consistently wrong, but it would be consistent.

What is hard to understand is how anybody who voted “yes” on October 16 to avoid a default would now vote “yes” on this bill that would bring about a default. So you talk about the message. Essentially, the message of this bill is once again we will utilize the threat of default. That is what this bill says. When you vote for it, that is precisely what you are saying. So you are saying that serious impairment of our Nation’s full faith and credit, which economists warned would plunge us back into recession, was a bad idea on Wednesday, 2 weeks ago, but doing so is a good idea on Wednesday, 2 weeks later, when we vote tomorrow. That is precisely what you are saying. That is your message. So the same person who voted one way then is soon going to vote the other way.

Let me just say why I think this is not within the spirit of an effort at bipartisanship that I referred to earlier and that I think is so important, and the lack of any effort at that has really twisted—I use that word—the strength of this institution.

Just a short time ago, a few weeks ago, as the Republicans took us to the brink of default, the minority leader on the Senate side said:

There is no education in the second kick of a mule, and we are not going to do this again in connection with the debt ceiling or with a government shutdown.

That is precisely what this legislation says—precisely. It says—forget about the second kick of a mule. What it says is that you would do it again in connection with the debt ceiling. So that is your message. And you would do that; you would take us to the brink of default that, earlier this month, the

Council of Economic Advisers estimated lost 120,000 jobs that would have been created in October and private forecasters estimated slowed fourth quarter GDP growth by between 0.2 and 0.6 percentage point.

So I think there is no escape from the inconsistency. There is no escape from essentially saying once again there is no real effort to reach across the aisle. There is no real effort to try to instill some belief that the two parties can work together. So that is a bad message, and I guess a lot of you think you can be inconsistent because it will never come up in the Senate. And it won’t. But that doesn’t take away the fact that there is an inconsistency here, I guess to try to cover some people’s votes, to somehow minimize their impact.

But when it comes to the default of the full faith and credit of this country, there has to be something more important than providing us cover. We need to provide cover for the citizens of this country so that they are not vulnerable to playing with the default and the full faith and credit of this country.

So you shouldn’t be bringing up this resolution. It will pass, I guess. There will be enough inconsistent votes, and it will go nowhere, but it sends the very, very wrong message.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. YOUNG of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I have so much respect for the long-standing service and distinguished tenure of my colleague on the other side of the aisle, and I just think that there is some clarification that is required in this body and for all who may be watching this evening’s proceedings, so let me begin by reminding those who would review the record.

I am not sure I invoked the words “Republican” or “Democrat” in my opening comments. If I did, it certainly wasn’t in a partisan nature. Instead, I extended a hand of friendship. I tried to actually increase trust and offered the hope that we might work together, we might actually work together to work on the very problems that caused me to run for office for the first time in 2010: the \$17 trillion national debt that I know has grown to a great degree during the service of the good gentleman on the other side of the aisle who just spoke; the unsustainable entitlement programs that, when push comes to shove and we can no longer find the resources to fund them because people haven’t made bold enough leadership decisions, those on the margins of society will be most adversely impacted.

I know these are issues that my good ranking member friend on the other side of the aisle cares about as much as I do. We have just not yet come together and found bipartisan solutions to these things.

Now, the continuing resolution vote that we passed, the package, if you will, the vote that we passed a few days

ago, accomplished a few things. We indicated that the President could suspend the debt ceiling, but that move could be checked by votes of disapproval in the House and the Senate. So this was a process that was put into motion by that earlier bipartisan vote that occurred right here in this body.

It is true that it has been made clear over in the other Chamber, the Senate, that the leader there will never bring this bill up in the Senate. That has been made eminently clear. The risk of default is something that ought not be mentioned. We needn’t spook the markets here. We will pay our bills in this country. That is something I have been proud to stand for ever since I have been in this body.

The continuing resolution package also indicated that, on February 8, the debt limit would be increased to reflect the borrowing that occurred during the debt limit suspension period, and then the Treasury would be given the ability to create additional headroom via so-called extraordinary measures after the debt limit was reinstated on February 8, 2014.

So that is the larger context here. It sounds to me very procedural, not particularly partisan. In fact, my hope was that this could be offered in the spirit of bipartisanship. This is a messaging bill.

There was an allusion during my good friend’s comments to a message being sent as if that is somehow a negative thing. Now, most of the bills that are introduced in this body are introduced in part, at least, to offer a message to the broader American people, and we stand here and argue on behalf of the message that we are trying to drive home.

The message that I am trying to drive home is that these debt problems have lingered on too long and that to increase a debt limit, to suspend a debt limit, is certainly not to approve further borrowing in the future absent the sort of bold changes that, frankly, have not been enacted when my good friend has served many years in Congress. So that is the larger message here, and that is how I would respond.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished freshman gentleman from Ohio (Mr. WENSTRUP), who has had a lot of life’s experiences.

Mr. WENSTRUP. Mr. Speaker, during World War II, man, woman, young, old, rich, poor, everyone in this Nation pulled together to bring our country through a difficult time. It was a bipartisan effort, for sure. After the war, we cut spending and we were a Nation that went to work.

But I ask my colleagues today, as we continue to increase our spending and run up our debt: What is the limit? At what point do you finally say it is dangerous, it is dangerous for the future of America? Is there a limit? We can’t keep going in this direction.

No one in this body wants America to default—that is not good for this country—but we need to be serious about

what we plan for the future of this country. People are always saying, "Do it for the kids; do it for the kids." We do a lot for kids, and we can always do more for kids, but what about when those kids today are grown up and they are stuck with all this debt? What are we doing to them?

The Temptations, in the 1970s, had a song that said:

Papa was a rolling stone. And when he died, all he left us was "a loan."

It was not a compliment. And if it was irresponsible in the 1970s, it is irresponsible today.

I spoke earlier about the Greatest Generation and the legacy they left. What is going to be our legacy? A legacy of nothing but debt?

Can you imagine the potential for opportunity in this country, for investment and for jobs, if we are serious and we are on a solvent course for the United States of America? And the sooner we go in that direction, the more we can do to help Americans that are in need.

It is about stability. It is about certainty for the United States of America.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 15 seconds.

The gentleman from Indiana mentioned about spooking the market—and Halloween is in a couple of days. Essentially, what this bill says is you would be willing to spook the market if you could. That is the wrong message.

I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. RANGEL), a veteran of these battles and a friend of Tom Foley's.

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

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, whoever hired the Republican consultants on keeping the majority should be able to get their money back.

I had a thought just a few weeks ago that a small group in this House had such an obsession with the Affordable Care Act and such a dislike for the President that they were prepared not only to close the government, but to attack the integrity of the full faith and credit of the United States. The scorn and ridicule that this caused this Congress, Democrats and Republicans alike, because of this strategy to repeal a bill that already had been signed into law and approved by the United States Supreme Court, you would think that no one would want to go anywhere near that again.

But still, we have a bill before us that admittedly has already been rejected by the Senate because we want to remind the American people how totally irresponsible we have been in the past in not only causing our great country to lose \$125 billion, not only the job loss, not only the pain and sacrifice that so many people have gone through because they weren't paid for the work that they were supposed to be doing, but to have the whole country call us irresponsible and to have people

who loaned us money be uncertain as to our ability to pay it back, and then we want to revisit this with a bill that is destined to go nowhere.

□ 1800

I am a partisan Democrat, but I am more of a patriot, and I hate to see the Republican Party do this to itself because I really think that our country needs another party, not just a Democratic party. I know that individuals don't care about the national Republican reputation, but what has happened here is that the irresponsibility, the ridicule, the insanity of these strategies has gone beyond the Republican Party in the House. It has now infested part of our party, and people are talking about the Presidency in terms of "bring on the clowns."

This is embarrassing to all of us as Americans, and especially as lawmakers. This body wasn't created for us to send messages; it was created for us to pass laws.

Mr. YOUNG of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. STUTZMAN), a hard-working colleague.

Mr. STUTZMAN. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank my friend from Indiana (Mr. YOUNG) for introducing this resolution.

This is about communicating with the American people. I am not quite sure what to say after the last speaker, who said he was a partisan Democrat, would not want to come together, both parties, to work together to find a problem to the \$17 trillion of debt that we have. That seems to be more of the problem in Washington today—the fact that parties don't want to work together to find a problem to the threat to our children and our grandchildren.

Mr. YOUNG mentioned earlier that that was the reason that he ran for office—because of the \$17 trillion of debt that at the time in 2010 was roughly closer to \$13 trillion and has only exceeded that since we have been elected to office.

We are Americans first—not partisans, Americans—who believe that we need to pass on a better future for our children and our grandchildren and for future generations here in America. That is what is wrong with Washington: too many partisans.

I believe we have got to find solutions that are going to balance the budget, like Americans do across the country every day, whether it is filling up gas at the gas station or whether it is the book dues for the kids at school, health care costs, the cost of utilities.

People are trying to make ends meet. Instead, Washington is only making it harder, through partisanship, on the American people. Both parties, Republican and Democrat, have driven Washington \$17 trillion in debt. For decades, Republicans and Democrats offered empty promises and cheap excuses, but our fiscal crisis cannot be ignored any more.

The national debt now exceeds our gross domestic product and saddles

every American with a \$53,000 share of Washington's red ink. The facts are very clear. Our current path is unsustainable. Although Medicare, Medicaid, and Social Security will grow dramatically over the next decade, recent budget debates between Congress and the White House have largely ignored these key drivers of the debt. So what is going to happen? Washington is going to continue to stumble from one crisis to the next. This is no way to run a country.

Madam Speaker, it is irresponsible to raise the debt ceiling without tackling the underlying spending problems of this crisis. Hoosiers don't expect Republicans and Democrats to agree on every proposal, but they do expect us to make the difficult choices to put us on a path of fiscal stability. Now is the time for both parties to break Washington's cycle of manufactured crises and pay down our debt.

I thank the gentleman for bringing this resolution to the floor of the House so we can discuss not only the spending problems, but what is the problem underlying the spending habits and the spending problems in Washington. Is it just ObamaCare, as the gentleman said previously? ObamaCare is part of the problem of our spending in Washington. Washington continues to look out for Washington interests and special interests rather than looking out for American interests.

Mr. YOUNG, thank you for bringing this important resolution. If there is anything that threatens our security, it is our national debt. The Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff in 2011, Admiral Mike Mullen, said that this is the greatest threat to our national security.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Ms. FOXX). The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. YOUNG of Indiana. Madam Speaker, I yield the gentleman an additional 1 minute.

Mr. STUTZMAN. I thank the gentleman.

As I mentioned, Admiral Mike Mullen, the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff in 2011, after the last debt ceiling discussion in July and August of 2011, said that the debt was the greatest threat to our national security.

Not only is it a threat to our ability to protect our country militarily, but it is an even greater threat to our country economically. Families are feeling the brunt day to day in the fact that salaries are not increasing, jobs are not being created. This is the fundamental crisis that our country is facing today, and we do need to talk about it, and we do need to share with one another here in Congress ideas and ways that we can tackle our debt problems.

Mr. YOUNG, thank you for this resolution. I proudly support it, and I am glad to work with anyone, Republican or Democrat, to tackle our debt problems.

Mr. LEVIN. Madam Speaker, it is now my pleasure to yield 3 minutes to

the gentleman from Illinois (DANNY K. DAVIS), a distinguished member of our committee.

Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois. Madam Speaker, I want to thank the ranking member for yielding.

I hope that we have learned from 3 weeks ago, and that we are not easing down the road to brinksmanship once again. Every American will pay another heavy price if some of our colleagues are able to again trigger another shutdown of the government.

I agree with President Obama that the full faith and credit of our country is not negotiable. If there are colleagues who are thinking about it, I would urge you not to do it. Don't create higher mortgage costs. Don't cause investors to lose on their retirement plans. Don't cause doctors and hospitals to wonder whether or not they are going to be paid for treating Medicare and Medicaid patients. Don't cause student loans to go up. Don't create anxiety for more than 10 million seniors who will be wondering whether or not they are going to get their Social Security checks. Don't create concern among veterans who will be wondering whether or not they are going to get their disability benefit checks.

Anybody that might be thinking about it, I would urge you not to do it. Don't attempt to hold the debt ceiling hostage. I would say, as it was said in the Book of Isaiah, Come and let us reason together, because if we don't, then the whole country will suffer. Come and let us find the way to work in a way that our problems can be dealt with. I believe that we can do it. It has been done before.

I thank the gentleman for yielding, and I end with: let's do it. Let's show the American people that we can work in a bipartisan way and solve the problems and meet the needs of the people of this country.

Mr. YOUNG of Indiana. Madam Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Kansas (Mr. HUELSKAMP), a distinguished colleague.

Mr. HUELSKAMP. Madam Speaker, I appreciate the efforts of my colleague from Indiana bringing this before the House for discussion.

The reality is, the staggering fact is that since the President's reelection through to the next debt limit vote, Washington will have added about \$1 trillion to our national debt—in exchange for what? For no spending reductions, in exchange for maintaining the status quo.

This is not, as Democrats would argue, about paying our bills; it is about mortgaging our Nation's future. Not only must we vote "yes" on this resolution to disapprove of this culture of debt, but it is also time to bring long overdue transparency to the process.

As we approached the so-called "default deadline," the White House press secretary told reporters that Secretary Lew did not say we risked default at midnight on October 17; only that we were likely to exhaust our borrowing

authority that day. The press corps, as you might recall, responded in disbelief that their doomsday default clocks may actually be wrong. Let's be clear: we were not going to default.

Why do I say that? Ask the Vice President, who disappeared for a couple of weeks. It was the Vice President who went to China in August of 2011 and told the Chinese we would never default. Moody's said we were not going to default. The markets showed little volatility. They knew we would not default. Default was just a scare tactic to scare the American people, and we as elected Representatives had no access to the actual data to determine how much borrowing authority the Secretary and the administration had left. We were simply left to take Jack Lew's word for it. In the future, I believe we must require a fuller accounting of how extraordinary measures are used, reported, and are remaining by any administration. In the words of Ronald Reagan, we should "trust, but verify."

Madam Speaker, earlier this year, the President sent us a budget that never balances. In fact, he has done that now for 5 years straight. That means under his plan, time and time and time and time again, we would only add to our national debt and never pay it off.

A vote today to disapprove this debt limit increase may have little impact on the previous \$17 trillion in debt or the next \$600 billion in debt that we approved as a body a few weeks ago, but it does say three things:

It is time to end our culture of debt;

It is time to end the Washington status quo;

It is time to end the crisis of out-of-control spending and massive debt.

I appreciate my colleague's leadership on this matter.

Mr. LEVIN. Madam Speaker, it is now my pleasure to yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. HONDA).

Mr. HONDA. Madam Speaker, I want to thank my colleague for yielding time to me.

I rise in opposition to this resolution, but I am strongly in favor of the process that we are using to deal with the debt limit. There is a difference.

If this resolution to force an unprecedented default passes both this House and the Senate, the President can decide to sign it or not. Even if he doesn't sign it, Congress will have another opportunity to stop a debt ceiling raise.

This is a process that the Senate Republican leader, MITCH MCCONNELL, first suggested in 2011 and has been used in debt limit bills to avoid defaulting since. It is good enough to use right now, it has been good enough to use for 2 years, and it is good enough to help us avoid these manufactured crises on a permanent basis.

This is a process that helps us separate the true need for congressional intervention on the debt limit from those that are manufactured and moti-

vated by politics. This is a process that works and helps us avoid unnecessary pain. We should never have a replay of the hostage-taking and brinksmanship that we recently went through to get to this point.

We know what we have to do, and we know we should not be playing games with the debt limit. That is why I offer a bill that would make this process permanent and keep this Nation fiscally solvent. Senators BOXER, SCHUMER, and HIRONO introduced this very same bill today in the Senate.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. LEVIN. I yield the gentleman an additional 30 seconds.

Mr. HONDA. I support this process, and I hope my colleagues will support my efforts to make it the permanent solution to the debt crisis.

I urge a "no" vote on the resolution, but I support this process that allows it.

□ 1815

Mr. YOUNG of Indiana. Madam Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. GRIFFIN), a distinguished member of the Ways and Means Committee and my friend and colleague.

Mr. GRIFFIN of Arkansas. Madam Speaker, I rise today in support of House Joint Resolution 99, offered by the gentleman from Indiana, my good friend and colleague on the House Ways and Means Committee.

And I want to be clear: this is not a resolution for default. This is an opportunity to talk about how we have got to, when raising the debt ceiling, deal with the underlying drivers of the debt.

History shows numerous instances in which spending cuts and reforms have been coupled with increases in the debt limit. This dates back to the inception of the debt ceiling limit in 1917. It also includes two instances during the 110th Congress when President Obama served in the Senate.

Further, in March 2006, then-Senator Obama voted against raising the debt limit. And we have heard some folks tonight talk about how they agree with President Obama. Well, let's listen to what he said in March 2006:

Increasing America's debt weakens us domestically and internationally. Leadership means that the buck stops here. Instead, Washington is shifting the burden of bad choices today onto the backs of our children and grandchildren. America has a debt problem and a failure of leadership. Americans deserve better.

Well, I also agreed with then-Senator, now President, Obama. And it is abundantly clear that no one is going to fail to raise the debt ceiling. No one is going to jeopardize our credit, but we must speak out on the failure to address the debt drivers.

In July 2008, then-Senator Obama said that adding \$4 trillion to the national debt over 8 years was "irresponsible" and "unpatriotic." I agree with what he said then.

Since he became President in 2009, President Obama has increased the

total Federal debt from \$10.6 trillion to over \$17 trillion. One has to wonder what then-Senator Obama would have to say about President Obama.

He has continually called for raising the debt ceiling during his Presidency without implementing any of the necessary reforms needed to get our Federal spending under control.

My focus has always been on working with anyone who is willing to find a real, long-term solution to Washington's spending addiction. This resolution shows the House is ready to start talking across party lines about how to fix our debt problems now, not at the next deadline.

Late last year, CNN reported that "the United States spends about 71 cents of every Federal tax dollar it collects on what is called the Big 4—Medicare, Medicaid, Social Security, and interest on the debt."

If nothing is done, in just 13 years the Big 4 could eat up every penny of tax revenue collected by the Federal Government, leaving nothing to pay for the discretionary spending that we like. That includes spending on defense, veterans benefits, education, roads, national parks, museums, medical research, food safety and air traffic control, to name a few.

CNN further said that "by 2040, more than half of all Federal tax revenue would be eaten up by interest payments on the debt alone."

In 2006, then-Senator Obama said those "interest payments are a significant tax on all Americans, a debt tax that Washington doesn't want to talk about."

But let's be clear: House Republicans in Congress, and the voters who put us here, are the only reason—the only reason—anyone in August of 2011 talked about the debt problem and reached a debt deal. Otherwise, the President would have simply had the debt ceiling raised, and there would have been nothing done structurally.

And we are the only reason why we talk about it now. Otherwise, it would be a clean debt ceiling increase with no strings attached.

I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting this important resolution and getting our excessive spending under control.

Mr. LEVIN. Madam Speaker, I yield myself the balance of our time, and I will speak very briefly because the message here is so clear, that those who vote for this bill are saying they are willing to use the threat of default once again, and we shouldn't be doing this.

I don't think the Nation believed that this government and its programs would be shut down; but it turned out, because of the way the Republicans handled it, this government was shut down, and programs were very much undercut that were needed by the people of this country.

We came within a flicker of default. The consequences of playing with that were very, very substantial.

So now, once again, the Republicans bring up a bill, and whatever the reason is, are giving people a chance, once again, to say that playing with default is a legitimate method of operation. You shouldn't do this.

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

Mr. YOUNG of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, in closing, I would just like to reiterate five key points:

One, our current national debt exceeds \$17 trillion, an amount that is greater than our annual GDP, the size of our economy.

Two, while I and so many others in my party agree with many of my colleagues across the aisle that risking default is irresponsible, it is just as irresponsible to ignore why our debt is so darn high and what it means for the future of our country.

Three, we can and must work across partisan lines to avoid default in conjunction with a debt ceiling vote or a default related to a continued failure to address the largest drivers of our debt; and we must begin that work now, not at the last minute, or the next self-imposed fiscal deadline.

Four, those who have served here for decades have known for decades that our population was growing older, that health care costs were rising, and that our long-term fiscal trajectory was unsustainable; but nothing has happened.

Five, this recognition that Washington continually misses opportunities to put our country on a path to fiscal health ought to be something on which we can all agree.

I urge all my colleagues who want to see our country address our long-term challenges before it is too late to vote "yes" on this resolution of disapproval.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. JOYCE). All time for debate has expired.

Pursuant to the statute, the previous question is ordered.

The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the joint resolution.

The joint resolution was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the joint resolution.

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

#### HONORING THE LIFE OF OAIL ANDREW "BUM" PHILLIPS

(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, in about 2 hours today, in Houston, at the Lakewood Church, we in Houston will honor the famed, the humble, and the especially loved Oail Andrew "Bum" Phillips, our favorite coach, Coach Bum Phillips of the Houston Oilers, our friend, my friend.

We lost Coach Phillips October 18, 2013, at his home, his ranch in Texas. I offer to his wife, his son and daughters and grandchildren and great-grandchildren my deepest sympathy.

But I know, as he is honored this evening, there will be a celebration of his life; for Bum Phillips was the kind of character-building leader that led young men into the most winningest franchise of the then-Houston Oilers. He did it because he had a championship spirit, and he had the ability to add quips to anything that you would ask him.

When asked one time about Earl Campbell, he said, "What kind of class is Earl Campbell in? He may not be in a class all by himself, but it doesn't take long to call the roll."

When asked about the Dallas Cowboys as America's team, Bum said, "The Dallas Cowboys may be America's team, but the Houston Oilers are Texas' team."

Tonight I know there will be many who will celebrate his life and the service he gave.

I want to thank Mike Barber for organizing this great effort. I will miss being there, but Bum, I want to thank you. Coach Bum Phillips, I want to thank you for the joy you brought to Houston, the excitement of the team, the spirit of winning and losing, the fairness and the balance that you added to those young men that were under your tutelage.

You went on to coach the New Orleans Saints, but you will always be special in our hearts, and I hope this body will offer a moment of silence for our dear friend, the Nation's friend, Texas' friend, Coach Bum Phillips.

I thank you, Mr. Speaker, for allowing this tribute on the floor to this great American, Coach Bum Phillips.

#### COMMEMORATING THE 1-YEAR ANNIVERSARY OF SUPERSTORM SANDY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2013, the gentleman from New York (Mr. TONKO) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Mr. TONKO. Mr. Speaker, on this evening of October 29, we commemorate the 1-year anniversary of Superstorm Sandy, which devastated the east coast. Many are still recovering from that tragic storm, and it certainly was a major force to be reckoned with.

That force of nature was, at one point, nearly 1,000 miles wide over the ocean front, and when it landed in southern Jersey, it was nearly 900

miles wide. It impacted so many States; 24 States, in number, felt the impact of that superstorm.

It was devastation to property; it was devastation to lives: 162 people in the United States lost their lives. And the fact that the storm surged to some record proportions reminds us of the impact of climate change.

□ 1830

Now as a member of the New York delegation in this House, my area received some mild impact from that superstorm. But ironically, the year before, Hurricanes Irene and Lee impacted the upstate region of New York and, again, devastated our area with loss of life, certainly of valuable farm land that was eroded, and damage to communities, businesses, and farms across the upstate region.

These are issues that are brought to mind this evening as we commemorate that 1-year anniversary, as many continue to struggle to recover from the ravages of Mother Nature.

The cost of climate inaction is severe. Climate change is an issue of science. It is certainly an issue of public health. And most definitely, it is an issue of economics, economic vitality.

Earlier, the Sustainable Energy and Environmental Coalition, which is a growing number—56, to be exact—of Democrats in the House looking to bring about significant policy reforms that speak to the environmental and energy needs of this Nation, began to provide a laser-sharp focus on the cost of climate change to our economy.

In 2011 and 2012, there were some 25 extreme weather events that caused at least \$1 billion each or more in damages. Total estimated economic damages were approaching \$200 billion, and the cost to taxpayers, some \$136 billion. The cost to individual taxpayers totaled \$1.61 billion. So we know that there is a tremendous impact here that has been realized by the lack of a focus on climate change and global warming.

As we continue to look at recovery—even from Irene and Lee in the upstate New York portion—as we look at the impact, the damage that came with Superstorm Sandy, as we look at the damage recently to Colorado, and if we look at the other extreme—not rainfall and flooding, but certainly drought and looking at the wildfires that have consumed some States in our country, there is definitely economic consequence that comes with climate change.

In my territory, in my area that is part of the 20th Congressional District, it becomes very apparent that we need to do more than just replace. If data compiled are telling us that extreme rainfall has been part of the last decade or two, then wise, effective government will not merely replace but reevaluate how to reconfigure, for instance, a bridge that may cross, traverse one of the creeks. I know that that is the case in many locations.

