

Afghanistan. Let me now say something about our returning veterans.

The unemployment rate for returning veterans under the age of 24 is an unacceptably high rate of 38 percent. A good and grateful Nation owes it to these veterans to ensure that they return home to economic opportunity.

The Department of Defense sponsored a program back in 2002 called Helmets to Hardhats to accelerate apprenticeship training and job placement for these returning veterans. Helmets to Hardhats is now a nonprofit organization working with 15 construction trades and over 80,000 American businesses.

Mr. Speaker, it is the right time to make a robust investment to repair our outdated and failing infrastructure. There's a lot of work to be done, and a lot of Americans need to be put to work.

### BULLYING

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

Mr. COBLE. Mr. Speaker, last Saturday evening, I was watching the weekly Fox television program entitled "Huckabee." Bullying was the featured issue.

Mr. Speaker, bullying has become a severely significant issue in some schools across our country.

Bullies, with limited exception, select their targets or victims in this manner: the victims are smaller in physical stature than are the bullies and are usually younger in years.

The victims of bullying become depressed and embarrassed, resulting in physical and emotional damage. One young lad became so distraught that he died by his own hand. Yes, he took his own life because of the damage that bullying had inflicted upon him.

The "Huckabee" program, in addition to having interviewed a bullying victim and his family, featured as well the director of the recently released movie entitled "Bully." I urge you all to see this movie.

Mr. Speaker, I want to insist that bullies are punished at their schools by their parents and are prosecuted as juveniles if they are still minors.

We should cut no slack to bullies. They deserve no slack. If exposure could link the bullies to the aforementioned suicide, perhaps that should be pursued as well.

Mr. Speaker, this bullying plague must be resolved, but it will be resolved only when the bullies receive the punishment they deserve.

### PUERTO RICO SNAP RESTORATION ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Puerto Rico (Mr. PIERLUISI) for 5 minutes.

Mr. PIERLUISI. Mr. Speaker, today I'm introducing the Puerto Rico SNAP Restoration Act.

In 1971, Congress enacted legislation to partially include Puerto Rico in what is today called the Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program, or SNAP, and what was then called the Food Stamp program.

□ 1010

Implementation of the Food Stamp program in Puerto Rico began in 1974. In 1977, Congress amended Federal law to fully include Puerto Rico in the Food Stamp program so that rules governing eligibility and benefits applied no differently on the island than they did in the 50 States. Four years later, however, Congress exercised its authority under the Territory Clause and removed Puerto Rico from the Food Stamp program, electing to provide the island government with an annual block grant instead. Since 1982, Puerto Rico has used this block grant to administer its Nutrition Assistance Program, which differs from SNAP in a number of material respects.

The bill I'm introducing today, which I will seek to include in the 2012 farm bill, would reinstate the SNAP program in Puerto Rico in place of the block grant.

If this bill is enacted into law, Puerto Rico would join the 50 States, the District of Columbia and two U.S. territories—Guam and the U.S. Virgin Islands—as jurisdictions fully participating in SNAP. My decision to file legislation converting Puerto Rico back to SNAP was made after carefully weighing the benefits and costs associated with this conversion. I relied primarily upon an in-depth study prepared by the USDA which evaluated the feasibility and impact of reinstating SNAP in Puerto Rico. On this subject, as with other important issues that I'm tackling, I have adhered to the principle that it is essential to build a strong evidentiary record prior to taking legislative action.

The USDA report is comprehensive and raises a number of important policy questions, but its bottom-line message for Puerto Rico is crystal clear, namely, while there are some trade-offs associated with the conversion to SNAP, the benefits of conversion far outweigh the costs.

Let me be more specific. Applying certain assumptions, the USDA study found that conversion would increase the number of households that receive nutrition assistance in Puerto Rico by over 15 percent. An additional 85,000 households would become eligible for assistance under SNAP. Moreover, restoring SNAP would raise the average monthly benefit by participating households by nearly 10 percent. And instituting equal treatment for Puerto Rico under SNAP would mean an additional \$457 million in Federal spending for the island each year, over 90 percent of which would take the form of additional benefits.