Looking at electric utilities, looking at what withstood the pressures of the

storm; combined heat and power systems that we will talk about during this hour that apparently withstood greater pressure than some of the traditional systems, so we go forward with not just merely replacement, but we go forward with a renewal, a revision of how to take that area that was affected and make it work again. That is sound government. That is effective government.

Tonight we are joined by several colleagues. We are joined by Representative RUSH HOLT from the State of New Jersey, and we are joined by Representative SCOTT PETERS from the State of California. We may be visited by other colleagues this evening. We are going to talk about impacts they have seen perhaps in their region and talk about the science and economics related to climate change.

I believe we, through SEEC, through the Sustainable Energy and Environmental Coalition, have brought about the discussion, have developed the dialogue, have encouraged moving forward, if you will, on this very important dynamic, understanding it full well so that we can move into prevention because the question asked here by a growing number of colleagues is, how long can we afford to go without a plan of action before we understand that the cost of replacement or renewal or transformation is going to drain the taxpayers, is going to drain the individuals and families impacted, the businesses impacted? No one wins in that scenario.

So, Representative RUSH HOLT, if you would like to share some thoughts this evening as we begin our hour, we welcome you.

Mr. HOLT. I thank my friend from New York (Mr. TONKO) for arranging this discussion.

It is well worth recognizing the anniversary of this devastating storm because it might be said this was a storm like we have never seen before. That may be true, but I don't think it is correct to say this is a storm such as we will never see again.

A year ago, Hurricane Sandy devastated New Jersey and much of the east coast. The storm may have faded from the headlines, but New Jerseyans haven't forgotten. It is felt in a very personal and painful way by thousands and thousands of New Jerseyans still today.

These New Jerseyans are not alone. I mean that in two senses. First, we can hear from some who are representative of the millions. But also, when we hear from the younger New Jerseyans who are affected, we understand that they represent the future that will be affected by climate change. Quite simply, superstorms like Sandy are the new normal, and we had better get used to it, even if climate change skeptics claim otherwise.

I think response to Sandy means, of course, tending to the human needs of those who have been victims of the storm, but it also means making sig-

nificant investments in power engineering and transportation engineering and rail engineering and wireless engineering and shoreline engineering and river flood control engineering and residential planning, and taking steps to deal with the root cause of what we see.

We may not be able to stop hurricanes in their tracks. In fact, we certainly can't. But we can make sure that our infrastructure and our environment and our communities are more resilient when they strike, and if we work hard as a Nation and as humanity, we may be able to stem the climate change that will result in more and more powerful superstorms.

I know some in Washington are skeptical of the role of the Federal Government in fighting climate change, but as Sandy's \$83 billion pricetag should make clear, society, our economy, yes, and our government will bear the costs of climate change one way or another. If we make the investments today, as the debts are coming due, we would do far better than to wait to pick up the pieces after other superstorms hit.

I will be happy, as we go along, to talk about some specific New Jerseyans who were affected. I will be happy to talk about some of the science that suggests where we are as a world. Mostly, I just want to make the point that this is the new normal that we should be prepared for.

Mr. TONKO. Thank you very much, Representative HOLT. Certainly your State, my home State suffered economic consequences to the nth degree. It is a stark reminder that the cost of inaction here is painfully borne by taxpayers into the future also.

So I am proud of the SEEC organization, the coalition raising the consciousness of the House as to the importance of this issue.

We are joined by Representative SCOTT PETERS from California. Representative PETERS has worked in the environmental arena and has contributed greatly in that regard. We are proud to have you join us this evening, Representative.

Mr. PETERS of California. Thank you very much, Mr. TONKO. I appreciate the chance to speak with you on this special occasion.

I am the climate task force chair of the House Sustainable Energy and Environmental Coalition, SEEC, and I rise to recognize the 1-year anniversary of Superstorm Sandy and to recognize those who have lost their lives as well as those continuing to rebuild from the destruction.

I might mention, for the benefit of Mr. HOLT, that I am a graduate of Westfield High. I spent my high school years in New Jersey. I still have sisters in Chatham and New Providence and nieces and nephews. I visited regularly Long Beach Island, Ship Bottom, and Beach Haven for family vacations. So I know well a lot of those areas and how

hard they have been hit both from a personal and an economic standpoint.

I want to speak a little bit too about San Diego, though, as it has been my home for 25 years. My constituents in San Diego have experienced and know the long rebuilding and recovery process after disaster strikes, and we have a little bit of a different effect from climate change and global warming.

October marks the 10-year anniversary—and I think the anniversary was a few days ago—of the beginning of the Cedar Fire, the largest wildfire in California history. As a San Diego City Council member at the time, I remember firsthand the destructive impact of this fire on people's lives. It destroyed hundreds of homes, personal belongings and memories, and the recovery costs were in the billions of dollars.

The Cedar Fire burned through 273,246 acres of San Diego County, destroyed 2,232 homes, and took 15 lives. It burned through 95 acres of the Cuyamaca State Park and blazed through 98 percent of its mature conifer trees. To date, little of the forest has grown back from the bare mineral soil left behind by the wildfire.

The community faced similar damage in 2007 during the Witch Creek Fire, and parts of the city of San Diego were also scarred at that time.

Wildfires aren't new to California, but the damages from these fires are rising. This will sound familiar when we think about the warmest years on record all being recent. In California, 12 of the 20 most damaging wildfires occurred in the last 10 years. This has huge implications for California's tourism and farming industries. For example, take the Rim Fire this summer that pushed into parts of the Yosemite National Park and devastated local tourism.

After the Cedar Fire, San Diego, the county and the city, are undoubtedly more prepared and ready to respond to a large wildfire. We have better communication equipment, better communication among agencies, and better fire equipment in general. More importantly, we have worked to minimize further damage through better planning. As Thom Porter, the chief of the San Diego Fire Authority said, "It's not about stopping a fire from occurring but preventing the amount of damage it causes."

Today San Diego has new planning guidelines and building codes and 100-foot brush clearance requirements around homes. Before 2003, it was just 30 feet. We found that we could decrease risk and save homes and lives.

Resiliency starts at the local level because they know the conditions and the situations on the ground. They are the people who can talk to the neighbors about what they have to do to be ready. We have to make our communities more resilient to wildfires, hurricanes, and other extreme weather.

In the last 5 years, wildfires have cost taxpayers more than \$1.6 billion a year. Last year, 9.2 million acres were

burned by wildfires, which is an area bigger than the States of Delaware, Rhode Island, and Connecticut combined.

In June, I introduced the bipartisan STRONG Act so the Federal Government could give tools for planning and resiliency to State and local actors. I think one of the first things we noticed as freshmen here, one of the first votes we were asked to take, was \$60 billion for Sandy relief, which was the appropriate vote to take. We have spent \$136 billion on relief in the last 2 years off the budget.

Every dollar we spend now on disaster preparedness and resiliency, we can avoid at least \$4 in future losses and FEMA expenses. We can bounce back faster with less economic damage. Each day that a community is disrupted by extreme weather, we lose economic output. So we need to be doing more to support our local communities with emergency management communication, public health, and energy reliability in the event of an extreme weather event, whether it is a wildfire or something like Superstorm Sandy.

Swiss Re, a major reinsurer, recently ranked the top 10 metro areas in North and Central America that face the highest value of working days lost from natural perils. Nine of them were in the United States.

On this occasion, I commit with my colleagues to better protect my district from the devastation caused by extreme weather by working to rebuild stronger and smarter with a mind for the future.

Again, thank you very much for inviting me. I would be happy to discuss some of these items.

□ 1845

Mr. TONKO. Thank you, Representative PETERS.

We are also joined by Representative DENNY HECK from Washington State, who is a freshman but has brought a very strong voice of advocacy for the environment to this Chamber. We are proud to have him join us this evening and raise again the dialogue that is so essential about climate change, global warming, and the economic impact that every region across this country is experiencing.

So, welcome, Representative HECK, and thank you for being such an outstanding advocate.

Mr. HECK of Washington. Thank you, sir. Thank you for the privilege to be able to add my voice to this also.

As a member of the House Sustainable Energy and Environment Coalition, I stand here today as well to recognize the 1-year anniversary of Superstorm Sandy and remember all those whose lives were lost and all those left behind who are in the process of continuing to rebuild their lives from that destruction—not just in the months ahead but, undoubtedly, in the years ahead. Our Nation must—it can, it will, and it should—stand with those

families and businesses as they undertake that task all along the Atlantic coast as they seek to recover.

I actually come from about as far away from that in the continental United States as possible. I am from Washington State, and so the district that I have the honor to represent was not directly affected by Superstorm Sandy. However, my district has begun to feel the very real effects of climate change.

Science has shown that climate change is driving an ongoing decrease in seawater pH. Scientists refer to that as "ocean acidification."

You might ask, How does that happen? Truthfully, with all due respect to my colleague from New Jersey, you don't have to be a "Jeopardy!" champion to get this. In fact, you only need be exposed to a junior high- or senior high-level biology or chemistry course.

It only stands to reason that as more and more carbon is emitted into the atmosphere, not all of it goes into the atmosphere, but, in fact, a goodly portion of it is absorbed by what covers approximately three-fourths of our little globe's surface, namely the ocean. And that carbon being absorbed into the ocean does, in fact, affect the pH level.

So ocean acidification, in turn, affects marine life in a lot of different ways; but the effect that I am the most familiar with is the damage that it causes to shellfish, including the shellfish grown at farms in my districts, specifically in Mason County. Indeed, I am proud to tell that you the largest shellfish farm in America, Taylor Shellfish Farms, is located, along with many others, in the 10th Congressional District of Washington State.

The acidity in the water—the direct result of carbon emitted into atmosphere absorbed by the ocean—makes it difficult for the shellfish to grow and harden their shells. Frankly, it decreases survival rates. It makes it harder to raise shellfish.

More than 3,200 people in our State—a lot of them in my district—are employed directly or indirectly in the shellfish industry and by growers. The estimated total economic contribution is well over a quarter-billion dollars. But that entire industry is threatened by ocean acidification resulting from climate change. It is totally threatened by this.

I have said here on this floor and elsewhere many times that a healthy economy is completely dependent and requires a healthy environment. The effect of climate change on Washington State's shellfish industry is but one of the clearest examples of that fact.

Washington State has a climate change adaptation strategy that we are working on with our regional neighbors—and, I might add, with some degree of progress. But without the involvement at the Federal level and with the Federal Government, our plan isn't going to be successful. The reason: this is a global problem that will require global action; and global action

is only going to occur if the United States leads, which it has so often in the past.

And so, sir, on this occasion, the 1-year anniversary of Superstorm Sandy, I also commit to better protecting the district I represent, our Nation, and the planet from the devastating effects of climate change. We have been waiting long enough. The science is in, and it is time to act.

Mr. TONKO. Thank you, Representative HECK.

We have also been joined by yet another freshman of the House, from the State of Pennsylvania, another strong friend of the environment and a person who has spent much of his career defending the environment. Representative MATT CARTWRIGHT joins us this evening.

Welcome. Thank you for participating with the SEEC coalition.

Mr. CARTWRIGHT. It is my pleasure, my dear friend and colleague from New York.

It is almost hard to believe, I would say, that we are noting the 1-year anniversary of the terrible storm we called Hurricane Sandy striking our Nation's shores. It seems like no more than 6 or 7 months ago that that all happened.

Maybe one of the reasons is that it was so horrific, so damaging, so devastating, that the harm continues. There are still families searching for a place to live. There are Americans still digging out from this problem, trying to salvage the situation for themselves and their families. And so it is almost hard to believe that it was a full year ago that this happened.

This is a country that suffered so much in loss because of Hurricane Sandy, with \$245 billion in business losses and \$50 billion in property damage.

I come from Pennsylvania. Pennsylvania, so far as it is from the seacoast, still had 1.2 million residents lose electricity during that event. In my own district, up in the hills of the 17th District of Pennsylvania, we still lost power for 53,000 residents.

Indeed, I am so sorry to say that we had several lives lost in my district due to Hurricane Sandy; people who perished because of falling tree limbs and because of hypothermia due to exposure. We had somebody we lost because of exposure to carbon monoxide because of generator fumes that were emitted during the blackout.

We had tens of thousands of homes and businesses damaged in my district because of Hurricane Sandy. So don't think we didn't notice it either and don't think we didn't pay attention to the suffering of all of the other Americans because of Hurricane Sandy.

There is no denying that there is climate change. There is just no denying it. We can argue all day about what is causing it and what to do about it, but there is no denying that it is happening and that it is resulting in more and more frequent weather events like this and more and more severe weather

events like this. There is no denying that these things are happening, and there is no denying the damage and harm that comes to our Nation as a result.

In 2011 and 2012, there were 25 severe weather events that caused a billion dollars or more in damage each; 25 of them were in a 2-year span. The total price tag for that was \$188 billion in property damage to our Nation. And the taxpayers had to pick up \$136 billion of those losses because that is what we do in emergency relief and in flood insurance and in crop insurance. These weather events cost taxpayers money.

We have something in the legislature called the GAO. The GAO used to stand for the General Accounting Office. In 2004, we changed the name to the General Accountability Office, better to reflect the mission of that office—accountability and the proper husbanding of the assets and resources of the Federal Government. And they keep track of these things.

Every year, they come up with something that they call the GAO High Risk Report. The GAO High Risk Report is a compilation of all the risks and assets and finances we have in this Nation as part of our government. It is a list of the things that threaten the assets of the Federal Government. For the first time, earlier this year, the GAO High Risk Report included climate change as a reason for risk to the American Government's assets.

This is not just about security. It is not just about infrastructure. It is not just about damage to agriculture. It is not just about risk to the health and well-being of all Americans. It is also about financial losses to the American Federal Government, because, after all, we are an insurance company.

We are a government that insures against flood. We are a government that insures against crop damage. We do that. That is something that we have thought about and something that makes sense for our Nation. But we end up in the position of an insurance company, and we end up paying the price tag when these storms happen. The GAO recognizes that and recognizes that climate change is a major driver in the risks to the American finances as a result of these programs that we do.

As a result of all of that, in a few months, I will be introducing a comprehensive climate adaptation bill. Because, again, we can argue until the cows come home about what causes climate change and what the effects of it are, but one thing that can't be denied and that the GAO doesn't even deny is that this costs American taxpayers money, and the best way to handle that is to plan for it. And so, with the support of the White House, I will be introducing a comprehensive climate adaptation bill later this year. It should be out in a few months.

And so, on this, the 1-year anniversary of the horrible tragedy that was

Hurricane Sandy, we remember the devastation and we remember the losses. We remember the loss of life. We remember the communities that are continuing to struggle with the damage that was caused by that storm. And I say it is time for us also to plan for the future to minimize these losses that will continue to happen as the planet climate continues to change.

Mr. TONKO. The Representative talks about the growing acknowledgment by agencies and various elements of government, and I can tell you also a personal experience of watching the constituents in our area understand more starkly and painfully the impact of global warming in the aftermath of Irene and Lee.

Representative PETERS has long promoted the awareness concept—wanting people to understand the awareness of global warming and climate change.

Your thoughts on that.

Mr. PETERS of California. Just to follow on.

I think what Mr. CARTWRIGHT said is exactly right. We don't know that our house is going to burn down, yet we buy fire insurance because we know that there is a risk of it.

I often hear in this building, unfortunately, a lot of professed doubts about climate change; but even though I disagree with it, I think the science is pretty clear. If you doubt it, that doesn't mean it is not going to happen and you don't prepare for it and you don't plan for it and you don't make the investments to be more resilient, which is what the STRONG Act is about.

So I completely agree. In the face of doubt, that doubt should not equal inaction. The fact that we have the strong evidence that this is happening, that we have had these off-budget expenses, is every reason in the world we need here to plan.

I would say to folks listening at home that they need to get in touch with people in this body to let them know that.

One thing I would just add briefly about what we did in San Diego. I was chair of a volunteer climate initiative which was part of the San Diego Foundation's effort to do civic engagement. What we tried to do was, through philanthropy, provide good support for decisionmaking locally around climate, because a lot of leadership, as you know, Mr. TONKO, is happening at the local level.

We provided research on science. We did a study of what the major climate effects in San Diego would be, which are more intense wildfires, water supply threats, and sea level rise—no surprise to anyone here. And we were able to give that information to our elected officials so that they knew what we had to plan with locally.

We also did a public opinion survey just to let them know what people thought. It turned out that people in San Diego wanted to be leaders on climate action. First of all, they wanted

to be leaders in the State. They also didn't want the jobs associated with the industrial opportunities to be going to China or Texas. So we were able to arm our elected officials with that information and made them a lot bolder about taking the actions that we needed to take.

I bet the people in this body would benefit from the same kind of information and wouldn't be surprised that America is behind us in taking action, particularly on getting ready and being resilient and being prepared to save money down the road.

□ 1900

No one likes spending \$134 billion off-budget. I certainly didn't, and I know my colleagues don't. There is no need to do that. We can be prepared.

Again, thank you very much for scheduling this at this hour.

Mr. TONKO. Thank you very much, Representative PETERS.

The gentleman makes mention of awareness and of the many visuals out there that strike awareness even a coast away.

Representative HOLT, I just noticed recently in the news the reopening of the boardwalk—of the very famous, traditional boardwalk in your home State—as you continue to recover from the damages of Superstorm Sandy. The awareness is an amazing piece of the action here, and something as visible and understandable as that boardwalk brings it home for many people far removed from New Jersey.

Mr. HOLT. Some of the repair has taken place, but the recovery takes a very long time.

Today, three New Jerseyans came to visit me.

One, Eric, from Jersey City, had been ready to open his bakery with his wife when Sandy hit. The bakery was flooded by 6 feet of water, and a lot of equipment was damaged. It delayed until fairly recently the opening of that bakery, and of course there was the loss of income to that family.

Norma, from Seaside Park, was displaced by severe flooding, nearly 4 feet. We can talk about the depth of the storm surge or about the record low barometric pressure or what the wind speed was, but we mustn't lose sight of the people who were affected here. Norma had space in her home that was flooded, and so she lost the rental income for that space. She is still cleaning up. Incidentally, she is a science supervisor at a local school, and is now talking personally about climate change and extreme weather.

April, from Jersey City, is a single mother of a child with asthma, who was uprooted because of the flooding from Sandy. She is now dealing with mold issues in her child's school as a result of the flooding, and she has gotten involved in helping low-income families recover from Sandy.

I want to make this point about who is hurt the most.

Researchers at Rutgers University in New Jersey looked at families who are

employed but who are struggling. These would be asset-limited people, people who are barely earning a living. This makes up, really, about a third of New Jerseyans. They have no cushion. Yet about a third of New Jerseyans incurred more than half of the residential damage—the cost—and are obtaining only slightly more than a quarter of the resources that are available for rebuilding. So low-income families, who tend to have less safe, less resilient housing, are the ones who suffer the most damage. Many who work hourly jobs are less able to deal with the loss of wages that occur from these disasters. Many of them were underinsured, and about 90 percent did not have flood insurance. So it is only a fraction of the people in New Jersey, but it is a very large fraction of the people, who suffered the really severe damage.

As bad as this is in America, the effects of climate change are even worse in developing countries around the world. Developing nations are more vulnerable to crop failure. Tropical diseases are very sensitive to climate change. Malaria and dengue fever and diarrheal disease are more prevalent now because of climate change, and developing nations are less able to afford the damage that results.

I got in some trouble earlier this year—I was challenged earlier this year—when I said we have got to deal with climate change or millions will die. In fact, I looked it up. The World Health Organization estimates that climate change is already causing 140,000 deaths per year—more than would have occurred without the climate change—primarily in developing countries. So it doesn't take very many years before, indeed, millions are dying. That is something of the human cost of what we are talking about.

Mr. TONKO. In every measurement that we make, there is a huge impact that climate change calculates to the negative. You talked about the impact worldwide. It is the sightings of a perfect storm, with less available land as it erodes with these floodings and with a growing population worldwide. That is the formation of a perfect storm.

But when we look closer to home, in these United States, you and I are part of the delegations that represent coastal States. The coastal erosion and the erosion of valuable farmland in my district are realities, and it is measurable already. The forewarnings are out there to take action to prevent further erosion. When you think of that impact, it comes in several dimensions, perhaps agricultural in nature as it is a major sector of our economy in this country, or in tourism. One of the bits of erosion that I saw—one of the impacts that came—was with tourism infrastructure, with very valuable historic sites that were nearly ruined and that are along the beds of creeks and rivers that are tourism destinations but that now are shut for business as they get repaired. Some of these ele-

ments are extremely delicate, and part of our fabric as a Nation is to be able to share our sense of history with either other people of the United States or with visitors who travel to this land, so there are impacts that come.

I would also talk about the infrastructure impacts on the energy side. We witnessed situations in which some fared better than others, and I was proud of our SEEC organization. Now, you and I are longtime charter members of SEEC, and I am proud of the fact that we called upon the Sandy Rebuilding Task Force to help communities rebuild stronger and smarter by having the task force issue guidance for combined heat and power, CHP systems. Those systems fared well in areas ravaged by these superstorms.

CHP, as many know, is an innovative sort of concept, an energy-efficient method for generating electricity and harnessing heat, the thermal energy that accompanies that. In CHP systems, heat that normally is wasted—allowed to escape—is captured and recovered as useful energy, and that allows us to require and to, perhaps, promote this integrated concept approach far more efficient than conventional power generation would be. Conventional methods have a typical combined efficiency of 45 percent, while CHP can operate as high as 80 percent. This technology is not only efficient; it also has demonstrated resiliency to extreme weather events. I can cite South Oaks Hospital on Long Island, which is a hospital facility that includes an acute psychiatric hospital, a nursing home and an assisted living center. During the storm and its aftermath, the hospital maintained full power through the use of its 1.3 megawatt CHP system.

Again, lessons, hopefully, will be learned. So, as we go to replace, we also have to transition some of our thinking and make certain that we are building systems that will be able to endure these storms into the future. Certainly amongst our priorities has got to be this all-out effort to combat global warming, climate change, to make certain that we do all of our preventative measures. Then when we rebuild, we do it in a way that is efficient so that sound government, smart government, is the tool that is reached to rather than awkwardly replacing in a sort of rush order to get us back into a working progressive outcome, but where we haven't addressed some of the dynamics of the ravages of weather, which is teaching us several lessons as we go through these many storms.

So you are absolutely right. The people are the most impacted here. We have to keep them front and center in our thinking, but all of these services that either provide jobs for people or provide economic opportunities, economic growth, or that meet their public safety needs or their energy needs or their household needs or their business needs have got to be brought into this calculus that is adjusting concepts

based on the theory of climate change, and where we, again, underscore the importance of prevention.

Mr. HOLT. Mr. Speaker, I want to make sure that all of our colleagues understand that when my friend from New York talks in detail about new energy systems that he is talking about human welfare, that he is talking about addressing the human cost that we were speaking of earlier. In other words, it is not just a matter of providing energy for people to power our economy and provide comfortable daily lives; it is also a matter of doing it in a way that avoids this enormous human cost from climate change. The way we produce and use energy is the greatest insult to our planet. It is changing our very climate, and we must address that. The sooner we address it, the more effective we will be at addressing it, and the more of these costs we can avoid.

It is unmistakable, unequivocal, that global warming has taken place and is taking place. Just in the past month, the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change came out with its fifth very carefully prepared report. It says that global temperatures are likely to rise from a third of a degree to 4½ degrees, roughly, Celsius, and that sea levels will rise. It is certain that the upper ocean has already warmed over the last three decades. It is certain that the upper ocean has already absorbed carbon dioxide, making it more acidic, as we heard from our friends earlier.

Most of the aspects of climate change will continue for centuries with the result in a cost in lives and dollars if the CO<sub>2</sub> emissions are not brought under control. In fact, some of these costs will be incurred now even if we bring CO<sub>2</sub> emissions under control because of the damage already done, but it is important to emphasize that it comes down to the human cost. That is what we mustn't forget in all of the charts and graphs and scientific discussions of the causes and effects of climate change.

Mr. TONKO. I think it is very important for us to recognize, too, that here this evening you and several of our colleagues and I have shared thoughts about painful consequences in our given regions, or we have talked about not only flooding but drought situations and wildfires. We have talked about the economic impact of climate change with these associated storms. We have talked about the recovery efforts. We have talked about Superstorm Sandy on this 1-year commemoration date, still finding its neighborhoods, its communities, its people, its businesses, its farming communities still struggling to recover. We have talked about all of this, and now I think we need to close, in the remaining minutes we have in this hour, and talk about a plan of action.

□ 1915

Now, SEEC, the Sustainable Energy and Environmental Coalition, has a

growing number of representatives—56 strong as we speak. Individuals are talking about the consciousness, raising the consciousness, talking about awareness out there in the community. But there is also a requirement for legislative action. Absent that, we move to an executive order, and some have expressed concern about that.

Leaving no other option available, the Chief Executive, the President, has moved to resolve some of these concerns through organizations and agencies like the Environmental Protection Agency. So I think there needs to be this dialogue here and in the United States Senate, working with the President, with the White House, and the administration to develop a sound package of legislation that allows us to go forward.

It is apparent after the number of stories heard here just this evening and the personal anecdotes that you shared, Representative HOLT, about people from New Jersey and the pain that they endured. That should motivate us to move forward with a plan of action, understanding that the cost of inaction is very, very heavy. Many have placed threshold dates out there. They are not that far into the future—2017, 2020 some say at the latest.

It is our stewardship that is called upon. We inherited this environment, this Earth, from ancestors who preceded us. Now it is our challenge, I believe, to hand that to next generations unborn in even better working order with the growth worldwide of population, with the industrialization of many Third World nations, the reach to automobiles being put on the highways around the world, the development of power supplies around the world, causing this huge growth of challenge in terms of carbon emission and eventually methane that will destroy antibodies out there.

So the challenge is before us. I think we need to go forward with a very focused effort of policy development that can be done in the very near future here in the House.

Avoiding that, walking away from it, denying it ought to be revisited by those who have suffered heavily from the damages of these storms. Certainly as we focus on Superstorm Sandy this evening, on that one storm here, it has brought to mind many, many situations where people are still suffering—blocks destroyed by fires in Superstorm Sandy that destroyed neighborhoods.

We have a challenge before us, Representative HOLT.

Mr. HOLT. The work of the Sustainable Energy and Environmental Coalition here in Congress is to see that we can move into the future in a sustainable way.

It is completely appropriate that we talk about both energy and environment in this same—really with the same breath. Because as I said, the way we produce and use energy is the greatest insult to our planet. But it is pos-

sible to produce and use energy that will power our economy and provide a good quality of life for 10 billion people in the world if we are smart and if we get to work now. We can do it in a way that doesn't ruin the world and condemn all of these billions of people to the kinds of superstorms, the kinds of effects of climate change and spreading diseases and so forth that will result if climate change runs amuck.

New Jerseyans need no further reminder that climate change is real. Evidently, some of our colleagues here do need that reminder. This year, one year after Hurricane Sandy, we are here to tell our friends, to tell our colleagues this is for real, this is serious, and we should get to work. The work of the Sustainable Energy and Environmental Coalition is dedicated to that work.

I thank my colleague, Mr. TONKO of New York, for his work to propel the SEEC coalition.

Mr. TONKO. Thank you, Representative HOLT.

I will close by just focusing in on this graphic, which showed the enormity, the immense breadth and depth of this Superstorm Sandy.

Many didn't relate that storm to a huge tide coming in. For any of us who have jumped into the ocean, we know the power of a tide. But to have the highest storm surge ever measured recorded at Kings Point, New York, the highest ever recorded at 14.38 feet, tells a story. The fact that the water level at Battery Park in Lower Manhattan reached 9.1 feet above the average high tide line. Think of it—1 inch, 2 inches, a foot of water additional that comes into a flood zone calculates that much more damage.

Here, what we had with the situation were records beyond 9 feet, approaching 10 feet, a storm surge of 14.38 feet. We are talking monumental damage. We are talking about a force that swept away lives, a force that sparked fires in neighborhoods, a force that wiped out businesses and found neighborhoods still vacant, a silence that has befallen these given communities because of the ravages of Mother Nature that can be prevented if we put our minds and hearts and efforts into that concept of being better stewards of the environment.

This is a place where a plan of action can take hold. In these Halls of government, leadership is called upon. A moral compass points in the direction of us being sounder friends of the environment and protectionists when it comes to getting things done so as to avoid the high scale of economic destruction that has gripped our communities.

I still see it in the aftermath of Irene and Lee in the 20th Congressional District of New York. Damage done in 2011 is still causing hardship in 2013, impacted by all sorts of weather events that are atypical of our region—tropic storms, hurricanes, tornados—that wiped through the area and required all

sorts of volunteerism to enter in, and certainly dollars that were shared from private sector sources and from FEMA at the Federal level and various other programs at the Federal Government. It will be an exhausting situation that will continue to drain the taxpayers as we move forward if we don't take action.

On this very solemn day of commemoration, as we call to mind all of the destruction that came into 24 States a year ago this evening, should be all the call to action that is required of us. Since then, it has been followed by devastation in Colorado, wildfires in the Southwest, and predictions that more and more damage will be part and parcel to a future that is allowed to go forward without the soundness of stewardship of the environment that ought to be a high priority in this House, in the United States Senate, and certainly across this Nation.

Sound leadership begins with the acknowledgement that there is a challenge out there and that the challenge is then met with accurate and detailed and information exchange that builds a dialogue that creates a package of response that indicates that we are a compassionate, caring, loving people in this Nation that through the Halls of this House can provide hope for this environment and hope to families who have suffered the consequences and hope to generations unborn as we pass to them a stronger sense of stewardship of this Earth.

It has been our pleasure in this hour to have shared many of our ideas, many of our concerns, many of the anecdotal bits that personalize a given situation for far too many, and we are thankful for the opportunity.

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

#### TRIBUTE TO OUR MILITARY VETERANS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. COLLINS of Georgia). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2013, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. WENSTRUP) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. WENSTRUP. Mr. Speaker, tonight we are here 2 weeks before Veterans Day to take some time to pay tribute to so many of our outstanding veterans and for the great things that they have done. Arthur Ashe, a world-class tennis player, a hero to many, was once asked about heroism. He said:

True heroism is remarkably sober, very undramatic. It is not the urge to surpass all others at whatever cost, but the urge to serve others at whatever cost.

This describes our veterans so well—serving others at whatever cost.

Tonight, we give credit where credit is due. In honor of Veterans Day, we willingly say thank you, thank you to the 1 percent. Only 1 percent of Americans have worn the uniform. Over that time, they have produced exceptional results on behalf of freedom time and time again.

Army Chaplain Father Tim Vakoc was hit by an IED in Mosul, Iraq, in May of 2004. He suffered severe head wounds from the explosion and from shrapnel. He came home, but over time he succumbed to these wounds. The troops often asked Father Vakoc, Why did you go out so often with us when you could have stayed back on the base where it was safer? But, no, you came out with us into the fight, into the combat. He was quoted as saying:

The safest place for me to be is in the center of God's will; and if that is in the line of fire, then that is where I will be.

As I served as a surgeon in Iraq, it was part of my job to talk to troops whose comrade just was being taken back to the operating room, to talk to them before and after surgery when they were wounded. There are things you never forget from that.

I will never forget going into a room full of marines to tell them about the condition of their buddy before we operated, and sitting in that room hunched over was a marine praying his rosary. I will never forget how I felt when I went back an hour later to have to tell them that he didn't make it. They fight for their country, but they die for each other.

Tonight, we are honored to have several Members here, Members that very served, to tell their stories, to tell their stories about a hero that they have served with, to let America know about these great people, and to pay respect to our veterans.

At this time, I yield to the gentleman from Arkansas, Lieutenant Colonel TIM GRIFFIN, who is a colonel in the United States Army Reserve JAG Corps. He served in Iraq in 2006. He had been assigned to the Southeast Medical Area Readiness Support Group as a command judge advocate. When he went to Iraq, he was assigned to the 101st Airborne Division.

Mr. GRIFFIN of Arkansas. I thank the gentleman, and I thank the gentleman for his service.

Mr. Speaker, I want to talk first here about a fellow Screaming Eagle, a fellow member of the 101st Airborne Division, who was wounded in action, Sergeant Carl Moore, III, from Bigelow, Arkansas, in the Second Congressional District, my district.

Sergeant Moore in early June of this year was wounded while on patrol in Afghanistan. A bullet struck him under his arm, puncturing one of his lungs and grazing his spine.

I pray for Carl's speedy recovery so he can get back to enjoying the things that he loves. My thoughts go out to his parents, Carl and Teresa of Conway, Arkansas, also in my district, and his wife, Heather, and their 4-year-old daughter, Addison.

□ 1930

This is just one example of the type of service that we should all be thankful for, and tonight I want to thank Sergeant Carl Moore for his service and for his sacrifice, and for his family's sacrifice.

When I think about all the vets who have impacted my life personally, it is a list that is too long to read, and they have impacted me in so many ways.

I often think of my grandfather who served in World War I in France in 1918. I never met my grandfather on my mother's side. He died in 1966, just 2 years before I was born, but he was in the Army. He processed through Camp Pike in Little Rock, Arkansas, where I did a lot of Reserve duty. I often thought of him when I was there. I went to basic at Fort Lee in Virginia, and come to find out, that is where he went. He went to Fort Lee before he went to France in 1918, and I thank him for his service.

I also want to mention one of our famous vets in closing, one of our most famous vets from the Second Congressional District of Arkansas, and that is Nick Bacon. We recently were able to name a post office after Nick Bacon. He is a Medal of Honor winner. He passed away recently. He was born in Caraway, Arkansas, in 1945. He enlisted in 1963 at age 17. The story goes that he was too young to enlist, so he just sort of fudged a little bit on the age. He was stationed in Germany for awhile, did a tour in Vietnam. He was wounded three times during his first tour in Vietnam when the helicopter he rode in collided with another, and all were killed but Bacon and one other. So he volunteered for a second tour in Vietnam because that wasn't enough. I want to read this little paragraph that talks about what happened that led to him being awarded the Medal of Honor.

On August 16, 1968, while leading a squad in Bravo Company's 1st Platoon, in an operation, Bacon and his unit came under fire from an enemy position. He personally destroyed the position with hand grenades, but the platoon leader was wounded on open ground. Bacon assumed command, led the platoon in destroying still more enemy emplacements. The 3rd Platoon lost its leader, and Bacon took command of that platoon as well and led both platoons against the remaining enemy positions. During the evacuation of the wounded, Bacon climbed the side of a nearby tank to gain vantage point and direct fire into enemy positions, despite being exposed to enemy fire himself. He was personally credited with killing at least four enemy soldiers and destroying an anti-tank gun. For his actions in this battle, Bacon received the Medal of Honor, formally presented to him by President Richard Nixon during a 1969 White House ceremony.

He earned multiple awards within the military for various accomplishments. In addition to the Medal of Honor, he was awarded the Distinguished Service Cross, Legion of Merit, Bronze Star Medal with two Valor devices, and two Purple Hearts.

Then he went back to Arkansas and years later served as the director of the Department of Veterans Affairs, and was reappointed by Governor Mike

Huckabee in that position, and he served until February 2005.

We lost Nick in 2010, but he is a shining example of the type of selfless service that veterans often give, demonstrate for their country, and I just want to say thank you to Nick Bacon and the many veterans that he represents, the thousands of veterans from Arkansas that he represents.

Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman from Ohio for putting this together. A lot of times we come down here and debate a lot of policy issues, but I think it is the right thing to do, to take this time tonight to honor our veterans.

Mr. WENSTRUP. I thank the gentleman from Arkansas.

At this time, I would like to recognize the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. YOUNG). Mr. YOUNG is a graduate of the U.S. Naval Academy. He was a rifle platoon commander as well as an intelligence officer, serving a decade in the military as a Marine Corps captain.

Mr. YOUNG of Indiana. I thank the gentleman from Ohio for his leadership in these early stages of his first tour in Congress. I know he is proud of his military background, and I know he is proud of our Nation's veterans. I am proud of my own service, and I am proud of our veterans as well, the veterans of Indiana's Ninth Congressional District, those veterans I served with.

And I would like to just highlight today one veteran who inspires me as I reflect upon his life, one veteran that I had the opportunity to get to know when I was at the United States Naval Academy. He is a fellow marine. And Veterans Day, you will recall, is a day of celebration. November 11 is a time we celebrate not only those living, but also those who have worn the uniform and died in the course of service.

So today, I would like to talk about my classmate, the class of 1995 at Annapolis, Doug Zembiec. Maybe some of you have heard of Doug. He is a man of quite a reputation. He was a two-time NCAA All-American wrestler at the Naval Academy. He was a leader. He had an amazing presence. Even among his fellow athletes who spent a lot of their hours preparing for the next match, the next game, he stood out. He worked especially hard, always went above and beyond. Because of his tireless work ethic, because of his infectious personality and a certain X factor about him, Doug just earned all sorts of friends. And he earned the respect of people in an atmosphere at a service academy where leaders and aspiring leaders are competing for the respect of their peers, and that really says something.

On May 31, 1995, Doug and I were commissioned as second lieutenants in the U.S. Marine Corps, at which point our careers took separate paths. After initial training at The Basic School in Quantico, Doug joined a Force Reconnaissance platoon. It was among the toughest of the United States Marines. We like to think we are all tough, but

we can certainly agree that Force Recon marines have earned the respect of their fellow marines and fellow Americans.

He was among the first to enter Kosova in 1999 with his first unit, and 5 years later, he found himself in command of Echo Company, 2nd Battalion, 1st Marines. During Operation Vigilant Resolve in 2004, Doug led his rifle company of 168 marines and sailors in the first ground assault into Fallujah. His remarkable leadership earned him a number of decorations. These things weren't important to Doug, but it is important that our country recognize our fearless leaders like him. We awarded him a Silver Star, a Bronze Star, two Purple Hearts for the wounds he suffered in the course of the Battle of Fallujah. His men were so impressed by the bravery and the principled leadership that Doug exhibited that they named him the "Lion of Fallujah." The Lion of Fallujah would serve four combat tours in Iraq.

In his final tour, on May 11, 2007, Doug was killed by small arms fire. He was always thinking of others first. Doug warned the Iraqi forces that he helped train to get down, but Doug himself did not make it.

A mutual friend of ours and fellow Naval Academy classmate, Eric Kapitulik, who was very close to Doug, he delivered a moving eulogy at Doug's funeral at the Naval Academy chapel. He read some words that were written by Doug himself in the closing of that eulogy, entitled, "Principles My Father Taught Me," and here they are:

Be a man of principle. Fight for what you believe in. Keep your word. Live with integrity. Be brave. Believe in something bigger than yourself. Serve your country. Teach. Mentor. Give something back to society. Lead from the front. Conquer your fears. Be a good friend. Be humble and be self-confident. Appreciate your friends and family. Be a leader and not a follower. Be valorous on the field of battle. And take responsibility for your actions. Never forget those that were killed, and never let rest those that killed them.

That is Doug Zembiec. May God continue to bless Doug Zembiec and his wife and beautiful child he left behind. May God continue to bless our Nation's veterans, and may God continue to bless this great Nation, the greatest Nation on Earth, America.

Mr. WENSTRUP. I thank the gentleman from Indiana, and thank you for sharing that story of heroism. So often we don't get to hear about our heroes today. They go unnoticed.

What you just spoke on reminds me of a gentleman named Mike Spann. Very few people know who Mike Spann is. Mike Spann was a marine, and he joined the CIA. After 9/11, 2001, he was the first American killed in Afghanistan. What is even more impressive about Mike Spann is what he wrote on his CIA application. He said:

I believe in the meaning of honesty and integrity. I am an action person who feels personally responsible for making changes in this world that are within my power, because if I don't, no one else will.

These are the type of people that we are here to honor tonight.

Next, it is my privilege to yield to the gentleman from Utah, CHRIS STEWART, an Air Force pilot for 14 years, flying both rescue helicopters and B-1 bombers. He holds three world speed records, including the world's record for the fastest nonstop flight around the world.

Mr. STEWART. Thank you, Mr. WENSTRUP, for organizing this Special Order honoring our country's heroes. It is a privilege for me to be with you tonight.

As you mentioned, I come from a family with deep roots in the military. I was a pilot for 14 years, and my father was a pilot in World War II. Four of my five brothers have served in the military. I have to tell you, my time flying in the military was, in many ways, the happiest years of my life. I remember I would be up flying, and I would think I can't believe that they pay me to do this. I would do this for free if I could.

In addition to my family members, three of my congressional staff are veterans. I know firsthand some of the sacrifices that come with service—the time away from family, the personal discomforts, the danger, being put in harm's way—for many of our soldiers, all to protect our Nation and to protect the freedoms of others.

There have been great sacrifices in the past. Some of those we have heard about tonight. I suspect that we will probably hear about some others.

I would like to mention one man from my hometown of Farmington, Utah. I think he is a great example of sacrifice and courage. His name is Lieutenant Colonel Jay Hess. He spent 5½ years as a prisoner of war at the Hanoi Hilton during the Vietnam war. During this time, you can imagine what he endured—starvation, beatings, isolation, and deprivations, which it is very difficult—probably impossible—for us to appreciate. After 2½ years, he was finally given a letter from his family. As he read this letter, he found himself smiling, and after awhile it hurt, because those smile muscles had not been exercised in 2½ years and he had lost that ability to smile. It was a joyous day when he was returned to his family, his wife and five children.

□ 1945

Despite all of this hardship, he looks back on his life and his experience with great humility and appreciation. He said, "How could I be so lucky? So fortunate? It is a good life." This man was a true American hero.

Heroism continues today. This fall I had the opportunity to honor four Army soldiers. Two of them, Sergeant Daryl Williams and Sergeant John Russell, were jogging here on the National Mall one morning when they heard a collision. They looked over and saw that a civilian had been hit by a bus. They didn't hesitate. They knew immediately what to do. They ran over, and using their shirts, they provided a tourniquet and they saved this

man's life. That may seem like a small thing, but it is a great example, once again, of the caliber of men and women that we find serving in our United States military. As Veterans Day approaches, I find myself humbled to share this background and experience with such people. I have always said that the military is the greatest incubator for leadership that there is anywhere in the world, and we see that demonstrated again and again.

Let me end with this. The United States of America is a special place. I recognize that most nations feel that way. Every one is proud of the land from which they come. I think God intended that they should feel that way. That is a good thing. Even though that is true, there is something special about this place. There is something truly unique about the United States, and there is no better example of that than the young men and young women that serve in our United States military. We don't fight to conquer people; we fight to keep a people free. We don't fight to capture a land; we fight to set a land free. The only thing we have ever asked is, as Colin Powell once said, the only land we have ever demanded is a tiny piece of pasture in which we could bury our soldier dead.

If you have ever been to a military cemetery—and they are spread all over the world, from France to England to the Netherlands to Panama to the Philippines to Japan—if you have walked among those stone-cold graves, then you know that this is sacred land.

A poet once wrote about these soldiers:

Here dead we lie, because we did not choose to live  
And shame that land from which we had sprung  
Life, to be sure, is nothing much to lose  
But young men think it is  
And we were all young

I, like millions of other Americans, will always be grateful for their sacrifice. I honor them, and once again I am grateful to be among them.

Mr. WENSTRUP. I thank the gentleman from Utah for his profound words and for sharing such a nice tribute.

Next, I yield to the gentleman from Nevada, Dr. JOE HECK. Dr. HECK is a colonel in the United States Army Reserve and commands the Medical Readiness Support Group. He was recently selected for general, and he continues to serve. Over time he has served us in Operation Joint Endeavor, Operation Noble Eagle, and Operation Iraqi Freedom.

I yield to the gentleman from Nevada.

Mr. HECK of Nevada. I would like to thank my brother in uniform, the gentleman from Ohio, for organizing this very important Special Order to pay tribute to some very special people, America's veterans, America's heroes.

I want to tell a story that I think epitomizes the very sacrifice and dedication that our men and women in uniform have to this Nation. The date was February 21, 2008. The place was Al

Asad, Anbar Province, Iraq. I was assigned as the chief of emergency services and aeromedical evacuation at a combat support hospital. A combat support hospital is similar to any inner city emergency department, with periods of hustle and bustle, kind of routine stuff, punctuated by moments of controlled chaos and sheer terror.

Such was that day on February 21. We were taking care of routine cases in the emergency services section when the radio crackled and we received a call from an incoming helicopter saying that they were bringing in a young Marine who had been shot in the chest. Of course we quickly focused on the task that would soon be at hand. As the chief, I was making assignments, making sure all our equipment was ready. We were ready to receive this casualty and make sure that we could return him home.

A couple of minutes later, the radio crackles again, and it is the helicopter calling in to tell us that the casualty was now unresponsive and that they have lost his pulse. A quiet fell over the resuscitation area. Everybody was singularly focused on what we were going to do for this young Marine when he arrived. The helicopter lands, we offload him, get him into the resuscitation suite, and we start doing what medical folks do, ripping off clothing, starting IVs, doing an assessment. It winds up that he received a single gunshot wound to the chest, just mere millimeters to the side of his trauma plate protecting his center of mass.

His eyes stared up at me lifeless as I was at the head of the bed. He was unresponsive. We quickly tried everything that we could to bring this young man back. We worked for over a half an hour doing things that in a civilian emergency department would be considered heroic, but we were going to do everything we possibly could. Alas, we were not successful. That young man was Lance Corporal Drew Weaver of St. Charles, Missouri, and he was 20 years old. He sacrificed and gave his last full measure of devotion to this country.

What happened next was even additionally awe-inspiring. My charge nurse, Lieutenant Colonel—now retired—Maria Tackett came into the room with a bucket of sudsy water and gingerly, carefully started to wash down Lance Corporal Weaver, wiping the dirt from his brow and his face, wiping off the now dried blood from his body. Just like a caring mother, she took care of this young 20-year-old Marine.

Just when I thought I couldn't see any other acts of compassion greater than that, two of my medics, young enlisted folks, came in with an American flag. I have no idea where they got it from. They might have taken it off the flagpole in front of the hospital. They carefully draped the flag over Lance Corporal Weaver, and then they both took up a position of parade rest at the foot of the bed. While we were waiting for Mortuary Affairs to come and re-

trieve Lance Corporal Weaver, they stood there and they stood there and they stood there.

I went in and said, "Guys, you need a break? Take a break. Sit down." Their response to me was, "Sir, never leave a fallen comrade." There they stood until Mortuary Affairs came to retrieve that young Marine.

Such is the story of those who sacrifice and of those who are dedicated to those who wear the uniform. I remember their names and I remember their faces to this day. I remember that day and the actions that those heroic men and women took, from Lance Corporal Weaver to the helicopter pilot to the medics in the back of that helicopter to my team and everything we tried to do. That is why we gather here tonight to pay tribute to these very special men and women.

May God bless our veterans, their families, their survivors, and may he continue to bless the greatest Nation on his Earth, the United States of America.

Mr. WENSTRUP. Thank you very much, Dr. HECK, Colonel Heck. Thank you for sharing that story. As a surgeon who served in Iraq, that was very moving to me and very familiar.

I think about how my experience in war has changed the national anthem for me. When I hear the "rockets red glare and bombs bursting in air," I think of those that we didn't save. When I think of "home of the brave, land of the free," I think of those that have saved us time and time again throughout our history.

At this time, I yield to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. BENTIVOLIO). He is retired as a sergeant first class in the Army National Guard. He had service in Iraq in 2007 and served in Vietnam as an infantry rifleman from '70 to '71.

I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. BENTIVOLIO. I thank the gentleman from Ohio and brother in arms for the opportunity to speak today.

Mr. Speaker, my grandfather served in World War I, and my father and uncle served in the 1940s. The gentleman who lived in the house across the street from where I grew up was a former sailor in World War II. His aircraft carrier was hit by a kamikaze.

Down the street a few houses, was someone who fought in the Korean war. His daughter, Cookie, gave me my first kiss. Near him lived another veteran who served on a destroyer in the Navy, and there were two men across the street from him who served together in General Patton's 3rd Army as part of the force that relieved the 101st Airborne at Bastogne. I can still see their faces. Their examples of service played a crucial role in why I served in the armed services.

Our next door neighbor was Charles Parker, Sr. As a Marine in World War II, he received the Purple Heart on Iwo Jima. His son, Charles, Jr., was my best friend. When I think of Chuck, I

still smile. He was the guy who stood up for the little guy. I remember one time when this big bully picked on this little kid and a fight started. Chuck rushed into action and broke up the fight. He defended the weak. Doing the right thing matters.

Charles Parker's name is inscribed on the Vietnam Wall memorial, panel 40 west, line 25. He died in service to his country on October 23, 1968. Doing the right thing matters.

I think my understanding of service can be best summed up in the message of the movie "Saving Private Ryan." Perhaps you have seen it. If you haven't, let me tell you what it is about. The movie begins with an elderly man walking through the cemetery off the beach at Normandy. His family is quietly following behind him. The scene then shifts to a landing craft heading for the beaches of Normandy on D-day. Tom Hanks plays the part of Captain Miller, 2nd Rangers. As the landing craft hits the beach, the soldiers quickly experience the horrors of battle.

Many of his comrades are killed and wounded in the scenes that follow. But after securing the beachhead, Captain Miller receives new orders. His new mission is to locate and bring home Private Ryan, played by Matt Damon, who is in the 101st Airborne. Ryan's three brothers were recently killed within weeks of each other, and the Army thinks that no family should lose four sons to war. With a small contingent of soldiers under his command, Captain Miller sets off to locate Ryan.