These numbers reveal a fundamental truth: because Congress removed Puerto Rico from SNAP 20 years ago, hun-

dreds of thousands of needy children, families, and seniors on the island have received no nutrition assistance at all or have received far fewer benefits than they would have received if they lived in the 50 States or even in the neighboring Virgin Islands.

Accordingly, Puerto Rico's exclusion from this program serves as yet another example of how the American citizens I represent, especially my most vulnerable constituents, are treated unequally because of the island's territory status.

Whether I'm fighting to convert Puerto Rico back to SNAP or to increase the island's annual block grant, I strongly believe this is a fight worth making. By ensuring that the neediest of my constituents can afford a healthy diet, we enable them to lead a dignified and independent life, which in the long run helps reduce health care costs and takes pressure off other safety net programs.

### THE RYAN BUDGET AND THE INDIVIDUAL MANDATE

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

Mr. NUNNELEE. Mr. Speaker, this is an important week for the future of our Republic. In this Capitol, we are debating and voting on budgets, laying out our visions for how we should handle the spending, taxing, and debt issues facing America in the coming years. Across the street at the Supreme Court, they're debating what, if any, limits can be placed on the Federal Government's power to regulate under the Commerce Clause of our Constitution.

But, really, we're talking about the same thing: Do we still live under a Federal Government of limited and enumerated powers? Do we believe that the source of our government begins in "We the people"? Do we believe in liberty? Do we trust people to make their own decisions about their own lives without reliance on, or subservience to, an all-knowing and all-powerful central government in Washington? Are there limits on what Washington can demand of the citizens that it's supposed to be serving? Republicans believe that the answer to these questions is a resounding "yes."

The budget put forth by Chairman RYAN and the Budget Committee shows that it is possible for this Congress to offer solutions to the challenges of the modern world that are rooted in limited government, individual freedom, and the Constitution. It is our responsibility to govern and to offer the people an alternative to the do-nothing attitude of the Senate Democrat leadership or the business-as-usual, tax-spend-and-borrow budget offered by the President.

The arguments being made by the plaintiffs against the individual mandate are that the Constitution is not

dead, that at least one party in Washington and a majority of the country still believe that the Constitution means what it says, and that there are limits on the power of Congress and of the executive branch.

I'm energized and hopeful for the future of this great Republic as I see these events unfold this week, and I'm reminded of the observation of President Reagan:

I hope we once again have reminded people that man is not free unless government is limited. There's a clear cause and effect here that is as neat and predictable as a law of physics: as government expands, liberty contracts.

#### THE HOUSE REPUBLICAN BUDGET

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

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, today the clock is ticking here in Congress and especially on the floor of the House where people around the country would like to be preparing for the next construction season. Indeed, the most important action for the economy, for job creation, and for strengthening the livability of our communities might well be enacting the Surface Transportation Act. Sadly, so far, the news has not been good.

Later today, we debate the House Republican budget, which would slash infrastructure funding to a level less than is required simply to meet obligations for contracts that we've already entered into with people that are building roads, bridges, and transit systems. And we have an obligation to them. They're down that path and the budget sadly would not even allow the Federal Government to meet its partnership obligation.

There's more bad news as we see the Republican leadership can't come to grips with what would be required to move the transportation authorization bill forward. Last month, they offered up what has been characterized as the worst transportation bill in history. It was partisan, and it was unbalanced. It would have overturned two decades of transportation reform, undercut transit and the vital enhancement programs that communities have used to improve the quality of life and stretch their transportation resources. It even attacked bike and pedestrian programs, eliminating Safe Routes to School for our children.

Well, luckily, it collapsed under its own weight. They were afraid to even have a hearing on it before it came to the floor, and then they found out that there wasn't an opportunity to pass it. The support wasn't there in the face of united opposition around the country from people who care about transportation. At the same time, the Senate has given us a balanced and bipartisan bill. Seventy-four Members of the other body voted for it and passed it over to us.