Over the course of a few days, Miller's group takes several losses. Eventually, they find him in a small village in France, but alas, he decides to stay and fight alongside his brothers in arms as they defend the small bridge in the village. During the battle, most of Miller's soldiers are killed. Only two remain. Captain Miller receives a mortal wound and sits gasping, his back against a motorcycle. He looks up at young Private Ryan and says with his last breaths, "Earn this. Earn this."

The scene changes to a close-up of Matt Damon. His face changes from young Ryan to the older man we met at the beginning of the movie. He is overlooking a gravestone that reads, "Captain Miller, 2nd Rangers." Old Ryan falls to his knees in front of the gravestone and says, "Not a day goes by that I don't remember what you all did for me. I tried to live my life the best that I could. I hope that was enough. I hope that, at least in your eyes, I have earned what all of you have done for me."

Let me tell you something. Not a day goes by that I don't remember what the fathers of my childhood friends and playmates did for us to protect the American Dream, and my good friend Charles Parker. No matter where your family hails from, no matter what your background is, as citizens of this great Nation, we must never let it be said that we have forgotten what our forefathers did for us.

To my fellow veterans of the 182nd Field Artillery of the Michigan Army National Guard, and to all the veterans past and present, thank you for your service. May God always bless America, and may we continue to be the home of the free because of the brave.

□ 2000

Mr. WENSTRUP. I thank the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. BENTIVOLIO) for his words.

I would like to take a moment to tell you about James McNaughton, Staff Sergeant James McNaughton, Army Reservist, an MP, New York City policeman.

We served on the same base in Iraq; and one day he and some other sergeants were being tasked with a mission that was going to be dangerous, and one of them had to go. James McNaughton volunteered over the other two. He did that because the other two had children.

On that mission, Staff Sergeant James McNaughton was killed by a sniper; and today there are two families that have their father because of James McNaughton. This is the type of selfless service that we see from our troops day in and day out.

I had the opportunity to tell that story on TV one time, national cable TV. A couple of days later I got a call from James McNaughton's father who said they were so shocked to hear their son's name and so honored that he was remembered in that way.

We need to honor and remember all of our veterans, especially those that have made the ultimate sacrifice on behalf of us.

At this time, I am pleased to yield to the gentleman from Illinois, Mr. RODNEY DAVIS. Mr. DAVIS is not a veteran, but he is a supporter of veterans, and he will be speaking on behalf of one of his staff members. Outside of his office he has a sign that says, I hire veterans.

I yield to you, Mr. DAVIS.

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Thank you to my colleague from the great State of Ohio.

I am humbled to be here as a non-veteran, somebody who has not served our country in our military, but is so proud of those of you who have. And I am just honored to be able to be a part of this Special Order that you have arranged.

Mr. Speaker, this is an opportunity that many in this country will take for granted as they are watching this tonight, and not know that it is because of the sacrifices of those like my colleague BRAD WENSTRUP, who have served their country so well, that give us the freedoms today to stand on this floor and debate the issues that will impact this country for generations to come.

I would like to stand here as somebody who hasn't served to thank all of my colleagues who have come to this floor to honor those who have, who have served with them, those who have served our country and have had the

opportunity to come home and, as we have heard tonight, those who have served our country and paid the ultimate sacrifice.

So I would like to personally thank my colleague, TIM GRIFFIN from Arkansas, for his service, not only as a member of our military, but as a Member of this Congress.

I would like to thank my colleague, TODD YOUNG from Indiana, for his service in the military, and also for his service in this body.

I would like to thank my colleague, JOE HECK, Dr. JOE HECK, for his service for our Nation, not only in our Nation's military, but also in this body.

I would like to thank CHRIS STEWART, my good friend and colleague from Utah, for his service for this country and our military and, again, for his service today as a Member of Congress.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank one who has yet to rise, Mr. DOUG COLLINS, for his service to our country as a member of our military, protecting our freedoms, and also for his service to the citizens of Georgia.

And, Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank you for your service in our Nation's military and for the service that you provide today for the great citizens in the great State of Michigan.

Thank you on behalf of those of us who have not had the opportunity to serve. I want to say thank you for giving us this great Nation that we now have the opportunity to serve in this body.

Mr. Speaker, I, again, am humbled to rise today to talk about our veterans and the sacrifices they have made to ensure the freedom of every single American, and I want to specifically mention a couple of folks.

One is a good friend of mine who served our country in Vietnam, who came back injured and served my State, my great State of Illinois as a Member of the Illinois General Assembly.

He still serves the citizens of Illinois today as somebody who is a pharmacist, works in the private sector; but my friend, Representative Ron Stephens from Greenville, Illinois, now spends his time, his spare time, raising money to help our wounded warriors. He walked miles upon miles over the last 2 years to raise thousands of dollars to help those who made it back home but paid a price.

Representative Ron Stephens, thank you for your service in Vietnam, thank you for your service to the great State of Illinois, and thank you, sir, my good friend, for serving this country for our heroes who walk the streets with us today.

And one of those heroes, as my colleague from Ohio mentioned, is someone who is not only a good friend of mine, but he works for me in my office in Champaign, Illinois. His name is Garrett Anderson.

Garrett was on patrol in Iraq, ran over an IED. Garrett sacrificed his right arm. He sacrificed time away

from his family, and he sacrificed the road to recovery for the freedoms that we enjoy and take for granted every day.

Garrett now works with the veterans who are trying to access the benefits that they were promised; and Garrett was out here with me a few weeks ago as we stood here and did an unprecedented, bipartisan Special Order that honored all 79 living Congressional Medal of Honor recipients.

We stood here with my colleague, TULSI GABBARD, who has also served her country and continues to serve her country today in this body. We stood there side by side, making sure that we honored every single recipient.

These are our heroes, and I was humbled to see men and women from both parties come here to honor those who have served our country and showed acts of heroism.

But since that time, Mr. Speaker, we had someone else awarded, given the Congressional Medal of Honor, and I would like to stand here today because he didn't have the opportunity to have his story told until now.

I would like to honor today the heroic efforts of the newest Medal of Honor recipient, Captain William D. Swenson of the United States Army. Captain Swenson would have made the 80th living Medal of Honor recipient. However, Sergeant Nicholas Oresko passed away on October 4, leaving the number of Medal of Honor recipients at 79 still.

My thoughts and prayers are with Sergeant Oresko's family and friends.

Captain Swenson, though, was awarded the Medal of Honor for extreme bravery at the risk of his life, above and beyond the call of duty in the Kunar province in Afghanistan on September 8, 2009.

Captain Swenson's combat team was ambushed as it moved into the village of Ganjgal for a meeting with village elders. The enemy began unleashing a barrage of fire onto the team. Captain Swenson immediately returned fire and directed his Afghan border police, while simultaneously calling in suppressive fire.

Surrounded on three sides by enemy forces, Captain Swenson coordinated air assets and medical evacuation helicopter support to allow for the evacuation of the wounded.

He ignored enemy radio transmissions demanding surrender and maneuvered uncovered to render medical aid to a wounded fellow soldier and moved him for air evacuation. With complete disregard for his own safety, Captain Swenson unhesitatingly led a team in an unarmored vehicle, exposing himself to enemy fire to recover the wounded.

Captain Swenson's team returned to the battlefield amidst enemy fire again to recover three fallen marines and one fallen Navy corpsman. His exceptional leadership and gallantry during 6 hours, 6 hours of continuous fighting, rallied his teammates and effectively disrupted the enemy's assault.

It is for his unwavering courage and heroism that I am proud to honor the actions today of Captain William D. Swenson.

And I would be remiss, Mr. Speaker, if I did not mention the role that one of our other colleagues and veterans and heroes who have served this great country in the military and who serve this country now in this body, my colleague, DUNCAN HUNTER, who played a role in making sure that Captain Swenson was awarded this great honor as the now 79th living recipient of the Congressional Medal of Honor.

Thank you, Mr. WENSTRUP, for what you have done for veterans tonight and what you continue to do every single day that you are here. May God bless you. May God bless all those who you have honored this evening, and may God continue to bless the United States of America.

Mr. WENSTRUP. I thank the gentleman from Illinois for that fine tribute.

I would like to share a story about Major John Pryor, John Pryor, MD, trauma surgeon from Philadelphia. He joined the Army Reserve in 2004; but on September 11, 2001, seeing that his Nation was under attack, he got in his car and he drove to Ground Zero, hitchhiked all the way in after he drove as far as he could. And after that, he took care of people.

After that, he started thinking that there is more that he could do for his country. He joined the Army Reserve. We served together in Iraq, became good friends; and after returning, we did a trauma conference together in Cincinnati.

John returned to Iraq in 2008; and on Christmas Day, after attending mass, he walked out and he was hit by a mortar and killed.

John was the type of person that did all for others. He left behind, unfortunately, a wife and three children.

Above his desk he had a quote by Albert Schweitzer that said:

Seek always to do something good, somewhere. Every man has to seek in his own way to realize his true worth. You must give some time to your fellow man. Even if it is a little thing, do something for those who need help, something for which you get no pay but the privilege of doing it. For remember, you don't live in a world all your own. Your brothers are here too.

It is now my privilege to yield to the gentleman from Georgia, Mr. DOUG COLLINS. He serves as the Air Force Reserve Chaplain with the 94th Airlift Wing.

Doug has ministered to members of our military as a chaplain in the Air Force Reserve since 2002. He served a combat tour, stationed at Balad Air Force Base in Iraq in 2008.

I yield to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. COLLINS).

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Thank you, I appreciate that.

Mr. Speaker, it is just an honor to be here tonight, for in 2 weeks, Americans across this great Nation will pause to remember, to honor, and to commemo-

rate the men and women who have served the cause of liberty while wearing the uniform.

Veterans Day origins come from the battlefields of Europe when, on the 11th hour of the 11th day of the 11th month, the guns of World War I fell silent.

Of all of our Nation's holidays, Veterans Day holds a special meaning for me and my family. This day affords a unique opportunity to reflect and to remember people I have served alongside in the uniform and out.

It also reminds me tonight of not only those that I served in uniform with, but I continue to serve with who are actually members of my staff. I serve with two, one who is with me tonight in the gallery, retired Master Sergeant Bill Kokley, and also Vernon Robinson, Major, United States Army, who serves in my D.C. office as well.

It is just a reminder of the continuity of those who serve and the areas in which they serve as we go forward each and every day in our daily walk.

As a chaplain serving at Balad Air Base in Iraq, I was privileged to know and to comfort those who bore the wounds of battle. I watched in awe at the absolute determination and phenomenal dedication of doctors, nurses and medical technicians as they fought back against death itself to save the lives of our military warriors.

And because of their skills, more than 98 percent of those arriving at Balad alive left Balad alive. That is an amazing statistic and a compliment to you, Congressman, and others like you, and seeing the others at night on the flight line, both Army and Air Force, Marine, Navy, and even Coast Guard, in the middle of the desert.

I also think of the young airman I met one night while he was on guard duty. He didn't come to the gate when I first drove up, and I sat there for a second in the truck, and then he didn't come out. And he finally came out and he came rumbling out of the back. He said, oh, Chap, I'm sorry I didn't see you sitting there. I didn't see you. I apologize.

I looked at him and I said, okay if it is just me, but if the colonel had come along, it might have been a different issue. What were you doing? I was going to try and help him.

And I was ready for some excuse, that he was tired or whatever, and he got out a little piece of paper and he had written down. And I said, what are you doing?

He said, well, I was figuring up my salary, because now I have got a little bit of money, and last year wasn't real good at home. Mom and Dad, Mom was sick and Dad got laid off, and he said, we didn't have a lot of Christmas.

□ 2015

He said, "But this year, I am making big money." He is an AIC. "Big money." He said, "I want to make sure that I will be able to send stuff home so

my brother and my sister can have Christmas.” That is what I met that night.

When I came home, I carried with me a reminder, because one day, I picked up the Stars and Stripes—you know, in a war zone, you pick up anything to read, and I would pick up the Stars and Stripes, pick up everything. One of those papers I happened to just be reading while I was eating, and I opened it up, and in the Stars and Stripes, they carry pictures of those who did not make it. They died in combat. I remember opening that page up, and I looked, and along the bottom, there were eight pictures. I remember distinctly four of them because I stood beside their bed and held their hand in Balad. I carry that picture and that flag.

As Congressman WENSTRUP has said, the National Anthem is no longer—if it ever was—just a song. It is a spirit that lives.

The Ninth District of Georgia has a great legacy of citizens who have proudly served in our Armed Forces. This spring, we lost one of our greatest, Colonel Benjamin Purcell, United States Army. Colonel Purcell was the highest-ranking Army officer held as a prisoner of war.

Colonel Purcell was commissioned a lieutenant through the Army Reserve Officers Training program at North Georgia College, my alma mater. He was stationed at Fort Benning, Georgia, and was subsequently sent to Europe. In August 1967, a year after I was born, he was stationed in Vietnam.

Colonel Purcell became a POW after his helicopter was shot down in Quang Tri City, Vietnam, in 1968. Most of his time as a POW was spent in solitary confinement. He was unable to be with other prisoners until shortly before he was released. On March 27, 1973, Colonel Purcell was freed, as the U.S. was finally pulling out of Vietnam.

During his military career, Purcell was awarded the Silver Star, the Legion of Merit, the Bronze Star, and the Purple Heart, along with the Parachutist and Combat Infantryman badges. Colonel Purcell was laid to rest with full military honors.

Colonel Purcell’s courageous story is just one of the many we remember on Veterans Day. He will always have the thanks and admiration of many Georgians.

On this Veterans Day, I will think about a young Marine from my hometown of Gainesville. In 2011, Corporal Sean Adams was on patrol in Afghanistan when he stepped on an improvised explosive device. The IED left him without legs, his left thumb, and his right pinky finger. He told me that when he went to Afghanistan, “I fought for myself, my family, my country, and the Corps, and now I’m fighting for my life.”

Sean is being medically retired from his beloved Marine Corps and is even now searching for the opportunity to continue to serve his community. He is

now fitted with prosthetic legs. His stated goal is to run the Marine Corps Marathon next year. Having seen this young man’s courage and strength, I am certain he will make it.

Later this week, I have the privilege of attending a retirement ceremony at Dobbins Air Force Reserve Base for Colonel Timothy E. Tarchick, who has honorably served our Nation for his entire adult life. I am humbled to call him a mentor and, most importantly, my friend.

These are just a few of the veterans who have touched my life. I often think back on the men and women of our Armed Forces with whom I have had the pleasure of serving our Nation, and I think of the conversations, the laughter, and also the tears that we have shared. It is often the very short or one-time interactions with a comrade in arms that leave the most indelible memories.

On my desk, if you were to come to my office, if you can find it on the fifth floor of Cannon, you will see on my desk a little bracelet that was made for me by a young lady in Balad who was struggling every day. I would go by and see her, and I would take her stuff, and I would give her encouragement or I would give her a coke or give her a candy. One night, I came by, and she said, “Chap, you are always giving me something. I want to give you something,” and she gave me this parachute bracelet which sits on my desk right now.

So I don’t care what goes on on the floor of this House in the big sense because all I have to do is remember that bracelet on my desk and remember why we are here and what that flag means.

This Veterans Day, let us commit ourselves to express our gratitude to America’s veterans by remembering their service and sacrifice and, of course, thanking each of the veterans in our own lives in our own way.

Before I yield back, I want it to be known the one who put this together, the gentleman who has become a valued part of my life in the time that we have served together.

Lieutenant Colonel BRAD WENSTRUP has served in the United States Army Reserve since 1998. In 2005 and 2006, he served a tour in Iraq as a combat surgeon and was awarded the Bronze Star and the Combat Action Badge for his service. During his time in Congress, BRAD is fulfilling his Reserve duties by treating patients at Walter Reed National Military Medical Center in Bethesda.

I commit to you, Mr. Speaker, he is serving every day on a place called Capitol Hill with the gifts that he has been entrusted to by his Creator. He is also a soon-to-be dad who will pass along this legacy of service to his child.

With that, I yield back to you, sir.

Mr. WENSTRUP. I thank the gentleman from Georgia, my dear friend, Chaplain DOUG COLLINS, for those kind words.

We are honored to serve here with so many that have served—not all of them are here tonight—on both sides of the aisle.

I think of my colleague from Illinois, TAMMY DUCKWORTH, who suffered severe injuries in Iraq, has bilateral leg prosthesis. She had the courage to serve again and to continue to serve not only in the Guard but here as a Congresswoman from Illinois. It is an honor to serve with her here on Capitol Hill.

Teddy Roosevelt said it so well when he said, “It is not the critic who counts; not the man who points out how the strong man stumbles, or where the doer of deeds could have done them better. The credit belongs to the man who is actually in the arena, whose face is marred by dust and sweat and blood.”

Our veterans serve. They fight in wars, wars they didn’t start, and those who serve in war are probably the greatest lovers of peace, the ones who appreciate it the most.

Our great American veterans, they may be best described in this way: they are what others care not to be. They go where others fear to go, and they do what others fail to do, and they ask nothing from those that gave nothing.

I want to thank everyone for being here tonight to honor those that felt that they should give of themselves for something greater than themselves.

You know, when I was a child, and we would go to bed at night, we would kiss my parents good night, and my father would come in one more time, and he would take his thumb, and he would make the sign of the cross on our forehead.

When you tuck your children in at night, when you go to bed and you close your eyes and you feel safe and secure and unafraid, remember why.

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

#### IMMIGRATION REFORM

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BENTIVOLIO). Under the Speaker’s announced policy of January 3, 2013, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. POLIS) for 30 minutes.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, tonight we will be talking about a very important accomplishment that this body, the House of Representatives, could make on a bipartisan basis for our country, and that is immigration reform.

By refusing to act on comprehensive immigration reform, there is great cost to the American people in jobs, the undermining of the rule of law, and destruction of the opportunities that will arise by tackling this head-on. The longer we delay passing comprehensive immigration reform, the greater the cost of inaction in both economic, human, and security terms. Every week that Congress is in session for the rest of the year, I will be here on the floor, talking about the cost of inaction on immigration reform.

There is a clear path forward. There is a comprehensive immigration reform bill, a compromise. It took a little give-and-take from both sides, a compromise supported by the business community and labor, by the faith community, by the law enforcement community, by farmers, and by farmworkers, that has passed the United States Senate with more than a two-thirds majority.

We have introduced a similar bill, H.R. 15, here in the House with a growing number of bipartisan cosponsors and are encouraging the Speaker and the majority leader to bring this bill to a vote, where we have confidence that it will pass.

Our economy will suffer tremendously if we fail to pass comprehensive immigration reform. According to the nonpartisan Congressional Budget Office, immigration reform helps grow the economy, creating between 500,000 and 1 million jobs, reduces the deficit by over \$200 billion, bolsters job creation, and strengthens the viability of Social Security and Medicare. What is not to like?

Let's restore the rule of law to our country. Let's improve our security, and let's unite families. In human terms, the cost of inaction is inflicting a heavy toll.

Over 135,000 deportations have taken place since the Senate passed immigration reform last June, including thousands of people who are noncriminals who would have benefited from immigration reform and, instead, became a cost to U.S. taxpayers to the tune of more than \$10,000 each to deport.

Take a few examples from my district of people that immigration reform will help today. Dianna and Kathia are two young women from Larimer County in my district. They are high school students who were brought here from Mexico as young children by their parents. They are excellent students, both straight-A students. They want to go to college. Kathia wants to go to medical school, and Dianna wants to study cinematography.

Both of these young women are applicants to the President's Deferred Action for Childhood Arrivals, or DACA program, and we hope that they receive their DACA permit soon, but that is only a temporary fix for a limited period of time. They are both ambitious, capable young women who want to give back to our country and make it stronger, if only we will let them.

It is time to find a way for Kathia and Dianna and the so many like them to pursue their dreams and contribute to our communities without having to live in constant fear because of lack of status.

Another woman in my district who feels the pain of our current broken immigration system is Norma. Norma came to the U.S. over a decade ago, like so many of our ancestors, including my great grandparents, in search of a better life. She is the mother and pri-

mary caretaker of twin boys who are U.S. citizens. Both of her children suffer from medical conditions, and she works incredibly hard to ensure that her kids have access to what they need. She is a hardworking, honest person, a leader in her community, doesn't have any criminal history or pose any kind of threat to national security. All she wants to do is to give back to our country, to pay taxes, and contribute like every other American.

Nevertheless, Norma was placed in deportation proceedings last year following a traffic stop. If we don't reform our broken immigration system today, how many more families will be torn apart?

People like Kathia, Dianna, and Norma feel the negative impact of this House of Representatives' failure to act on the Senate immigration reform bill every single day. There is no excuse for inaction. We need to finalize and pass immigration reform this year.

I will be talking more about the cost of inaction in a few moments, but I want to yield to my good friend and colleague from Florida (Mr. GARCIA), the sponsor of H.R. 15.

Mr. GARCIA. I thank the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. Speaker, I have the distinct privilege of representing a district that, in the last several decades, has in large part been built by immigrants.

I lived in south Florida during some very tough times for the immigrant community. I remember as a young man seeing bumper stickers on the backs of cars that said, "Would the last American please bring the flag." But you know what? The flag still flies high in Miami. It is a thriving, growing economy and a beacon of work and opportunity for millions. People from all over are drawn to my community because they believe in the American Dream.

My constituents know that immigrants only add to the American way of life. They make our country better. They create more opportunity for all. A vast majority of Americans recognize this.

Some polls show that 70 to 80 percent of Americans support comprehensive immigration reform, with a pathway to citizenship. Fixing our broken immigration system isn't something that we can tackle on a step-by-step basis, only addressing parts of the problem.

□ 2030

It is a bill that secures our borders, builds our economy, and provides a way forward for millions of undocumented individuals living in the United States.

With every day that passes, millions continue to live in the shadows and jobs continue slipping away overseas. This is an issue that is not simply about justice. It is about fairness. It is about ensuring, also, America's economic prosperity.

In Florida alone, legalizing all of the currently undocumented immigrants

would generate \$1.3 billion in additional tax revenues and create 97,000 new jobs. Fixing our broken immigration system will help small businesses expand, foster innovation, increase productivity, raise wages, and help create thousands of jobs.

The fight for comprehensive immigration reform is one that makes all Americans better, makes our country richer, and creates opportunity for all. In the history of the world, there has never been a great nation that was shedding citizens. In fact, great nations welcome opportunities.

The last few weeks have not cast a positive light on the House of Representatives, but this is an issue where we can repair that broken image. It is possible to find a bipartisan compromise that is the right thing for our Nation to do. The costs of inaction are simply too high.

More than enough Members of this Chamber understand the benefits of immigration, understand that it is a necessity for our country's prosperity, and understand that it is what we will do inevitably. Let's do it now. Let's do it right. Let's get it done.

Mr. POLIS. I thank the gentleman from Miami, a leader on the effort to reform our broken immigration system.

I want to talk about the overwhelming public support for immigration reform.

More than 70 percent of the American people support immigration reform, including majorities of Republicans, Independents, and Democrats. The American people know that what we are doing now isn't working, and by failing to act and only continuing to perpetuate the undermining of the rule of law, a population of over 10 million people that are here illegally and a system that is out of whack with reality, will only continue to hurt the American people.

With that, I am happy to yield to the gentleman from California (Mr. TAKANO).

Mr. TAKANO. I thank the gentleman from Colorado for yielding the time.

Reforming our immigration system is one of the top issues in our Nation. I was happy to see the Senate act this past June when it passed a comprehensive immigration bill with an overwhelming bipartisan vote.

The Senate bill solves many of the problems with our current immigration system. It creates a pathway to citizenship, secures our borders, addresses the current backlog, and helps the DREAMers, who were brought here through no fault of their own. Unfortunately, the push for immigration reform hit a brick wall when the legislation moved over to the House and Speaker BOEHNER flatly refused to bring it up for a vote.

Sadly, this is not the first time Speaker BOEHNER and his irresponsible faction of the House Republican caucus have stood in the way of what is best for the American people, even though

there is a clear governing majority that is ready to act. Despite Speaker BOEHNER's desperate attempt to follow the so-called rule which requires him only to allow votes supported by a majority of House Republicans, the governing majority has been able to pass several pieces of substantive legislation this year.

Just who is this governing majority? It is made up of nearly the entire Democratic Caucus and a handful of moderate, sensible Republicans.

In January of this year, a governing majority of 172 Democrats and 85 Republicans came together to avoid the fiscal cliff, saving our economy from ruin.

Several weeks later, when a majority of the Republican caucus stood opposed to relief for the victims of Superstorm Sandy, it took overwhelming support from Democrats and a small group of Republicans to help those in need.

Shortly thereafter, the House passed the Senate's version of the Violence Against Women Act, providing protections for victims of domestic violence, with unanimous Democratic support and a portion of the Republican caucus.

Then, in March, facing the deadline of a government shutdown, a temporary budget extension to keep the government funded until September 30 also needed the support of the Democrats to pass the House.

Finally, despite claims indicating that the votes weren't there to pass a clean CR, the House reopened the government and avoided default with the unanimous support of Democrats and a group of Republicans.

The reality is, to pass anything with substance, Speaker BOEHNER needs to stand up to the extreme faction of his party, stop blocking important legislation, and get out of the way and let the House of Representatives work its will. America needs Democrats and Republicans to come together. We have seen what can be accomplished when we are united.

And who are we kidding about the Hastert rule? The Speaker has already violated it multiple times this year.

In the lead-up to the most recent crisis, he said that he didn't want the government to shut down or default on its debts. If Speaker BOEHNER truly meant that, he would have turned to the governing majority and we would have avoided a 16-day shutdown that cost our country \$24 billion in economic activity.

The governing majority has done its job with the fiscal cliff, with aid to Superstorm Sandy, with the Violence Against Women Act, and the recent government shutdown and debt ceiling negotiations. We have escaped manufactured crisis after manufactured crisis. I know that the American people are eagerly waiting for the House of Representatives to pass meaningful legislation that addresses our challenges.

The governing majority is ready to do its job once again with comprehen-

sive immigration reform. As millions of Americans and aspiring Americans are waiting for this body to act, it is time to put aside the theatrical displays, Mr. Speaker. Let us govern so we can bring our brothers and sisters out of the shadows.

I believe that if the Senate's comprehensive immigration reform bill came to the floor of the House, the governing majority would once again do what is right for the American people and pass this important legislation. Let's vote on the Senate's bill and fix our broken immigration system. The time is now.

Mr. GARCIA. I thank the gentleman from California.

I take this opportunity to sort of point out that, as he talks about the governing majority, we are seeing a coalition already built around immigration reform. In a bill that was filed less than 3 weeks ago, we already have 187 cosponsors, which puts us in a very good place to pass it if it is allowed to come to the floor. That means that already 95 percent of Democrats have signed on to the bill. That means that a Democratic Senate already passed out a bill and that the President stands ready to sign a comprehensive immigration reform if it gets to his desk.

So our hope is that in the days to come, the 17 days left of working session before the end of the year, that we will find the will to bring something to the floor so that we can move this forward.

With that, I yield to the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. POLIS. I thank the gentleman from Miami.

I want to talk a little bit about supporting Colorado.

Colorado is a purple State. It is middle of the road, with four Republicans and three Democrats in our congressional delegation. It is a State that is affected by immigration. We have a strong tradition of immigration in our district, a strong exchange of economic ties with our neighboring countries.

Here are some recent polls in a few of our congressional districts in our State:

In the Third Congressional District, represented by my friend, Congressman SCOTT TIPTON, a recent poll showed that 77 percent of the people in the district—this is the district including Pueblo, Grand Junction, and Aspen—support immigration reform with a pathway to citizenship. Only 17 percent oppose it.

In the neighboring district of my good friend CORY GARDNER, the Fourth Congressional District of Colorado, 76 percent support immigration reform with a pathway to citizenship.

In the district of my friend and colleague MIKE COFFMAN of Aurora, Colorado, and Douglas County, 74 percent support immigration reform with a pathway to citizenship.

Failure to act and avoid this issue is, in fact, not delivering for the American people. One cannot speak out of both

sides of their mouth forever and say that in some abstract sense we are for immigration reform but not give this body the ability to pass immigration reform. The American people, Mr. Speaker, are smarter than that.

It has been 123 days since the Senate has passed an immigration reform bill. And you know what? We have H.R. 15 in the House. We want that to come to a vote. But there may be other immigration reform packages. I know there has been a bipartisan group that has been meeting for awhile. Recently, some of the Members have pulled out. If there are other ideas, let's put them on the table. But inaction for 123 days is inexcusable—inexcusable.

The time for action is not now. It wasn't just yesterday. It was last year. It was 5 years ago. It was 10 years ago. We can't afford to continue to wait day after day, week after week, year after year, without taking action. The American people, Mr. Speaker, have had enough and are demanding more.

There is something that we know for sure. The enforcement-only approach has failed. It hasn't worked. The number of people here illegally has only increased. We have increased the budget of the Border Patrol by 10 times, and the number of unauthorized people here illegally increased by 3 times during that same period.

So what does that mean? If we increase that budget 20 times, does that mean the number of people here illegally will quadruple? Maybe. But that is clearly not a solution; just look at the data.

And there is a human toll, Mr. Speaker. From 1998 to 2010, over 5,000 people died crossing the U.S.-Mexico border looking for a better life, just as my ancestors did, Mr. Speaker, and just as your ancestors did.

From 1998 to 2007, over 100,000 parents of U.S. citizen children were removed from this country. Yes, little Johnny, little Sara coming home from school, they are American. They were born here. They will vote some day. Coming home from school and, Sorry, Mom is in deportation proceedings. Your mom won't be here for you, little Johnny or little Sara. What did she do? A tail-light out on her car or 10 miles over the speed limit.

I got a speeding ticket last year, Mr. Speaker. I have a 2-year-old son, Mr. Speaker. To think something like that could force me to be ripped from my family—not for months, not for years—forever.

There is something called the lifetime bar, Mr. Speaker. Forever being taken away from my family, Mr. Speaker, I would risk crossing that border and dying—like 5,000 people did—to be with my son, Mr. Speaker. And that is an American trait. That is what a good American would do. That is what a good American parent would do, Mr. Speaker.

Let's let people give back to our country and provide for their families. That is an American value, and we can do that now.

My colleague, Mr. TAKANO, talked about a governing majority. There is a governing majority for passing H.R. 15, the Comprehensive Immigration Reform bill, now.

□ 2045

I can't tell you whether it is 25 Republicans or 45 Republicans or 80 Republicans, but they will join nearly every Democrat, if not every Democrat, in passing comprehensive immigration reform now.

I ask my colleague from Miami if he has ever seen this kind of coalition of business and labor and faith-based community and agriculture and farm workers—unlikely suspects—coming together around something that is such common sense. Have you seen this kind of unprecedented coalition of public support on any other issue, and what do you think it means for immigration reform?

Mr. GARCIA. I would like to thank the gentleman from Colorado, and I think he is absolutely right.

This is an unprecedented partnership with business, labor, the tech community all coming together around a basic thing—to help our country move forward. I think about all of the opportunities that we are missing and of all of the places that are doing better than we are in competition because we don't offer a pathway forward.

I would mention to the gentleman from Colorado that there are 130,000 Chinese students in the United States right now, that there are somewhere in the neighborhood of 90,000 Indians studying in the United States, that there are 70,000 South Koreans studying in the United States. Under the present immigration system, if your company thinks, "Hey, I can hire this guy, and it will be good for us," they just can't. He has got to go home. So we are sending them home to come back and compete with our workers when we could offer them a future here and when they could create a better future for other Americans.

This is something we have done always. We take people from all over the world, and we put them to work for America in the best interest of America. Yet, under our broken immigration system, you just can't do it.

Mr. POLIS. I represent a district with two fine universities—the University of Colorado at Boulder and Colorado State University. Both have excellent graduate programs—engineering, physics, environmental engineering, the biological sciences, you name it. Like many of our institutions of higher education, a high number of students there are foreign nationals who are studying under student visas.

Under our current immigration policy, Mr. Speaker, at our public State institutions, we provide this world-class education for people who fill a need in the economy—they are going to be great engineers; they are going to be great mathematicians; they are going to be great computer scientists. Guess

what? They graduate with a master's, and they graduate with a Ph.D., and what do we tell them? Oh. Go back to another country, and compete against us.

Compete against us. We are telling them to compete against us. How does that make sense, Mr. Speaker?

What we need to do is to provide a way—and the Senate bill and H.R. 15 do this—for people who graduate with advanced degrees in these fields to be able to stay here, keeping the jobs here, because guess what? Today's companies don't care where the jobs are. You can be a computer programmer in India. You can be a computer programmer in France. You can be a computer programmer here. Out of convenience, we would rather have you here, but the job is going to follow you. It is not the other way around.

In addition, if we act with H.R. 15, it will lead to over \$5 billion in additional tax revenues. It will reduce our deficit by over \$200 billion. It will create between three-quarters of a million and 900,000 jobs for Americans—jobs for Americans that are created under H.R. 15. It includes provisions around startups and entrepreneurs—people who want to come here to found companies and hire Americans. Don't we want that? Don't we want jobs for our brothers, our sisters, our friends, and our neighbors, jobs for Americans? H.R. 15 is the biggest jobs bill for Americans before the House of Representatives, and that is another reason we need to pass it.

Mr. GARCIA. I would also add to that the report that the Congressional Budget Office has released.

Here is what we know: in the next 10 years, if we move forward with comprehensive immigration reform, it will produce \$175 billion to the U.S. economy. Here is what we know even further: in the 10 years after that, it will produce \$870 billion to our economy. This is a net positive overall.

For my colleagues across the aisle who love to talk about the deficit, who love to talk about the fact that our country isn't bringing in revenue, here is revenue that is sitting there—people who are working, people who are ready to contribute to the American economy. They are there, and we know that, if we bring them out from the shadows and give them a pathway forward, they will make our Nation richer, and they will make our country better.

Mr. POLIS. So we can improve our security, and we can restore the rule of law, and we can create jobs for Americans, and we can reduce our deficit—all in one bill? What is not to like?

I yield to my colleague from probably the longest congressional district in the country. I don't know if it is the largest in area, but I think it is probably the longest in the country. I yield to my good friend from Texas.

Mr. GALLEG0. Thank you for yielding.

We were visited today by a group called Bibles, Badges and Business. One

of the Bible passages which was quoted to me today is in the Gospel according to St. Matthew, in which he talks about, I was hungry, and you gave me to eat. I was thirsty, and you gave me to drink. I was a stranger, and you took me in.

That is the genesis, I think, for a lot of people who want, from a Christian ethics' perspective, to support immigration reform.

You also have the people who support immigration reform, frankly, because of the idea that they are parents. Frankly, I think any parent understands that, once you hold that kid in your arms for the first time, I mean, you will do anything you have to do to make sure your little boy or your little girl eats.

Then there are the economic arguments that we have been talking about. For me, the economic arguments also are so important because the U.S. Chamber of Commerce, for example, has cited a study that shows that immigrant-owned businesses would generate more than \$775 billion in revenue with \$125 billion in payroll and \$100 billion in income. That is pretty impressive.

Do you know what percentage of the American workforce they could employ if they were unleashed? They could employ 1 out of every 10 workers, which is just a phenomenal statistic.

The other thought that I find really interesting is, of course, that immigrants are also consumers, and when they consume, they further drive the job growth. Now, many Members of Congress and, certainly, many people from Texas are familiar with George W. Bush.

Do you know there is now a George W. Bush Institute? Were you aware of that?

The George W. Bush Institute has, frankly, been a very strong proponent of immigration reform, and it has produced a 65-page document titled "Growth and Immigration" which states that immigrants serve as catalysts for growth. In fact, the report from the George W. Bush Institute says that communicating the positive economic contributions of immigrants is the first step in helping Americans recognize the hidden advantages of immigration. The institute is confident that bipartisan solutions exist and that, when properly informed, Americans agree more on this topic than they realize. That is pretty impressive coming from the George W. Bush Institute.

Further, the Congressional Budget Office shows that immigration reform wouldn't negatively impact U.S. workers and that it would reduce the Federal budget deficit by \$175 billion.

So I think it is important that we get the facts out and that we make a difference because comprehensive immigration reform is so important to everybody from across the border. I have never seen so many groups unified to pass comprehensive immigration reform.

Mr. POLIS. I thank the gentleman from Texas for his words.

This is 123 days. That is 123 days too long. Let's pass immigration reform now.

I yield back the balance of my time.

#### OBAMACARE ORIGINATION CLAUSE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2013, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. FRANKS) for 30 minutes.

Mr. FRANKS of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, in 2012, the Supreme Court narrowly and specifically upheld the individual mandate at the heart of ObamaCare under Congress' general taxing power. The Court specifically noted:

Even if the taxing power enables Congress to impose a tax on not obtaining health insurance, any tax must still comply with the other requirements in the Constitution.

Let me read that again, Mr. Speaker:

Even if the taxing power enables Congress to impose a tax on not obtaining health insurance, any tax must still comply with the other requirements in the Constitution.

In short, ObamaCare was upheld as a tax. The Supreme Court did not and has not yet considered a challenge to the Affordable Care Act's taxing provisions on the grounds that it violated the Origination Clause in the United States Constitution, and it most certainly did exactly that. The Origination Clause is found in article I, section VII of the Constitution, and it states:

All bills for raising revenue shall originate in the House of Representatives.

In creating ObamaCare, Senator HARRY REID took an entirely unrelated bill, H.R. 3590, containing just 714 words that did not raise taxes, and then stripped it of everything but its bill number. He then put the 400,000-word ObamaCare that raised taxes in 17 different places into its empty shell. Through this bit of legislative trickery, Mr. REID claims that ObamaCare originated in the House, when, in fact, every last provision of ObamaCare, including the largest tax increase in American history, all came from the Senate.

This sort of procedure absolutely ignores and vacates the Founders' intent, and it renders the Origination Clause of our Constitution completely meaningless. If it is allowed to stand, the Origination Clause in the Constitution is a dead letter.

Mr. Speaker, this is not a small or marginal issue. The principle behind the Origination Clause was the moral justification for our entire War of Independence. Its importance was expressed through the Virginia House of Burgesses, the Stamp Act Congress, and the First Continental Congress, all of whom petitioned the Crown and the Parliament in England for redress of their tax grievances. It was with these realities in mind that the Origination Clause of our Constitution was written, and without it at the core of the Great Compromise of 1787, the 13 original

States would have never agreed to ratify the Constitution.

When our Founding Fathers wrote the Constitution, they knew it was vital for the power to raise and levy taxes to originate in the people's House, whose Members are closest to the electorate with 2-year terms, rather than in the Senate, whose members sit unchallenged for 6-year terms and who do not proportionally represent the American population and who already enjoy their own unique and separate Senate powers intentionally divided by the Framers between the two Chambers.

If we as Members of the House of Representatives, who took a solemn oath to support and defend the Constitution, including its Origination Clause, fail to assert this right and responsibility as the immediate Representatives of the people and those most accountable to them, we dishonor the Founders' memory, and we fundamentally abrogate our sworn oath to support and defend the Constitution of the United States from all enemies, foreign and domestic.

This fall, the U.S. Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia Circuit will hear an appeal in the case of *Sissel v. HHS* as to whether ObamaCare violates the Origination Clause of the Constitution. I would urge my colleagues to sign on to H. Res. 153 and to join me in an amicus brief, along with currently 31 other Members of Congress, that I will be filing with the court. This brief expresses our collective conviction that the passage of ObamaCare was and is unconstitutional.

Mr. Speaker, ObamaCare was the largest tax increase in American history. The United States Supreme Court specifically and officially ruled it a tax. Consequently, under NANCY PELOSI and HARRY REID, the House and the Senate, in passing it in the manner that they did, categorically violated the Origination Clause, without which the U.S. Constitution never would have been born in the first place.

It is now the duty of the judiciary to strike down ObamaCare as a clear violation of the Origination Clause.

□ 2100

By following this amicus brief, we hope the judiciary will seize on the opportunity to support and defend the origination clause of the United States Constitution. If the judiciary does not strike down ObamaCare as an unconditional Senate-originated tax, Mr. Speaker, it would allow the Obama administration to blow yet another huge hole into the constitutional fabric of this noble Republic.

Mr. Speaker, Daniel Webster once said:

Hold on, my friends, to the Constitution and to the Republic for which it stands. Miracles do not cluster and what has happened once in 6,000 years, may never happen again. Hold on to the Constitution, for if the American Constitution should fall, there will be anarchy throughout the world.

#### U.S.-IRAN NUCLEAR NEGOTIATIONS ACT

Mr. FRANKS of Arizona. Now, Mr. Speaker, I would like to move to another subject.

Mr. Speaker, the greatest security threat in the world today is that of a nuclear-armed Iran. Now, Iran is once again the news of the moment. As talks between the United States and Iran have begun, American leaders given the charge to protect America's national security must not be charmed by wolves in sheep's clothing.

When innocent Syrian civilians were mercilessly attacked by chemical weapons, the Obama administration was caught on its heels in a foreign policy quandary. America was reminded again that the United States must always be vigilant and embrace an international relations framework which enables proactive engagement rather than merely reactionary, crisis response.

Mr. Speaker, I desperately hope that these discussions will proceed in the context of the grave reality the human family will face if nuclear weapons fall into the hands of jihadists in Iran.

To use the slightly altered words of our Secretary of State, Mr. Speaker: In a world of terrorists and extremists, we ignore these risks at our peril. We simply cannot afford to have nuclear weapons become the IED or car bomb of tomorrow. Neither our country, nor our conscience, can bear the costs of inaction.

Mr. Speaker, the U.S.-Iran Nuclear Negotiations Act is: an action that will reinforce the prohibition against illegal nuclear weapons development. We are talking about actions that will degrade Iran's capacity to use these weapons and ensure that they do not proliferate.

With this authorization, the President will simply have the power to make sure that the United States of America means what we say.

Now, Mr. Speaker, actually, the words I have just quoted are really just the essential words of Secretary Kerry's recent justification for wanting to attack Bashar al Assad's regime in Syria. However, I changed the quote a little bit, Mr. Speaker. Whenever he said "Syria," I inserted "Iran," and whenever he said "chemical weapons," I inserted "nuclear weapons," Mr. Speaker. If this line of reasoning of the administration chooses to stand behind this, then we simply cannot refute the parallel argument related to a nuclear Iran which poses an exponentially greater threat in terms of our security to the United States of America.

Secretary Kerry asserted that Mr. Obama "means what he says." But, Mr. Speaker, if the world truly believed that this President means what he says, the chemical weapons crisis in Syria would never have occurred in the first place.

Secretary Kerry said of the Syrian crisis that North Korea and Iran were closely watching our actions. However, Mr. Speaker, the converse is actually

far more accurate: Syria has been closely watching Mr. Obama's inaction toward North Korea and Iran since he became President; and, consequently, Assad felt he could use chemical weapons on innocent men, women, and children with impunity. Unfortunately, Mr. Speaker, the entire world now sees the U.S. under this President as all talk.

However, in this monumentally important issue of preventing Iran from gaining nuclear weapons, our critical diplomatic policies must be backed by our unmovable will to back them up by all means necessary.

The popular narrative of the Obama administration is to embrace Iran's openness and reward their willingness to negotiate, Mr. Speaker. But, Mr. Speaker, we know United Nations resolutions, IAEA declarations, and diplomatic efforts, including 10 rounds of negotiations toward this regime, have produced absolutely no fruit at all. Decades have passed without a single concession from this, the world's leading sponsor of terror.

In 2005, we saw North Korea, another rogue nation, petition for "talks" about ending their nuclear weapons program, and demanding U.S. concessions. How did they hold up that end of that bargain? They conducted three flagrant nuclear weapons tests. This, in spite of the fact that North Korea has been sanctioned, in terms of economic sanctions, into the virtual starvation of their people for now a half century.

Mr. Speaker, Iran is closer than ever before and racing toward a full nuclear weapons capability. The Iranian Government's intentions, actions, and capacity to develop nuclear weapons capability and sponsor international terrorism are terrifyingly clear. The time to regain our credibility with both our allies and foes alike in this region is now, before the situation devolves into a Syria-like situation, frantically searching for solutions after the crisis has already begun.

To that end, Mr. Speaker, I have introduced the U.S.-Iran Nuclear Negotiations Act, and I urge my colleagues to cosponsor this bill along with 25 other Members of Congress who are now signed on. The U.S.-Iran Nuclear Negotiations Act will strengthen the United States negotiating position in the upcoming talks with Iran, and it will outline vital congressional priorities on any nuclear negotiations with Iran.

Mr. Speaker, a bad deal with Iran which does not definitively prevent a weapons-capable Iran is worse than no deal at all. I am afraid that is exactly where this administration may take us.

Mr. Speaker, we must not let it happen.

Whatever the cost is to prevent a nuclear-armed Iran, it will pale in significance compared to the cost to our children and the entire human family of allowing the jihadist regime in Iran to gain nuclear weapons.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I have a thought I would like to repeat.

Mr. Speaker, in 2012, the Supreme Court of the United States narrowly, but specifically, upheld the individual mandate at the heart of ObamaCare under Congress' general taxing power. The court noted specifically that "even if the taxing power enables Congress to impose a tax on not obtaining health insurance, any tax must still comply with other requirements in the Constitution."

Mr. Speaker, I am going to read that one more time: "Even if the taxing power enables Congress to impose a tax on not obtaining health insurance, any tax must still comply with other requirements in the Constitution."

In short, Mr. Speaker, ObamaCare was upheld as a tax. The Supreme Court did not, and has not yet, considered a challenge to the Affordable Care Act's taxing provisions on the grounds that it violated the origination clause in the United States Constitution. Mr. Speaker, it most certainly did exactly that.

Mr. Speaker, the origination clause is found in article I, section 7 of the Constitution, and it states:

All bills for raising revenue shall originate in the House of Representatives.

In creating ObamaCare, Senator HARRY REID took an entirely unrelated bill, H.R. 3590, containing just 714 words that did not raise taxes, and then he stripped it of everything but its bill number. He then put the 400,000-word ObamaCare that raised taxes in 17 different places into this empty shell bill.

Through this bit of legislative trickery, Mr. Speaker, Mr. REID claims that ObamaCare originated in the House when, in fact, every last provision of ObamaCare, including the largest tax increase in American history, all came from the Senate.

Mr. Speaker, this sort of procedure absolutely ignores and vacates the Founders' intent, and it renders the origination clause of our Constitution completely meaningless. If it is allowed to stand, the origination clause in the Constitution is a dead letter, Mr. Speaker.

This is not a small or marginal issue. The principle behind the origination clause was the moral justification for our entire War of Independence. Its importance was expressed through the Virginia House of Burgesses, the Stamp Act Congress, and the First Continental Congress, all of which petitioned the Crown and Parliament in England for redress of their tax grievances.

It was with these realities in mind that the origination clause of our Constitution was written. Without it at the core of the great compromise of 1787, the 13 original States would never have agreed to ratify the Constitution of the United States.

It is not a small issue, Mr. Speaker. When our Founding Fathers wrote the Constitution, they knew it was vital

for the power to raise and levy taxes to originate in the people's House whose Members are closest to the electorate with 2-year terms, rather than the Senate whose Members sit unchallenged for 6-year terms and who do not proportionately represent the American population and who already enjoy their own unique and separate Senate powers intentionally divided by the Framers between the two Chambers.

If we, as Members of the House of Representatives, who took a solemn oath to support and defend the Constitution, including its origination clause, fail to assert this right and this responsibility as immediate representatives of the people and those most accountable to them, Mr. Speaker, we dishonor the Founders' memory and we fundamentally abrogate our sworn oath to support and defend the Constitution of the United States from all enemies foreign and domestic.

Mr. Speaker, this fall the U.S. Circuit Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia Circuit will hear an appeal in the case of *Sissel v. HHS* as to whether ObamaCare violates the origination clause of the Constitution.

I would urge my colleagues to sign on to H. Res. 153 and to join me in an amicus brief that I will be filing with the court along with currently 31 other Members of Congress. This brief expresses our collective conviction that the passage of ObamaCare was and is unconstitutional.

Mr. Speaker, ObamaCare was the largest tax increase in the history of the United States of America. The United States Supreme Court specifically and officially ruled it a tax. Consequently, under NANCY PELOSI and HARRY REID, the House and the Senate in passing it in the manner that they did categorically violated the origination clause without which the U.S. Constitution never would have been born in the first place.

Mr. Speaker, it is now the duty of the judiciary to strike down ObamaCare as a clear violation of the origination clause.

By filing this amicus brief, we hope the judiciary will seize on the opportunity to support and defend the origination clause of this our United States Constitution.

Mr. Speaker, if the judiciary does not strike down ObamaCare as an unconstitutional Senate-originated tax, it would, Mr. Speaker, allow the Obama administration to blow yet another huge hole in the constitutional fabric of this noble Republic.

Mr. Speaker, DANIEL WEBSTER said something that I think applies so profoundly here. He said:

Hold on, my friends, to the Constitution and to the Republic for which it stands. Miracles do not cluster and what has happened once in 6,000 years, may not happen again. Hold on to the Constitution, for if the American Constitution should fall, there will be anarchy throughout the world.

Mr. Speaker, we must defend this Constitution. We must as the House of

Representatives do our part to uphold those privileges and responsibilities we have been given by the Constitution, and I hope we do it, sir.

I yield back the balance of my time.