I would hope that there is time for us to stop playing partisan ideological games with this vital transportation bill. The headlines that the Republican maneuvering has done is an embarrassment to Speaker BOEHNER and to Chairman MICA. But not just to the Republican leadership; it's an embarrassment to the House.

□ 1020

I'm sorry that my Republican friends and colleagues can't seem to agree amongst themselves about a path forward. They cannot get 218 Republican votes for any bill, even the Speaker's proposal. The good news is they don't have to. There are 435 Members of the House. If they would work in a bipartisan basis, as we have done in the past, we can stop this short-term roulette; we can give the construction industry, local government, and people in the private and public sector the certainty they need for not just this construction cycle, but the next construction cycle. We can put tens of thousands of people to work, bolster the economy, and do what Congress needs to do, what Congress has done always until this point.

I hope the Republican leadership, before we leave this week, will at least allow the bipartisan Senate bill to come to the floor to be voted on. I'm confident that a majority will support it, and we'll meet our obligations to keep America moving and the economy growing.

#### ALL-OF-THE-ABOVE ENERGY

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

Mr. WESTMORELAND. Mr. Speaker, all-of-the-above energy. It's a plan first introduced by House Republicans when gas prices spiked during the summer of 2008. For the 2 years prior, congressional Democrats were following a green energy plan only, doing their best to completely eliminate the traditional forms of energy like petroleum, natural gas, and coal that account for 83 percent of our energy consumption.

When President Obama took office in 2009, he took up their flag and began pushing for his controversial cap-and-trade law that even he admitted would mean electricity rates would necessarily skyrocket. He appointed an Energy Secretary that admitted on national TV that he wanted our gas prices at European levels. Well, they're both on their way. Since then, energy costs have doubled, gas prices have skyrocketed, and we are in a crisis in this country when it comes to our energy use.

Just as we saw in the summer of 2008, when these gasoline prices spiked and our energy costs rose, the price of everything else is soon to follow. When his cap-and-trade bill failed to get enough support in a Democratic-controlled Congress, he set out to have the

EPA basically regulate the bill into law.

Over the last 3 years, the EPA has issued some of the most costly regulations on power plants in their history. By 2016, the Utility MACT regulation is expected to cost \$9.6 billion annually in direct costs, and some analysts estimate its total indirect costs closer to \$100 billion. The Cross-State Air Pollution Rule is expected to impact over 1,000 power plants across the country, and, by the EPA's own estimates, it's estimated to cost \$2.8 billion annually.

With no business experience in this administration, I don't think they realize that when the cost of doing business goes up, business prices go up; and that affects every hardworking American taxpayer at the pump. When he turns on a light at home, when he buys a loaf of bread, when he goes to buy a U.S.-manufactured product, it costs.

According to the President's own Commerce Department, the Boiler MACT regulation in itself is expected to cost between 40,000 and 60,000 jobs. The impact of these regulations is already being felt. Last month, two utility companies announced the closing of 10 of their power plants as a direct result of some of the strict new regulations—another move that will raise the price of electricity for consumers.

Yet it seemed as though the President had finally come around when he said in his State of the Union speech earlier this year, right here in this room: This country needs an all-out all-of-the-above energy strategy that develops every available resource of American energy.

It's not often that I agree with the President, but at that point I did.

Unfortunately, the President hasn't stayed true to his words. In fact, just yesterday the EPA announced their latest set of regulations that will effectively ban the building of any new coal-fired power plants by dramatically decreasing carbon dioxide emissions.

Whether the President and environmentalists like it or not, coal currently accounts for almost half of the electricity generated in this country. Effectively eliminating coal-fired power plants is only going to increase the cost of electricity to American families.

We can no longer allow the White House to say one thing and do another when it comes to energy. If the President truly supports the Republican all-of-the-above energy strategy as he claimed he did, then he needs to follow through.

It's time we start to take advantage of all of the God-given natural resources this country has and to have American-made energy, American-made power that will power this Nation.

#### U.S.-AFGHANISTAN POLICY IN SHAMBLES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from