□ 2115

#### MORE PROBLEMS WITH AFFORDABLE CARE ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. 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, to follow on my dear friend Mr. FRANKS from Arizona's discussion about the so-called Affordable Care Act, I continue to hear from people who have lost their insurance, had insurance go up significant amounts, it is not affordable.

Now, I did hear from one of my constituents tonight that about 30 out of 147 people at his place of business actually were helped by the Affordable Care Act, and that is great. Eighty percent of Americans seem to have gotten no help or been greatly harmed by the Affordable Care Act. Their insurance has gone up dramatically. They didn't get to keep their insurance. They didn't get to keep their doctor. They didn't save \$2,500. Most Americans have been harmed by the Affordable Care Act.

It is just very hard for me to call it the Affordable Care Act, but in this body so often there have been bills which had for a title, such as the Affordable Care Act, had a name that was exactly opposite of what the bill actually was going to accomplish. The cap-and-trade bill, as it was called, certainly didn't help trade, but it sure did cap a lot of commerce that could have taken place and would not have been able to if that bill had been passed.

There are just all kinds of bills. Some people are pretty creative in the way that they put a name on. There is no law that says the title to a bill has to be truthful, and that is how you can end up with a bill calling it "affordable care" when the majority lose their insurance and don't get the care that they need or, for example, find out that in 3 to 5 years, when they need a new pacemaker, the new law will not allow them to get it. Those are problems.

What I have also found more and more of are senior citizens who are now beginning to figure out that when the AARP-endorsed ObamaCare—and I don't think it is disrespectful to the President to call the bill ObamaCare, just as the President and others called the bill that Governor Romney signed in Massachusetts RomneyCare. I don't consider it disrespectful to former Governor Romney to call it RomneyCare, and I don't think it is disrespectful to call the un-Affordable Care Act ObamaCare. So no disrespect to the President intended by referring to his signature bill.

But people have been hurt. People have been moved from full-time em-

ployment to part-time employment. They liked their insurance policy, but then they found out they didn't get to keep it. They have lost it. They found out their deductible shot up dramatically, and now they don't think that they can afford the thousands of dollars that will be required before their insurance policy kicks in.

We have seen news reports repeatedly about companies that have had to drop spouses from coverage or families from coverage or drop coverage altogether. We found out that there may be as many as 80 percent of those who individually bought their insurance that will or have lost their insurance. And so when I see a number projected like 14 million Americans will lose their insurance, my understanding is that most of these projections about the millions that are losing their insurance are actually talking about millions of policies that are lost. So, for example, if it were my family when my children were growing up, then it would mean not just one policy was lost, but it would mean five people lost their insurance. So I think we will continue to see millions and millions losing their insurance rather than getting to keep it, which is a broken promise.

Now, there was an article written by Lisa Meyers, and it is referenced here in the blog of Ace of Spades, and I don't have the article itself here, but a great point is made that it is bad enough that we were told over and over: If you like your insurance, you can keep it. If you like your insurance, you can keep it. If you like your insurance, you can keep it. If you like your insurance, we will make sure you can keep it. You want to keep your insurance, you can keep it.

We were told those types of things over and over by the President himself and people speaking for the President as well. And the point is made that actually the law itself did not destroy as many insurance policies as have now been lost, but so many of the lost insurance policies have been forcibly lost by this administration by the law but also by the thousands of pages of regulations that have been written. And this article points out:

In other words the ACA, Affordable Care Act, did make it incredibly hard for insurers to continue plans for the millions of Americans who don't want comprehensive insurance. Financially, insurers almost certainly had to adjust them in such a way that they would lose the grandfathered status. This isn't "normal turnover in the insurance market," although there is plenty of that in the individual market. There is a reason why an exceptionally large number of Americans are getting cancellation notices this fall.

It points out that very often insurance companies will keep premiums down despite rising costs of insurance by raising deductibles or copayments, and that is precisely what Obama's regulations say makes a policy automatically ungrandfathered. So people were told, if you like your policy, you can keep it because we are going to grandfather them in. The President himself

used that term, "we are going to grandfather in these policies."

Then his Health and Human Services wrote the regulations in such a way that it forced insurance companies to have to change their policies, mandated some new coverage if it was going to comply with the law, but there were so many things that were written into the regulations that forced insurance companies to change their policies which meant they could not be grandfathered. So it was bad enough that people were promised, if you like your insurance, you can keep it, and then there were going to be some people who lost their insurance anyway, but then the regulations were written in such a way that it was going to force and has forced people to lose their insurance.

So the President's own Health and Human Services Department has created more lost policies by the way they have written the regulations. They could have been written in such a way so that the President would have been allowed to keep his promise. And all it would have taken from a strong leader who wanted to make sure that no Department made a liar out of him would have been to either pick up the phone or write a letter or have an email sent saying, Hey, don't make a liar out of me. Don't you write these regulations in such a way that it causes people to lose insurance policies when I promised them they won't lose their policies.

That could have happened, but it didn't happen. In fact, what the Health and Human Services Department did, by virtue of the Secretary who is in charge, they made sure that millions and millions and millions of Americans would lose their health insurance. So it makes that point, the Affordable Care Act as written and passed, would have protected the grandfathered plans for a longer period of time and with more freedom for adjustment, but the Obama administration filled out the Secretary's "shalls," and there are so many "shall this," "shall do that," "shall do this" in such a way as to make it that much harder, if not basically impossible to do.

The Obama administration's original June 2010 rules were actually even stricter and have, for example, made it impossible for an insurer company to change the firms it uses to manage and administer the plan, which needn't affect coverage and is a simple way to lower costs. But those ludicrous restrictions were eliminated, but enough rules remained that it is again near impossible to maintain a grandfathered health insurance policy.

Very tragic. Promises made were not kept.

And also, I had some folks tell me that, gee, it seems disrespectful for Republicans to say, to talk about President Obama without mentioning the word "President." It seems disrespectful. And so, Mr. Speaker, I certainly don't mean any ill will any time I have used the shorthand, and I try to use

“President Obama,” but I also hope that my friends, probably every one of the Democrats in this body and probably all of the Republicans in this body that have referred to anything that happened in the Bush administration or used the shorthand rendition “under Bush” without saying “President Bush,” that those people who want President Obama to always have “President” before “Obama” said that they will go ahead and apologize for ever referring to Bush without “President” in front of that.

But the reason that doesn't necessarily need to happen is I know most people didn't mean any ill will by that. Obviously, those who hung President Bush in effigy or said some of the most mean-spirited, nasty things about President Bush, it never crossed my mind that they might be racist, because I thought they just disliked the man. But we are hearing now from so many people that if you say something about the President, then you must be a racist. I just look so forward to the day when the dream of Martin Luther King, one of them, will be realized that people will be judged by the content of their character and not by the color of their skin.

I testified today before the Senate Subcommittee of the Judiciary about the Stand Your Ground Act, and actually that language comes from an 1895 Supreme Court case where the Supreme Court said an individual could stand his ground, so that is not a new invention. But I was reminded, when people began to talk in terms of racism from stand your ground laws, that, as a prosecutor, we didn't care what anybody's race was, not as a defendant nor as a victim. Everybody deserved to have protection regardless of race, creed, color, gender, national origin.

But it did remind me that back when I was a judge, judges did not select the grand jury, their grand jury members. Those were chosen by grand jury commissioners the judges chose, but the commissioners chose the panel members for the grand jury.

□ 2130

There were some defense attorneys that decided to attack the system by claiming judges were by a disproportionate number appointing too many Anglos as grand jury foreman because that is something that judges did in Texas. A judge selected the foreman for the grand jury. He did not select the members. But among the members, they would choose who the foreman would be.

I was subpoenaed at one time back then without the defense attorneys doing their homework, and they intended to put me on the stand in their attack on a racist grand jury foreman system and use that to establish that, gee, it was grossly unfair, the disproportionate number of Anglos that were chosen as grand jury commissioners. Then, after I was subpoenaed and before I testified, they did their

homework, and they found out that actually it was a disproportionate appointment if you only looked at race. I had appointed proportionately more African Americans as foremen of my grand jury than the percentage of African Americans in my district. The reason I did that was because I did not care what anybody's race was. It didn't matter to me. I had to look at the backgrounds of the individuals, look at the individuals that were on the grand jury, and then select from among those someone that I believed would be a leader, would be good at organization, would have the respect of the other grand jurors, and be able to work for 6 months as head of the grand jury and make good decisions as a peacemaker and an organizer.

I never looked at their race. I didn't care about that. But I happened to know the people that I appointed as grand jury foremen. Sometimes they were women; sometimes they were men. I couldn't have told them, but they went back and checked and, wow, I had appointed a majority of African Americans during the time I was in charge of the grand jury rather than Anglos. Once they found that out, that blew their theory as far as me as a witness. So they quickly sent word that my subpoena had been dismissed and my testimony was not desired because, clearly, I wasn't going to help them establish a case of district judges being racist.

I can remember a couple of the grand jury foremen I selected. It had nothing to do with race. They were good people. One I remember was a community leader, was in so many organizations that everybody respected her. I knew she was amazing in organization, a former assistant superintendent. Anyway, I feel like so many times people want to use the term “racist,” and they are like those defense attorneys that don't bother to check the facts before they start mouthing off.

Another article that I saw in the last couple of days disturbed me greatly because it follows along in a pattern of abuse of law enforcement, of the tools of the administration. It follows along in what really amounted to the weaponization of the Internal Revenue Service. We still need a special prosecutor to go through and indict anyone and bring them to trial, anyone in the IRS that abused their positions, anybody that has committed perjury. We need a special prosecutor to do that. Obviously, the Justice Department will not, and we need someone to do that.

We have seen how abusive this administration can be using the powers of its office to go after people. We also know, despite the promises before being elected that this administration would be the most transparent in history, it has not been so. More and more mainstream reporters are starting to realize that, wait a minute, these guys are not even as open as the Bush administration was. I am sorry, the President Bush administration.

This story by John Hayward in Human Events is entitled “DHS Raids Human Events Alumnus, Seizes List of Whistleblowers.” We also know this administration, instead of being the most transparent, has the dishonor of having prosecuted more whistleblower or leakers than any other administration, in fact, than all other administrations put together. It is ruling with an iron fist.

This article points out that:

Human Events alumnus Audrey Hudson was the target of a Department of Homeland Security raid in August that was ostensibly related to firearms, but in a new interview with the Daily Caller, she revealed that DHS and the Maryland State Police also just happened to confiscate her files and notes, which included information about whistleblowers inside Homeland Security.

Hudson says the files were taken without her knowledge and without a subpoena. The Daily Caller confirmed that the search warrant pertained to firearms and ammunition. Even that part of the story seems rather flimsy, but then we get to all those juicy files that got hoovered up during the raid.

At about 4:30 a.m. on August 6, Hudson said officers dressed—

That is 4:30 in the morning. It is hard to believe that people sleeping peacefully, law abiding citizens, a reporter who has written stories using sources within Homeland Security that the administration didn't like, they bust into her home with a subpoena and say we are here to look for firearms, and instead, without the consent—I would say that if the subpoena did not allow for them to take her notes pertaining to DHS whistleblowers that provided this reporter information, it begs the question that perhaps these law enforcement officers acting under color of State law or Federal law stole these without due process.

So it bears looking into. If we had a Justice Department that was going to do justice in such an abuse of power, the same kind that would actually prosecute people who brought a billy club and intimidated voters at a voting location—but that doesn't seem to be the case.

Anyway, the article says:

After the search began, Hudson said she was asked by an investigator with the Coast Guard Investigative Service if she was the same Audrey Hudson who had written a series of critical stories about air marshals for The Washington Times over the last decade. The Coast Guard operates under the Department of Homeland Security.

Hudson said that investigator, Miguel Bosch, identified himself as a former air marshal official.

But it wasn't until a month later, on Sept. 10, that Hudson was informed by Bosch that five files, including her handwritten and typed notes from interviews with numerous confidential sources and other documents, had been taken during the raid.

In particular, the files included notes that were used to expose how the Federal Air Marshal Service had lied to Congress about the number of airline flights there were actually protecting against another terrorist attack, Hudson wrote in a summary about the raid provided to The DC.

The Coast Guard was involved because Audrey's husband works for them as an ordinance technician. What was the reason given for grabbing his wife's files?

She said she asked Bosch why they took the files. He responded that they needed to run them by TSA to make sure it was “legitimate” for her to have them.

I am sorry. Legitimate for a reporter to have her own handwritten notes? What kind of a country are we living in that busts into somebody’s home at 4:30 in the morning to take her notes regarding whistleblowers at Homeland Security? We are living in a scary time.

Back to the article.

This guy basically came in here and took my anonymous sources and turned them over—took my whistleblowers—and turned it over to the agency they were blowing the whistle on.” Hudson said. “And these guys still work there.”

Hudson says none of the documents were classified, and no laws were broken in obtaining them. She said the government papers in her possession were obtained through a Freedom of Information Act request, an assertion the Coast Guard confirmed. And how did they confirm it? They handed the material over to the “source agency” for review—or, as Hudson put it, they turned the whistleblower information over to the agency that had the whistle blown against it.

It wasn’t just official documents that were seized, however. Hudson says they also “took four other files with my handwritten and typed interview notes with confidential sources, that I staked my reputation as a journalist to protect under the auspices of the First Amendment of the Constitution.” One of her major reasons for coming forward with the story is to give the whistleblowers a heads-up, because she’s “terrified to contact them” directly.

This is unbelievable. This is happening in America. Mr. Speaker, I think we should defund the Department of Homeland Security until such time as they start being honest about what they are doing and we get answers from the Justice Department. They need to be addressed until they provide the information that the Attorney General has been held in contempt for. We want to make sure law enforcement services are done, we fund those, but we don’t defund the Attorney General himself or the head of DHS until such time as they start complying with the requirements of the

law, like Americans across the country are required to do without this kind of abuse.

We have got to stop the abuse. We have the power to do it. All we have to do is defund it until they come within the letter of the law themselves.

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

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. RUSH (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for October 28 through October 30 on account of attending to family acute medical care and hospitalization.

PUBLICATION OF BUDGETARY MATERIAL

STATUS REPORT ON CURRENT SPENDING LEVELS OF ON-BUDGET SPENDING AND REVENUES FOR FY 2013, 2014 AND THE 10-YEAR PERIOD FY 2014 THROUGH FY 2023

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,  
COMMITTEE ON THE BUDGET,  
Washington, DC, October 29, 2013.

Hon. JOHN A. BOEHNER,  
Speaker, Office of the Speaker, U.S. Capitol,  
House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, to facilitate application of sections 302 and 311 of the Congressional Budget Act, I am transmitting an updated status report on the current levels of on-budget spending and revenues for fiscal years 2013, 2014 and for the 10-year period of fiscal year 2014 through fiscal year 2023. This status report is the last update for fiscal year 2013, which ended on September 30, 2013. For fiscal year 2014, the report is current through October 22, 2013.

The term “current level” refers to the amounts of spending and revenues estimated for each fiscal year based on laws enacted or awaiting the President’s signature.

Table 1 in the report compares the current levels of total budget authority, outlays, and revenues with the overall limits set in H. Con. Res. 112 (112th Congress) for fiscal year 2013 and H. Con. Res. 25 (113th Congress) for fiscal year 2014 and the 10-year period of fiscal year 2014 through 2023. This comparison is needed to implement section 311(a) of the Budget Act, which creates a point of order against measures that would breach the budget resolution’s aggregate levels. The

table does not show budget authority and outlays for years after fiscal year 2014 because appropriations for those years have not yet been considered.

Table 2 compares the current levels of budget authority and outlays for action completed by each authorizing committee with the “section 302(a)” allocations made under H. Con. Res. 112 (112th Congress) for fiscal year 2013 and H. Con. Res. 25 (113th Congress) for fiscal years 2014 and the 10-year period 2014 through 2023. “Action” refers to legislation enacted after the adoption of the budget resolution. This comparison is needed to enforce section 302(f) of the Budget Act, which creates a point of order against measures that would breach the section 302(a) allocation of new budget authority for the committee that reported the measure. It is also needed to implement section 311(b), which exempts committees that comply with their allocations from the point of order under section 311(a).

Table 3 compares the current status of discretionary appropriations for fiscal years 2013 and 2014 with the “section 302(b)” sub-allocations of discretionary budget authority and outlays among Appropriations subcommittees. The comparison is also needed to enforce section 302(f) of the Budget Act because the point of order under that section equally applies to measures that would breach the applicable section 302(b) sub-allocation. The table also provides supplementary information on spending in excess of the base discretionary spending caps allowed under section 251(b) of the Budget Control Act.

Table 4 gives the current level for fiscal year 2015 of accounts identified for advance appropriations under section 601 of H. Con. Res. 25. This list is needed to enforce section 601 of the budget resolution, which creates a point of order against appropriation bills that contain advance appropriations that are: (i) not identified in the statement of managers or (ii) would cause the aggregate amount of such appropriations to exceed the level specified in the resolution.

In addition, letters from the Congressional Budget Office are attached that summarize and compare the budget impact of enacted legislation during the FY 2013 and FY 2014 fiscal years against the budget resolution aggregates in force during those years.

If you have any questions, please contact Paul Restuccia.

Sincerely,

PAUL RYAN,  
Chairman.

TABLE 1—STATUS OF THE FISCAL YEAR 2013 AND 2014 CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET AS ADOPTED IN H. CON. RES. 112 AND H. CON. RES. 25

(Reflecting Action Completed as of October 22, 2013 (On-budget amounts, in millions of dollars).)

	Fiscal Year 2013 <sup>1</sup>	Fiscal Year 2014 <sup>2</sup>	Fiscal Years 2014–2023
<b>Appropriate Level:</b>			
Budget Authority .....	2,793,848	2,761,945	n.a.
Outlays .....	2,891,589	2,811,517	n.a.
Revenues .....	2,089,540	2,310,972	31,089,081
<b>Current Level:</b>			
Budget Authority .....	3,021,853	2,904,124	n.a.
Outlays .....	3,065,784	2,922,851	n.a.
Revenues .....	2,015,873	2,310,977	31,089,104
<b>Current Level over (+)/under (–)</b>			
<b>Appropriate Level:</b>			
Budget Authority .....	+228,005	+142,179	n.a.
Outlays .....	+174,195	+111,334	n.a.
Revenues .....	–73,667	+5	+23

n.a. = Not applicable because annual appropriations Acts for fiscal years 2015 through 2022 will not be considered until future sessions of Congress.

<sup>1</sup> The appropriate level for FY2013 was established in H. Con. Res. 112, which was subsequently deemed to be in force in the House of Representatives pursuant to H. Res. 5. The current level for FY2013 starts with the baseline estimates contained in Updated Budget Projections: Fiscal Years 2012 to 2022, published by the Congressional Budget Office, and makes adjustments to those levels for enacted legislation.

<sup>2</sup> The appropriate level for FY2014 was established in H. Con. Res. 25, which was subsequently deemed to be in force in the House of Representatives pursuant to H. Res. 243. The current level for FY2014 starts with the baseline estimates contained in Updated Budget Projections: Fiscal Years 2013 to 2023, published by the Congressional Budget Office, and makes adjustments to those levels for enacted legislation.

TABLE 2—DIRECT SPENDING LEGISLATION—COMPARISON OF CURRENT LEVEL WITH AUTHORIZING COMMITTEE 302(a) ALLOCATIONS FOR RESOLUTION CHANGES  
[Reflecting Action Completed as of October 22, 2013 (Fiscal Years, in millions of dollars.)]

House Committee—	2013—		2014—		2014–2023—	
	BA	Outlays	BA	Outlays	BA	Outlays
<b>Agriculture</b>						
Allocation—	–1,577–	–1,503–	–2,631–	–2,501–	–209,044–	–208,556
Current Level—	–106–	–106–	0–	0–	0–	0
Difference—	+1,471	+1,397	+2,631	+2,501	+209,044	+208,556
<b>Armed Services</b>						
Allocation—	0–	0–	0–	0–	0–	0
Current Level—	+77–	+94–	0–	0–	0–	0
Difference—	+77–	+94–	0–	0–	0–	0
<b>Education and the Workforce</b>						
Allocation—	–18,098–	–7,096–	–21,712–	–7,430–	–217,458–	–198,921
Current Level—	+16,870	+11,355	+14,400	+12,670–	–16,770–	–8,795
Difference—	+34,968	+18,451	+36,112	+20,100–	+200,688	+190,126
<b>Energy and Commerce</b>						
Allocation—	–20,137–	–4,661–	–22,996–	–20,659–	–1,604,166–	–1,596,356
Current Level—	+9,762–	+11,695–	0–	0–	0–	0
Difference—	+29,899–	+16,356–	+22,996–	+20,659–	+1,604,166–	+1,596,356
<b>Financial Services</b>						
Allocation—	–8,562–	–8,495–	–11,465–	–10,428–	–94,439–	–94,325
Current Level—	+5,245–	+5,245–	0–	0–	0–	0
Difference—	+13,807	+13,740	+11,465–	+10,428–	+94,439–	+94,325
<b>Foreign Affairs</b>						
Allocation—	0	0–	0	0	0	0
Current Level—	0	0–	+2	+2	+20–	+20
Difference—	0–	0	+2	+2	+20	+20
<b>Homeland Security</b>						
Allocation—	0	0–	–305–	–305–	–12,575–	–12,575
Current Level—	0–	0–	0–	0–	0–	0
Difference—	0	0–	+305–	+305–	+12,575–	+12,575
<b>House Administration</b>						
Allocation—	0	0–	–34–	0–	–295–	–130
Current Level—	0	0–	0–	0–	0–	0
Difference—	0	0–	+34–	0–	+295–	+130
<b>Judiciary</b>						
Allocation—	–8,490	–594–	–11,506	–637	–47,461	–45,809
Current Level—	0–	0–	0–	0–	0–	0
Difference—	+8,490	+594–	+11,506	+637	+47,461	+45,809
<b>Natural Resources</b>						
Allocation—	–460–	–229–	–900–	–632–	–17,995–	–17,225
Current Level—	+259–	+596–	–16–	–58–	–95–	–95
Difference—	+719–	+825–	+884–	+574–	+17,900	+17,130
<b>Oversight and Government Reform</b>						
Allocation—	–8,146–	–8,113–	–11,758–	–11,758–	–165,996–	–165,996
Current Level—	–9–	–9–	0–	0–	0–	0
Difference—	+8,137	+8,104	+11,758	+11,758–	+165,996	+165,996
<b>Science, Space and Technology</b>						
Allocation—	0	0–	0	0–	0	0
Current Level—	0	0–	0	0–	0	0
Difference—	0	0–	0	0–	0	0
<b>Small Business</b>						
Allocation—	0	0–	0	0–	0	0
Current Level—	0	0–	0	0–	0	0
Difference—	0	0–	0	0–	0	0
<b>Transportation and Infrastructure</b>						
Allocation—	–36,626	–9,354	–78	–47	–116,444	–951
Current Level—	+6,588	+6,200	0	0	0	0
Difference—	+43,214	+15,554	+78	+47–	+116,444	+951
<b>Veterans' Affairs</b>						
Allocation—	0	0–	0	0–	0	0
Current Level—	–36–	–36–	–1–	–1–	–4–	–4
Difference—	–36	–36	–1	–1	–4	–4
<b>Ways and Means</b>						
Allocation—	–5,970	–8,211	–22,567	–21,667	–1,298,202	–1,291,946
Current Level—	+23,031	+23,031	0	0	0	0
Difference—	+29,001	+31,242	+22,567	+21,667–	+1,298,202	+1,291,946

TABLE 3—DISCRETIONARY APPROPRIATIONS FOR FISCAL YEAR 2013—COMPARISON OF CURRENT STATUS WITH APPROPRIATIONS COMMITTEE 302(a) ALLOCATION AND APPROPRIATIONS SUBCOMMITTEE 302(b) SUB ALLOCATIONS AS OF SEPTEMBER 30, 2013

[Figures in Millions]<sup>1</sup>

	302(b) Allocations (H. Rept. 112–489)		302(b) for GWOT		Current Status General Purpose		Current Status GWOT		General Purpose less 302(b)		GWOT less 302(b)	
	BA	OT	BA	OT	BA	OT	BA	OT	BA	OT	BA	OT
Agriculture, Rural Development, FDA	19,405	22,759	0	0	20,531	22,910	0	0	+1,126	+151	0	0
Commerce, Justice, Science	51,129	62,853	0	0	50,210	62,708	0	0	–919	–145	0	0
Defense	519,220	573,770	88,480	48,420	517,632	572,413	87,226	48,044	–1,588	–1,357	–1,254	–376
Energy and Water Development	32,098	40,682	0	0	36,744	41,350	0	0	+4,646	+668	0	0
Financial Services and General Government	21,150	23,939	0	0	21,453	24,370	0	0	+303	+431	0	0
Homeland Security	44,598	45,194	0	0	51,385	46,785	254	203	+6,787	+1,591	+254	+203
Interior, Environment	28,000	31,058	0	0	29,827	31,583	0	0	+1,827	+525	0	0
Labor, Health and Human Services, Education	150,002	162,699	0	0	157,355	167,544	0	0	+7,353	+4,845	0	0
Legislative Branch	4,289	4,381	0	0	4,284	4,315	0	0	–5	–66	0	0
Military Construction and Veterans Affairs	71,747	79,069	0	2	71,930	79,400	0	2	+183	+331	0	0
State, Foreign Operations	40,132	48,569	8,245	2,454	42,093	49,660	11,203	3,510	+1,961	+1,091	+2,958	+1,056
Transportation, HUD	51,606	115,161	0	0	51,817	115,117	0	0	+211	–44	0	0
Full Committee Allowance	2	0	0	249	0	0	0	0	–2	0	0	–249
<b>Total</b>	<b>1,033,377</b>	<b>1,210,134</b>	<b>96,725</b>	<b>51,125</b>	<b>1,055,261</b>	<b>1,218,155</b>	<b>98,683</b>	<b>51,759</b>	<b>+21,883</b>	<b>+8,021</b>	<b>+1,958</b>	<b>+634</b>
<b>Comparison 302(a) and Total Appropriations<sup>1</sup></b>									<b>General Purpose</b>		<b>GWOT</b>	
									<b>BA</b>	<b>OT</b>	<b>BA</b>	<b>OT</b>
302(a) Allocation									1,033,377	1,210,134	96,725	51,125
Total Appropriations									1,055,261	1,218,155	98,683	51,759
302(a) Allocation vs. Total Appropriations									+21,884	+8,021	+1,958	+634
<b>Memorandum:</b>					<b>Amounts Assumed in 302(b)</b>		<b>Emergency Requirements</b>		<b>Disaster Funding</b>		<b>Program Integrity</b>	
Spending in Excess of Base Budget Control Act Caps for Sec. 251(b) Designated Categories					<b>BA</b>	<b>OT</b>	<b>BA</b>	<b>OT</b>	<b>BA</b>	<b>OT</b>	<b>BA</b>	<b>OT</b>
Agriculture, Rural Development, FDA					0	0	224	72	0	0	0	0

Memorandum: Spending in Excess of Base Budget Control Act Caps for Sec. 251(b) Designated Categories	Amounts Assumed in 302(b)		Emergency Requirements		Disaster Funding		Program Integrity	
	BA	OT	BA	OT	BA	OT	BA	OT
Commerce, Justice, Science	0	0	363	97	0	0	0	0
Defense	0	0	88	42	0	0	0	0
Energy and Water Development	0	0	1,889	327	0	0	0	0
Financial Services and General Government	0	0	811	430	0	0	0	0
Homeland Security <sup>2</sup>	5,481	274	6,693	283	11,779	1,453	0	0
Interior, Environment	0	0	1,443	153	0	0	0	0
Labor, Health and Human Services, Education	0	0	827	108	0	0	483	430
Legislative Branch	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Military Construction and Veterans Affairs	0	0	261	24	0	0	0	0
State, Foreign Operations	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Transportation, HUD	0	0	29,070	588	0	0	0	0
<b>Totals</b>	<b>5,481</b>	<b>274</b>	<b>41,669</b>	<b>2,124</b>	<b>11,779</b>	<b>1,453</b>	<b>483</b>	<b>430</b>

<sup>1</sup> Spending designated as emergency is not included in the current status of appropriations shown above.

<sup>2</sup> On May 22, 2012 the House Budget Committee provided an adjustment to the 302(a) allocation for the Committee on Appropriations to accommodate \$5.481 billion in budget authority and \$274 million in outlays for disaster designated spending. On September 28, 2012 the Continuing Appropriations Act, 2013 was signed into law which provided \$6.400 billion in budget authority and \$320 billion in outlays for disaster designated spending through March 27, 2013. This amount was subsequently extended through September 30, 2013 as part of P.L. 113-6. On January 29, 2013, the Disaster Relief Appropriations Act was signed into law which provided a full-year appropriation of an additional \$5.379 billion in budget authority and \$1.133 billion in outlays for disaster designated spending.

TABLE 3—DISCRETIONARY APPROPRIATIONS FOR FISCAL YEAR 2014—COMPARISON OF CURRENT STATUS WITH APPROPRIATIONS COMMITTEE 302(a) ALLOCATION AND APPROPRIATIONS SUBCOMMITTEE 302(b) SUB ALLOCATIONS AS OF OCTOBER 22, 2013

(Figures in Millions)<sup>1</sup>

	302(b) Allocations (H. Rept. 113-143)		302(b) for GWOT		Current Status General Purpose		Current Status GWOT		General Purpose less 302(b)		GWOT less 302(b)	
	BA	OT	BA	OT	BA	OT	BA	OT	BA	OT	BA	OT
Agriculture, Rural Development, FDA	19,450	21,300	0	0	19,450	21,294	0	0	0	-6	0	0
Commerce, Justice, Science	47,396	58,700	0	0	47,396	58,700	0	0	0	0	0	0
Defense	512,522	543,685	85,769	42,994	512,510	543,674	79,741	41,051	-12	-11	-6,028	-1,943
Energy and Water Development	30,426	38,363	0	0	30,414	38,369	0	0	-12	+6	0	0
Financial Services and General Government	16,966	19,711	0	0	16,966	19,707	0	0	0	-4	0	0
Homeland Security	44,617	45,961	0	0	44,617	45,961	0	0	0	0	0	0
Interior, Environment	24,278	25,207	0	0	0	12,537	0	0	-24,278	-12,670	0	0
Labor, Health and Human Services, Education	121,797	133,809	0	0	24,642	104,421	0	0	-97,155	-29,388	0	0
Legislative Branch	4,124	4,085	0	0	3,233	3,385	0	0	-891	-700	0	0
Military Construction and Veterans Affairs	73,320	76,204	0	0	73,320	76,204	0	0	0	0	0	0
State, Foreign Operations	34,103	36,308	6,520	5,016	34,103	41,824	6,520	2,182	0	+5,516	0	-2,834
Transportation, HUD	44,100	114,931	0	0	44,100	114,928	0	0	0	-3	0	0
Full Committee Allowance	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
<b>Total</b>	<b>973,099</b>	<b>1,118,264</b>	<b>92,289</b>	<b>48,010</b>	<b>850,751</b>	<b>1,081,004</b>	<b>86,261</b>	<b>43,233</b>	<b>-122,348</b>	<b>-37,260</b>	<b>-6,028</b>	<b>-4,777</b>

Comparison 302(a) and Total Appropriations<sup>1</sup>

	General Purpose		GWOT	
	BA	OT	BA	OT
302(a) Allocation	973,099	1,118,264	92,289	48,010
Total Appropriations	850,751	1,081,004	86,261	43,233
302(a) Allocation vs. Total Appropriations	-122,348	-37,260	-6,028	-4,777

Memorandum: Spending in Excess of Base Budget Control Act Caps for Sec. 251(b) Designated Categories	Amounts Assumed in 302(b)		Emergency Requirements		Disaster Funding		Program Integrity	
	BA	OT	BA	OT	BA	OT	BA	OT
Agriculture, Rural Development, FDA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Commerce, Justice, Science	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Defense	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Energy and Water Development	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Financial Services and General Government	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Homeland Security	5,626	281	0	0	5,626	281	0	0
Interior, Environment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Labor, Health and Human Services, Education	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Legislative Branch	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Military Construction and Veterans Affairs	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
State, Foreign Operations	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Transportation, HUD	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
<b>Totals</b>	<b>5,626</b>	<b>281</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>5,626</b>	<b>281</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>

<sup>1</sup> Spending designated as emergency is not included in the current status of appropriations shown above.

TABLE 4—2015 ADVANCE APPROPRIATIONS PURSUANT TO H. CON. RES. 25 AS OF OCTOBER 22, 2013 (Budget Authority in Millions of Dollars)

Section 601(d)(1) Limits—	2,015
Appropriate Level—	55,634
Enacted Advances:	
Accounts Identified for Advances:	
Department of Veterans Affairs	
Medical Services—	0
Medical Support and Compliance—	0
Medical Facilities—	0
Subtotal, enacted advances <sup>1</sup> —	0
Section 601 (d) (2) Limits—	2015
Appropriate Level—	28,852
Enacted Advances—	
Accounts Identified for Advances:	
Payment to Postal Service—	0
Employment and Training Administration—	0
Education for the Disadvantaged—	0
School Improvement Programs—	0

TABLE 4—2015 ADVANCE APPROPRIATIONS PURSUANT TO H. CON. RES. 25 AS OF OCTOBER 22, 2013—Continued (Budget Authority in Millions of Dollars)

Special Education—	0
Career, Technical and Adult Education	0
Tenant-based Rental Assistance—	0
Project-based Rental Assistance—	0
Subtotal, enacted advances <sup>1</sup> —	0
Previously Enacted Advance Appropriations <sup>2</sup> —	2,015
Corporation for Public Broadcasting—	445
Total, enacted advances <sup>1</sup> —	445

<sup>1</sup> Line items may not add to total due to rounding.  
<sup>2</sup> Funds were appropriated in Public Law 113-6.

U.S. CONGRESS,  
 CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET OFFICE,  
 Washington, DC, October 24, 2013.

Hon. PAUL RYAN,  
 Chairman, Committee on the Budget, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: The enclosed report shows the effects of Congressional action on

the fiscal year 2013 budget and is current through September 30, 2013. This report is submitted under section 308(b) and in aid of section 311 of the Congressional Budget Act, as amended.

The estimates of budget authority, outlays, and revenues are consistent with the technical and economic assumptions of H. Con. Res. 112, the Concurrent Resolution on the Budget for Fiscal Year 2013, as approved by the House of Representatives and subsequently revised.

Since my last letter dated September 9, 2013, there has been no Congressional action affecting budget authority, outlays, or revenues for fiscal year 2013.

Sincerely,  
 DOUGLAS W. ELMENDORF, Director.

Enclosure.

FISCAL YEAR 2013 HOUSE CURRENT LEVEL REPORT THROUGH SEPTEMBER 30, 2013

[In millions of dollars]

	Budget Authority	Outlays	Revenues
Previously Enacted <sup>a</sup>			
Revenues	n.a.	n.a.	2,293,339
Permanents and other spending legislation	1,869,081	1,818,079	n.a.
Appropriation legislation	0	553,169	n.a.
Offsetting receipts	-729,799	-729,799	n.a.
Total, Previously enacted	1,139,282	1,641,449	2,293,339
Enacted Legislation:			
Authorizing Legislation			
Temporary Bankruptcy Judgeships Extension Act of 2012 (P.L. 112-121)	0	0	1
Moving Ahead for Progress in the 21st Century Act (P.L. 112-141)	8,795	9,439	2,291
Food and Drug Administration Safety and Innovation Act (P.L. 112-144)	-16	-16	0
Honoring America's Veterans and Caring for Camp Lejeune Families Act of 2012 (P.L. 112-154)	-36	-36	0
An act to amend the African Growth and Opportunity Act . . . and to make technical corrections to the Harmonized Tariff schedule . . . for the Dominican Republic-Central America-United States Free Trade Agreement, to approve the renewal of import restrictions contained in the Burmese Freedom and Democracy Act of 2003, and for other purposes (P.L. 112-163)	0	0	-59
FDA User Fees Corrections Act of 2012 (P.L. 112-193)	0	-195	0
National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2013 (P.L. 112-239)	-33	-16	0
American Taxpayer Relief Act of 2012 (P.L. 112-240)	57,428	49,804	-279,700
Medicare IVIG Access and Strengthening Medicare and Repaying Taxpayers Act of 2012 (P.L. 112-242)	3	3	0
An act to amend title 5, United States Code, to make clear that accounts in Thrift Savings Fund are subject to certain Federal tax levies (P.L. 112-267)	0	0	1
An act to temporarily increase the borrowing authority of the Federal Emergency Management Agency for carrying out the National Flood Insurance Program (P.L. 113-1)	5,250	5,250	0
Bipartisan Student Loan Certainty Act of 2013 (P.L. 113-28)	14,290	8,080	0
Total, Authorizing Legislation	85,681	72,313	-277,466
Appropriations Legislation			
Continuing Appropriations Resolution, 2013 (P.L. 112-175) <sup>b</sup>	423	423	0
Disaster Relief Appropriations Act, 2013 (P.L. 113-2) <sup>c</sup>	8,840	1,479	0
Consolidated and Further Continuing Appropriations Act, 2013 (P.L. 113-6)	1,867,246	1,426,973	0
Reducing Flight Delays Act of 2013 (P.L. 113-9)	0	203	0
Total, Appropriations Legislation	1,876,509	1,429,078	0
Total, Enacted Legislation	1,962,190	1,501,391	-277,466
Entitlements and Mandatories:			
Budget resolution estimates of appropriated entitlements and other mandatory programs	-79,619	-77,056	0
Total Current Level <sup>d</sup>	3,021,853	3,065,784	2,015,873
Total House Resolution <sup>e</sup>	2,793,848	2,891,589	2,089,540
Current Level Over House Resolution	228,005	174,195	n.a.
Current Level Under House Resolution	n.a.	n.a.	73,667
Memoranda:			
Revenues, 2013-2022:			
House Current Level	n.a.	n.a.	28,846,212
House Resolution <sup>f</sup>	n.a.	n.a.	28,957,333
Current Level Over House Resolution	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.
Current Level Under House Resolution	n.a.	n.a.	111,121

Source: Congressional Budget Office.

Note:—n.a. = not applicable; P.L. = Public Law.

<sup>a</sup>Includes the following acts that affect budget authority, outlays, or revenues and were cleared by the Congress in 2012, but before adoption of the Concurrent Resolution on the Budget for Fiscal Year 2013 (H. Con. Res. 112): the FAA Modernization and Reform Act of 2012 (P.L. 112-95), the Middle Class Tax Relief and Job Creation Act of 2012 (P.L. 112-96), and an act to apply the countervailing duty provisions of the Tariff Act of 1930 to nonmarket economy countries, and for other purposes (P.L. 112-99).

<sup>b</sup>Sections 140(b) and 141(b) of the Continuing Appropriations Resolution, 2013 provided \$423 million for fire suppression activities, available until expended.

<sup>c</sup>Pursuant to Section 314(d) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, amounts designated as an emergency requirement pursuant to 251(b)(2)(A) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 shall not count for purposes of Title III and Title IV of the Congressional Budget Act. The amounts so designated for 2013, which are not included in the current level totals, are as follows:

	Budget Authority	Outlays	Revenues
Disaster Relief Appropriations Act, 2013	41,667	2,122	n.a.

<sup>d</sup>For purposes of enforcing section 311 of the Congressional Budget Act in the House, the resolution, as approved by the House of Representatives, does not include budget authority, outlays, or revenues for off-budget amounts. As a result, current level does not include these items.

<sup>e</sup>Periodically, the House Committee on the Budget revises the totals in H. Con. Res. 112, pursuant to various provisions of the resolution:

	Budget Authority	Outlays	Revenues
Original House Resolution	2,793,848	2,891,589	2,293,339
Revisions:			
For the American Taxpayer Relief Act of 2012	0	0	-203,799
Revised House Resolution	2,793,848	2,891,589	2,089,540

<sup>f</sup>Periodically, the House Committee on the Budget revises the 2013-2022 revenue totals in H. Con. Res. 112, pursuant to various provisions of the resolution.

U.S. CONGRESS,  
CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET OFFICE,  
Washington, DC, October 24, 2013.

Hon. PAUL RYAN,  
Chairman, Committee on the Budget, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: The enclosed report shows the effects of Congressional action on the fiscal year 2014 budget and is current through October 22, 2013. This report is submitted under section 308(b) and in aid of section 311 of the Congressional Budget Act, as amended.

The estimates of budget authority, outlays, and revenues are consistent with the technical and economic assumptions of H. Con. Res. 25, the Concurrent Resolution on the Budget for Fiscal Year 2014, as approved by the House of Representatives and subsequently revised.

Since my last letter dated September 9, 2013, the Congress has cleared and the President has signed the following acts that affect budget authority, outlays, or revenues for fiscal year 2014:

Department of Veterans Affairs Expiring Authorities Act of 2013 (Public Law 113-37);

Helium Stewardship Act of 2013 (Public Law 113-40);

An act to extend the period during which Iraqis who were employed by the United States Government in Iraq may be granted special immigrant status and to temporarily increase the fee or surcharge for processing machine-readable nonimmigrant visas (Public Law 113-42); and

Continuing Appropriations Act, 2014 (Public Law 113-46).

Sincerely,

DOUGLAS W. ELMENDORF, Director.

Enclosure.

FISCAL YEAR 2014 HOUSE CURRENT LEVEL REPORT THROUGH OCTOBER 22, 2013

[In millions of dollars]

	Budget Authority	Outlays	Revenues
Previously Enacted <sup>a</sup>			
Revenues	n.a.	n.a.	2,310,972
Permanents and other spending legislation	1,848,718	1,778,493	n.a.
Appropriation legislation	0	504,662	n.a.

FISCAL YEAR 2014 HOUSE CURRENT LEVEL REPORT THROUGH OCTOBER 22, 2013—Continued  
 (In millions of dollars)

	Budget Authority	Outlays	Revenues
Offsetting receipts .....	- 707,692	- 707,792	n.a.
Total, Previously enacted .....	1,141,026	1,575,363	2,310,972
Enacted Legislation: <sup>b</sup>			
Bipartisan Student Loan Certainty Act of 2013 (P.L. 113-28) .....	14,400	12,670	0
Department of Veterans Affairs Expiring Authorities Act of 2013 (P.L. 113-37) .....	- 1	- 1	0
Helium Stewardship Act of 2013 (P.L. 113-40) .....	- 16	- 58	0
An act to extend the period during which Iraqis who were employed by the United States Government in Iraq may be granted special immigrant status and to temporarily increase the fee or surcharge for processing machine-readable nonimmigrant visas (P.L. 113-42) .....	2	2	5
Continuing Appropriations Act, 2014 (P.L. 113-46) <sup>c</sup> .....	635	635	0
Total, Enacted Legislation .....	15,020	13,248	5
Continuing Resolution: <sup>d</sup>			
Continuing Appropriations Act, 2014 (P.L. 113-46) .....	1,000,318	602,907	0
Entitlements and Mandatories:			
Budget resolution estimates of appropriated entitlements and other mandatory programs .....	747,760	731,333	0
Total Current Level <sup>e</sup> .....	2,904,124	2,922,851	2,310,977
Total House Resolution <sup>f</sup> .....	2,761,945	2,811,517	2,310,972
Current Level Over House Resolution .....	142,179	111,334	5
Current Level Under House Resolution .....	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.
Memorandum:			
Revenues, 2014-2023:			
House Current Level .....	n.a.	n.a.	31,089,104
House Resolution <sup>g</sup> .....	n.a.	n.a.	31,089,081
Current Level Over House Resolution .....	n.a.	n.a.	23
Current Level Under House Resolution .....	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.

SOURCE: Congressional Budget Office.  
 Note: n.a. = not applicable; P.L. = Public Law.  
<sup>a</sup> Includes the following acts that affect budget authority, outlays, or revenues, and were cleared by the Congress during this session, but before adoption of the Concurrent Resolution on the Budget for Fiscal Year 2014 (H. Con. Res. 25): an act to temporarily increase the borrowing authority of the FEMA for carrying out the National Flood Insurance Program (P.L. 113-1), the Disaster Relief Appropriations Act, 2013 (P.L. 113-2), the Pandemic and All-Hazards Preparedness Reauthorization Act of 2013 (P.L. 113-5), the Consolidated and Further Continuing Appropriations Act, 2013 (P.L. 113-6), and the Reducing Flight Delays Act of 2013 (P.L. 113-9).  
<sup>b</sup> Pursuant to Section 314(d) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, amounts designated as an emergency requirement pursuant to 251(b)(2)(A) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 shall not count for purposes of Title III and Title IV of the Congressional Budget Act. The amounts so designated for 2014, which are not included in the current level totals, are as follows:

	Budget Authority	Outlays	Revenues
Continuing Appropriations Act, 2014 (Sec. 155) .....	0	50	n.a.

<sup>c</sup> Sections 135 and 136 of the Continuing Appropriations Act, 2014 (P.L. 113-46) provide \$636 million for fire suppression activities, available until expended. Section 146 of the Act freezes the pay of Members of Congress, which is estimated to result in a reduction in spending of \$1 million in 2014.  
<sup>d</sup> The Continuing Appropriations Act, 2014 (P.L. 113-46) provides funding through January 15, 2014.  
<sup>e</sup> For purposes of enforcing section 311 of the Congressional Budget Act in the House, the resolution, as approved by the House of Representatives, does not include budget authority, outlays, or revenues for off-budget amounts. As a result, current level does not include these items.  
<sup>f</sup> Periodically, the House Committee on the Budget revises the totals in H. Con. Res. 25, pursuant to various provisions of the resolution:

	Budget Authority	Outlays	Revenues
Original House Resolution: .....	2,769,406	2,815,079	2,270,932
Revisions:			
Pursuant to section 603 of H. Con. Res. 25 .....	- 14,089	- 4,100	40,040
Adjustment for Disaster Designated Spending .....	6,079	230	0
Adjustment for Technical Correction to the Budget Control Act Spending Caps .....	549	308	0
Revised House Resolution .....	2,761,945	2,811,517	2,310,972

<sup>g</sup> Periodically, the House Committee on the Budget revises the 2014-2023 revenue totals in H. Con. Res. 25, pursuant to various provisions of the resolution.

**PUBLICATION OF BUDGETARY MATERIAL**

REVISIONS TO THE ALLOCATIONS OF THE FISCAL YEAR 2014 BUDGET RESOLUTION RELATED TO LEGISLATION REPORTED BY THE COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,  
 COMMITTEE ON THE BUDGET,  
 Washington, DC, October 29, 2013.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE CHAIRMAN OF THE COMMITTEE ON THE BUDGET

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to section 314(a) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, I hereby submit for printing in the Congressional Record revisions to the aggregate budget levels set forth pursuant to H. Con. Res. 25, the Concurrent Resolution on the Budget for Fiscal Year 2014, as put into effect by H. Res. 243. The revision is a correction for disaster designated spending that was incorrectly included in a previous revision to the budget aggregates. A corresponding table is attached.

This revision represents an adjustment for purposes of enforcing sections 302 and 311 of the Budget Act. For the purposes of the Budget Act, these revised aggregates are to be considered as aggregates included in the budget resolution, pursuant to section 101 of H. Con. Res. 25 and H. Rept. 113-17, as adjusted.

Sincerely,  
 PAUL D. RYAN OF WISCONSIN,  
 Chairman,  
 House Budget Committee.

**BUDGET AGGREGATES—**  
 (On-budget amounts, in millions of dollars)—

	Fiscal Year—	
	2014—	2014-2023
Current Aggregates:—		
Budget Authority .....	2,767,571	( <sup>1</sup> )
Outlays .....	2,811,798	( <sup>1</sup> )
Revenues .....	2,310,972	31,089,081
Correction for Disaster Designated Spending:—		
Budget Authority .....	- 5,626	( <sup>1</sup> )
Outlays .....	- 281	( <sup>1</sup> )
Revenues .....	0	0
Revised Aggregates:—		
Budget Authority .....	2,761,945	( <sup>1</sup> )
Outlays .....	2,811,517	( <sup>1</sup> )
Revenues .....	2,310,972	31,089,081

<sup>1</sup> Not applicable because annual appropriations acts for fiscal years 2015-2023 will not be considered until future sessions of Congress.

**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. 893. An act to provide for an increase, effective December 1, 2013, in the rates of compensation for veterans with service-connected disabilities and the rates of dependency and indemnity compensation for the survivors of certain disabled veterans, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

**ADJOURNMENT**

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

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 9 o'clock and 42 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, October 30, 2013, at 10 a.m. for morning-hour debate.

**EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.**

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

3418. A letter from the Chief Counsel, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Suspension of Community Eligibility; Maryland: Accident, Town of, Garrett County; [Docket ID: FEMA-2013-0002] [Internal Agency Docket No.: FEMA-8299] received October 7, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Financial Services.

3419. A letter from the Associate General Counsel for Legislation and Regulations, Department of Housing and Urban Development, transmitting the Department's final rule — Federal Housing Administration (FHA) Approval of Lending Institutions and Mortgages: Streamlined Reporting Requirements for Small Supervised Lenders and Mortgages [Docket No.: FR-5536-F-02] (RIN: 2502-AJ00) received October 3, 2013, pursuant

to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Financial Services.

3420. A letter from the Regulatory Specialist, LRAD, Department of the Treasury, transmitting the Department's final rule — Regulatory Capital Rules: Regulatory Capital, Implementation of Basel III, Capital Adequacy, Transition Provisions, Prompt Corrective Action, Standardized Approach for Risk-weighted Assets, Market Discipline and Disclosure Requirements, Advanced Approaches Risk-Based Capital Rule, and Market Risk Capital Rule [Docket No.: R-1442; Regulations H, Q, and Y] (RIN: 7100-AD87) received October 16, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Financial Services.

3421. A letter from the General Counsel, Pension Benefit Guaranty Corporation, transmitting the Corporation's final rule — Allocation of Assets in Single-Employer Plans; Benefits Payable in Terminated Single-Employer Plans; Interest Assumptions for Valuing and Paying Benefits received October 3, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

3422. A letter from the Director of Government Affairs, Corporation for Public Broadcasting, transmitting the Corporation's 2011 annual report on the provision of services to minority and diverse audiences by public broadcasting entities and public telecommunication entities; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

3423. A letter from the Chairman and Co-chairman, Congressional-Executive Commission on China, transmitting the Commission's annual report for 2013; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

3424. A letter from the Assistant Secretary For Export Administration, Department of Commerce, transmitting the Department's final rule — Revisions to the Export Administration Regulations (EAR) To Make the Commerce Control List (CCL) Clearer [Docket No.: 110818512-3478-02] (RIN: 0694-AF37) received October 7, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

3425. A letter from the Assistant Legal Adviser for Treaty Affairs, Department of State, transmitting report prepared by the Department of State concerning international agreements other than treaties entered into by the United States to be transmitted to the Congress within the sixty-day period specified in the Case-Zablocki Act; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

3426. A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting the Department's final rule — Amendment to the International Traffic in Arms Regulations: Initial Implementation of Export Control Reform; Correction (RIN: 1400-AD37) received October 2, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

3427. A letter from the Secretary, Department of the Treasury, transmitting As required by section 401(c) of the National Emergencies Act, 50 U.S.C. 1641(c), and section 204(c) of the International Emergency Economic Powers Act, 50 U.S.C. 1703(c), a six-month periodic report on the national emergency with respect to Somalia that was declared in Executive Order 13536 of April 12, 2010; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

3428. A letter from the Secretary, Department of the Treasury, transmitting as required by section 401(c) of the National Emergencies Act, 50 U.S.C. 1641(c), and section 204(c) of the International Emergency Economic Powers Act, 50 U.S.C. 1703(c) pursuant to Executive Order 13313 of July 31, 2003, a six-month periodic report on the national emergency with respect to Iran that was declared in Executive Order 12170 of No-

vember 14, 1979; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

3429. A letter from the Acting Senior Procurement Executive, General Services Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Federal Acquisition Regulation; Allowability of Legal Costs for Whistleblower Proceedings [FAC 2005-70; FAR Case 2013-017; Item II; Docket 2013-0017, Sequence 1] (RIN: 9000-AM64) received September 30, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

3430. A letter from the Acting Senior Procurement Executive, General Services Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Federal Acquisition Regulation; Federal Acquisition Circular 2005-70; Small Entity Compliance Guide [Docket: FAR 2013-0078, Sequence 6] received September 30, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

3431. A letter from the Auditor, Office of the District of Columbia Auditor, transmitting a report entitled, "Update on Non-Reporting Public-Private Development Construction Projects"; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

3432. A letter from the Auditor, Office of the District of Columbia Auditor, transmitting a report entitled, "Audit of the Department of Small and Local Business Development Certified Business Enterprise Program"; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

3433. A letter from the Auditor, Office of the District of Columbia Auditor, transmitting a report entitled, "Audit of the Department of General Services Fiscal Year 2012 Procurement of Snow and Ice Removal and Pretreatment Services"; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

3434. A letter from the Acting Deputy Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Fisheries of the Northeastern United States; Scup Fishery; Adjustment to the 2013 Winter II Quota [Docket No.: 121009528-2729-02] (RIN: 0648-XC749) received September 12, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

3435. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; 2013 Annual Islamorada Swim for Alligator Lighthouse, Atlantic Ocean; Islamorada, FL [Docket Number: USCG-2013-0663] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received September 25, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3436. A letter from the Chairman, Surface Transportation Board, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Regulations Governing Fees for Services Performed in Connection With Licensing and Related Services — 2013 Update [Docket No.: EP 542 (Sub-No. 21)] received October 7, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3437. A letter from the Director of Regulation Policy and Management, Office of the General Counsel, Department of Veterans Affairs, transmitting the Department's final rule — Eligibility of Disabled Veterans and Members of the Armed Forces With Severe Burn Injuries for Financial Assistance in the Purchase of an Automobile or Other Conveyance and Adaptive Equipment (RIN: 2900-AO31) received September 19, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

## 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. SENSENBRENNER (for himself, Mr. CONYERS, Ms. LOFGREN, Mr. AMASH, Mr. NADLER, Mr. ROE of Tennessee, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Mr. FARR, Mr. POLIS, Ms. CHU, Ms. BASS, Mr. RICHMOND, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Ms. DELBENE, Mr. ROHR-ABACHER, Mr. MICA, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, Mr. PETRI, Mr. SANFORD, Mr. WELCH, Mr. GRAYSON, Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina, Ms. ESHOO, Mr. ROKITA, Mr. SMITH of Missouri, Mr. STEWART, Mr. AMODEI, Mr. YOHO, Mr. JEFFRIES, Ms. NORTON, Mr. DEUTCH, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Mr. QUIGLEY, Mr. HUNTER, Mr. GARAMENDI, Mr. MULLIN, Mr. MASSIE, Ms. LEE of California, Ms. MOORE, Mr. DUFFY, Ms. GABBARD, Mr. COBLE, Mr. TERRY, Mr. GRAVES of Georgia, Mr. POCAN, Mr. O'ROURKE, Mr. LABRADOR, Mr. HUFFMAN, Mr. GOWDY, Mr. COFFMAN, Mr. MULVANEY, Mr. BURGESS, Mr. ISSA, Mr. MORAN, Mr. GIBSON, Mr. HONDA, Ms. SPEIER, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mr. GOHMERT, Mr. YODER, Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, Mr. HUELSKAMP, Mr. CAPUANO, Mr. BENTIVOLIO, Mr. JONES, Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania, Mr. BUCHANAN, Mr. LONG, Mr. ELLISON, Mr. DAINES, Mr. MICHAUD, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Mr. PEARCE, Mr. POE of Texas, Mr. BERA of California, Mr. GRIFFIN of Arkansas, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. SCHWEIKERT, and Mr. FITZPATRICK):

H.R. 3361. A bill to reform the authorities of the Federal Government to require the production of certain business records, conduct electronic surveillance, use pen registers and trap and trace devices, and use other forms of information gathering for foreign intelligence, counterterrorism, and criminal purposes, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary, and in addition to the Committees on Intelligence (Permanent Select), and Financial Services, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. TERRY (for himself and Mr. CASSIDY):

H.R. 3362. A bill to amend the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act to require transparency in the operation of American Health Benefit Exchanges; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. POMPEO:

H.R. 3363. A bill to ensure that the Federal Aviation Administration advances the safety of small airplanes and the continued development of the general aviation industry, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. STIVERS (for himself and Mr. AL GREEN of Texas):

H.R. 3364. A bill to authorize and request the President to issue a posthumous commission in the regular Army to Milton Holland, who, while sergeant major of the 5th Regiment, United States Colored Infantry, was awarded the Medal of Honor for gallantry during the Civil War; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. WALBERG (for himself, Mr. GRAVES of Missouri, Mr. TIBERI, and Mr. MESSER):

H.R. 3365. A bill to exempt certain long-term care hospitals operating in a single-hospital MSA from the Medicare threshold payment adjustment policy for long-term care hospitals, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WALDEN:

H.R. 3366. A bill to provide for the release of the property interests retained by the United States in certain land conveyed in 1954 by the United States, acting through the Director of the Bureau of Land Management, to the State of Oregon for the establishment of the Hermiston Agricultural Research and Extension Center of Oregon State University in Hermiston, Oregon; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. BOUSTANY (for himself and Mr. BERA of California):

H.R. 3367. A bill to amend section 9010 of the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act to delay the application of the health insurance provider annual fee until 2016 and to provide a process to return to consumers any amounts attributable to the expected application of the annual fee to 2014 or 2015; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. BRALEY of Iowa:

H.R. 3368. A bill to require employers to provide veterans with time off on Veterans Day; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. COSTA (for himself, Mr. BENTIVOLIO, Ms. BORDALLO, Ms. CHU, Mr. CICILLINE, Mr. CONNOLLY, Mr. COOK, Mr. COURTNEY, Mr. DUFFY, Mr. FALCOMA, Mr. HANNA, Mr. HONDA, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Mr. MCNERNEY, Ms. MENG, Ms. MOORE, Mrs. NEGRETE MCLEOD, Ms. NORTON, Mr. O'ROURKE, Mr. PETERSON, Mr. PIERLUISI, Mr. POE of Texas, Mr. RIBBLE, Mr. RICHMOND, Mr. RUIZ, Mr. SCHIFF, Ms. TITUS, Mr. WELCH, and Mr. KIND):

H.R. 3369. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to authorize the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to inter in national cemeteries individuals who supported the United States in Laos during the Vietnam War era; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. GRIMM (for himself, Ms. WATERS, Mr. RICHMOND, Mr. OLSON, Mr. PALAZZO, Mr. CASSIDY, Ms. MATSUI, Mr. CRAMER, Mr. KEATING, Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, Ms. BROWN of Florida, Mr. HINOJOSA, Mr. MEEKS, Mr. MCINTYRE, Mr. NADLER, Mr. NUGENT, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Mr. LANGEVIN, Mr. CROWLEY, Ms. MOORE, Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania, Mr. JONES, Mr. WELCH, Mr. ENYART, Mr. LOBIONDO, Mr. LYNCH, Mr. CARNEY, Mr. SCALISE, Mr. CULBERSON, Ms. CASTOR of Florida, Mr. GARCIA, Ms. FRANKEL of Florida, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. KING of New York, Mr. PASCRELL, Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Mr. VELA, Mr. STOCKMAN, Mr. BOUSTANY, Mr. FITZPATRICK, Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. PERLMUTTER, Mr. WHITFIELD, Mr. MCNERNEY, Mr. MURPHY of Florida, Mr. ELLISON, Mr. DIAZ-BALART, Mrs. ELLMERS, Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, Mr. BUCHANAN, Mr. ANDREWS, Mr. CLEAVER, Mr. DEUTCH, Mr. GARAMENDI, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Mr. JEFFRIES, Mr. CLAY, Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York, Ms. PINGREE of Maine, Ms. TSONGAS, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. HARPER, Mr.

MAFFEI, Mr. SIRES, Mr. CONNOLLY, Mr. POLIS, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. KENNEDY, Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California, Mr. SCHRADER, Mr. BISHOP of New York, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. GUTIÉRREZ, Ms. DEGETTE, Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. AL GREEN of Texas, and Mr. HOLT):

H.R. 3370. A bill to delay the implementation of certain provisions of the Biggert-Waters Flood Insurance Reform Act of 2012, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services, and in addition to the Committee on Rules, 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. HINOJOSA (for himself and Mr. CASTRO of Texas):

H.R. 3371. A bill to exempt certain education loans made by States from certain preferred lender requirements under the Higher Education Act of 1965; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. HONDA:

H.R. 3372. A bill to provide a process for ensuring the United States does not default on its obligations; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committee on Rules, 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. JOHNSON of Ohio:

H.R. 3373. A bill to prohibit incurring further obligations with respect to the healthcare.gov website without offsetting savings; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. KILMER (for himself, Mr. COTTON, and Ms. TSONGAS):

H.R. 3374. A bill to provide for the use of savings promotion raffle products by financial institutions to encourage savings, and for other purposes; 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. LAMBORN (for himself, Ms. DEGETTE, Mr. POLIS, Mr. TIPTON, Mr. GARDNER, Mr. COFFMAN, and Mr. PERLMUTTER):

H.R. 3375. A bill to designate the community-based outpatient clinic of the Department of Veterans Affairs to be constructed at 3141 Centennial Boulevard, Colorado Springs, Colorado, as the "PFC Floyd K. Lindstrom Department of Veterans Affairs Clinic"; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. LONG (for himself, Mr. MEEHAN, Mr. CALVERT, and Mr. BACHUS):

H.R. 3376. A bill to provide a 12-month exemption from the health insurance mandate for individuals whose employer-sponsored health plan coverage or individual health insurance coverage is terminated for a plan year beginning during 2014, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. THORNBERRY:

H.R. 3377. A bill to clarify the definition of navigable waters, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. WELCH (for himself and Mr. GIBBS):

H.R. 3378. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to extend the nonbusiness energy property credit to include the insulation component of insulated siding; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. YOUNG of Alaska:

H.R. 3379. A bill to amend title 14, United States Code, to authorize the Commandant of the Coast Guard to lease tidelands and submerged lands under the control of the Coast Guard for periods longer than 5 years; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. BECERRA:

H. Res. 393. A resolution electing a Member to a certain standing committee of the House of Representatives; considered and agreed to.

By Ms. BASS (for herself, Mr. ROYCE, Mr. ENGEL, and Mr. SMITH of New Jersey):

H. Res. 394. A resolution condemning the September 2013 terrorist attack at the Westgate Mall in Nairobi, Kenya, and reaffirming United States support for the people and Government of Kenya, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

## CONSTITUTIONAL AUTHORITY STATEMENT

Pursuant to clause 7 of rule XII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the following statements are submitted regarding the specific powers granted to Congress in the Constitution to enact the accompanying bill or joint resolution.

By Mr. SENSENBRENNER:

H.R. 3361.

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

Article I, section 8, clause 3 and Article I, section 8, clause 18

By Mr. TERRY:

H.R. 3362.

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

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 of the United States Constitution. (Commerce Clause)

By Mr. POMPEO:

H.R. 3363.

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

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3

By Mr. STIVERS:

H.R. 3364.

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

Article I, Section 8, Clause 12 of the United States Constitution

By Mr. WALBERG:

H.R. 3365.

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

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1

The Congress shall have power to lay and collect taxes, duties, imposts and excises, to pay the debts and provide for the common defense and general welfare of the United States; but all duties, imposts and excises shall be uniform throughout the United States;

By Mr. WALDEN:

H.R. 3366.

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

Article IV, Section 3, Clause 2 (relating to the power of Congress to dispose of and make all needful rules and regulations respecting the territory or other property belonging to the United States).

By Mr. BOUSTANY:

H.R. 3367.

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

Article I

By Mr. BRALEY of Iowa:

H.R. 3368.

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

This bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article I, Section 8, Clause 18 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. COSTA:

H.R. 3369.

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

Clause 18 of Section 8 of Article I of the Constitution

By Mr. GRIMM:

H.R. 3370.

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

Article I, section 8, clause 1; and Article I, section 8, clause 3

By Mr. HINOJOSA:

H.R. 3371.

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

This bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article I, Section 8, Clauses 1 and 3 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. HONDA:

H.R. 3372.

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

Section 8 of article I of the Constitution.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio:

H.R. 3373.

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

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. KILMER:

H.R. 3374.

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

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1: "The Congress shall have Power to lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts and Excises, to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defense and general Welfare of the United States; but all Duties, Imposts and Excises shall be uniform throughout the United States."

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3: "To regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes."

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18: "To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof."

By Mr. LAMBORN:

H.R. 3375.

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

Article I, Section 8 of the U.S. Constitution.

By Mr. LONG:

H.R. 3376.

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, Clause 1 of Section 8 of Article I of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. THORNBERRY:

H.R. 3377.

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

This bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. WELCH:

H.R. 3378.

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

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 18: The Congress shall have Power To . . . make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Con-

stitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.

By Mr. YOUNG of Alaska:

H.R. 3379.

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

Article IV, Section 3, Clause 2 and Article 1, Section 8, Clause 1.

#### ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

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

H.R. 15: Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN and Mr. TIERNEY.

H.R. 241: Mr. HULTGREN.

H.R. 351: Mr. AMODEI, Mr. MARINO, Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania, Mr. FARENTHOLD, Mr. RUNYAN, Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. GRAVES of Missouri, Mr. SCHWEIKERT, and Mr. COBLE.

H.R. 366: Mr. ROONEY, Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York, and Mr. YODER.

H.R. 411: Mr. COHEN.

H.R. 455: Ms. BROWN of Florida, Mr. BISHOP of New York, and Mr. SMITH of Washington.

H.R. 495: Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania.

H.R. 543: Mr. COHEN.

H.R. 556: Mr. SESSIONS.

H.R. 562: Mr. MCGOVERN.

H.R. 611: Mr. COHEN.

H.R. 721: Mr. FOSTER and Mr. QUIGLEY.

H.R. 724: Mr. YODER.

H.R. 736: Mr. DEFazio.

H.R. 778: Mr. CRENSHAW.

H.R. 961: Mr. KILDEE.

H.R. 1020: Mr. RANGEL and Mr. RUSH.

H.R. 1030: Mr. SABLAN.

H.R. 1108: Mr. NOLAN.

H.R. 1129: Ms. KUSTER.

H.R. 1146: Mr. JOYCE.

H.R. 1186: Mr. MARCHANT.

H.R. 1201: Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania and Ms. SHEA-PORTER.

H.R. 1339: Mr. GUTHRIE and Mr. GIBSON.

H.R. 1354: Mr. FOSTER and Mr. COTTON.

H.R. 1507: Mr. HONDA.

H.R. 1508: Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. BUCHANAN, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Ms. BROWN of Florida, Mr. HIGGINS, Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York, Mr. POLIS, Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee, Ms. SEWELL of Alabama, Ms. CLARKE, and Mr. FATTAH.

H.R. 1518: Mrs. ELLMERS, Mr. DIAZ-BALART, Mr. COLLINS of New York, Mr. YODER, Mr. BARLETTA, and Mr. MAFFEI.

H.R. 1690: Ms. KELLY of Illinois.

H.R. 1692: Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York and Mr. KEATING.

H.R. 1694: Mr. HINOJOSA.

H.R. 1708: Mr. STIVERS.

H.R. 1726: Mr. YOUNG of Alaska and Mr. VAN HOLLEN.

H.R. 1767: Mrs. BEATTY, Mr. LANGEVIN, Mr. GRIJALVA, Ms. NORTON, Ms. SPEIER, Mr. GUTIÉRREZ, Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Mr. RANGEL, and Mr. CÁRDENAS.

H.R. 1770: Mr. GALLEGO.

H.R. 1771: Mr. YODER.

H.R. 1801: Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York.

H.R. 1814: Ms. DELBENE, Mr. COLLINS of New York, Mr. PETERS of Michigan, and Mr. TIPTON.

H.R. 1827: Mr. HECK of Washington.

H.R. 1832: Mr. ISRAEL, Ms. MOORE, Mr. HUFFMAN, Mr. CARTER, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Mrs. KIRKPATRICK, and Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania.

H.R. 1920: Mr. RUSH.

H.R. 1921: Ms. EDWARDS and Mr. HONDA.

H.R. 1975: Mr. ISRAEL, Mr. GRAYSON, Mr. HONDA, and Mr. LIPINSKI.

H.R. 1992: Mr. YOHO.

H.R. 1998: Ms. MENG.

H.R. 2001: Ms. ESTY, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio, Mr. CARTWRIGHT, Ms. SINEMA, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. O'ROURKE, and Mr. CALVERT.

H.R. 2066: Mr. WITTMAN.

H.R. 2144: Ms. BONAMICI.

H.R. 2250: Mr. CRAMER.

H.R. 2424: Mr. CICILLINE.

H.R. 2429: Mr. HECK of Nevada and Mr. JOYCE.

H.R. 2485: Ms. KELLY of Illinois.

H.R. 2504: Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. COHEN, Mr. CONNOLLY, and Mr. MCINTYRE.

H.R. 2590: Mr. GARCIA.

H.R. 2663: Mr. DUFFY.

H.R. 2726: Mr. VALADAO.

H.R. 2734: Ms. HANABUSA, Mr. MCDERMOTT, and Mr. MORAN.

H.R. 2744: Mr. DOGGETT.

H.R. 2767: Mr. BURGESS, Mr. AMASH, Mr. WEBER of Texas, Mr. GOWDY, Mr. KING of Iowa, and Mr. STEWART.

H.R. 2780: Ms. DELBENE, Ms. PINGREE of Maine, Mr. SIREs, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. POCAN, and Ms. BROWNLEY of California.

H.R. 2810: Mr. BERA of California.

H.R. 2866: Mr. SCALISE, Mr. HOLDING, Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, Mr. BOUSTANY, Mr. ROGERS of Alabama, Mr. PETRI, Mr. GUTHRIE, Mr. CRAMER, Mr. POMPEO, Mr. KINGSTON, Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina, Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, Mrs. CAPITO, Mr. POE of Texas, Mr. OLSON, Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee, Mr. GRIFFIN of Arkansas, Mr. GINGREY of Georgia, Mr. GOODLATTE, Mr. DAINES, Mrs. LUMMIS, Mr. PAULSEN, Mr. COFFMAN, Mrs. WALORSKI, Mr. GARDNER, Mr. BENISHEK, Mr. RIGELL, Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. REED, Mr. JOYCE, Mr. VALADAO, and Mr. FITZPATRICK.

H.R. 2894: Mr. GIBSON.

H.R. 2909: Mr. KEATING, Mr. DINGELL, Mr. LOEBSACK, Mr. TONKO, Mr. ELLISON, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. GARAMENDI, Ms. PINGREE of Maine, Mr. OWENS, and Mr. VELA.

H.R. 2932: Mrs. KIRKPATRICK.

H.R. 2997: Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana.

H.R. 2998: Mr. HECK of Washington and Mr. DEFazio.

H.R. 3077: Mr. TERRY.

H.R. 3111: Mr. BISHOP of New York and Mr. LATTA.

H.R. 3121: Mr. MCHENRY.

H.R. 3154: Mr. GOODLATTE.

H.R. 3172: Mr. POLLS, Ms. LEE of California, and Ms. CLARKE.

H.R. 3186: Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia and Mr. TIBERI.

H.R. 3196: Mr. DINGELL.

H.R. 3279: Mr. NEUGEBAUER and Mr. KING of New York.

H.R. 3286: Mr. PASTOR of Arizona.

H.R. 3292: Mr. PRICE of Georgia, Mr. ROE of Tennessee, Mr. MILLER of Florida, Mr. FLEMING, Mr. WALBERG, Mr. PITTS, Mr. MESSER, Mr. CRAMER, Mr. GOSAR, Mr. BROOKS of Alabama, Mr. BENTIVOLIO, Mr. NEUGEBAUER, and Mrs. BACHMANN.

H.R. 3309: Mr. CHABOT, Ms. MCCOLLUM, and Mr. HUFFMAN.

H.R. 3311: Mr. CHAFFETZ, Mr. DAINES, Mr. GOSAR, Mr. MCCLINTOCK, Mr. COFFMAN, and Mr. BISHOP of Utah.

H.R. 3319: Mr. CULBERSON and Mr. PRICE of Georgia.

H.R. 3333: Mr. VARGAS, Ms. CHU, and Mr. SCHIFF.

H.R. 3336: Mr. POLIS.

H.R. 3349: Mr. ISSA.

H.R. 3350: Mr. PRICE of Georgia, Mrs. LUMMIS, Mr. HARRIS, Mr. KINGSTON, Mr. ROKITA, Mrs. WALORSKI, Mr. FITZPATRICK, Mr. LATHAM, Mr. HULTGREN, Mr. POSEY, Mr. BENISHEK, Mr. BUCSHON, Mr. NUNNELEE, Mr.

October 29, 2013

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD—HOUSE

H6903

BUCHANAN, Mr. ROE of Tennessee, Mrs. CAPITO, Mr. FLORES, Mr. MEEHAN, Mr. YODER, Mr. WEBSTER of Florida, Mr. HENSARLING, Mr. HUIZENGA of Michigan, Mr. MCHENRY, Mr. WALBERG, Mr. WOMACK, and Mrs. MILLER of Michigan.

H.R. 3358: Mr. CHABOT.

H.R. 3359: Mr. WENSTRUP, Mr. BENTIVOLIO, Mr. WALBERG, Mrs. BACHMANN, Mr. SALMON, and Mr. WEBER of Texas.  
H. Con. Res. 60: Ms. ESTY.  
H. Con. Res. 61: Mr. PETERS of Michigan.  
H. Res. 30: Mr. KILDEE.  
H. Res. 75: Mr. GRIFFIN of Arkansas.  
H. Res. 110: Mr. YOUNG of Indiana.

H. Res. 131: Ms. KELLY of Illinois.

H. Res. 302: Ms. BASS.

H. Res. 327: Mr. WOLF, Mr. COLLINS of New York, Mr. HUELSKAMP, and Mr. BROUN of Georgia.

H. Res. 359: Mr. TIPTON and Mr. COLLINS of New York.