

ultimately have to be paid for. The Fed softened the recession by its decisive actions during the panic of 2008. But the marginal benefits of its subsequent policy have almost certainly been small. We may find the policies that had little positive impact on the recovery today will have high costs, indeed, when they must be reversed in a full-blown expansion.

There's not a man or woman in this country, Mr. Speaker, who's registered to vote who's not thinking about their tax bill, who's not thinking about the economy, who's not thinking about job creation, and who's not going to go to the polls and vote accordingly. Mr. Speaker, I encourage you to encourage your constituents, as I'm going to encourage mine, don't just think about tax policy. Think about monetary policy. What we're doing here in Washington to cut budgets, that's what we'll call fiscal policy. What the Federal Reserve is doing with its balance sheet and with interest rate, that's going to be monetary policy. And it makes a difference. The decisions we make today have to be paid for tomorrow. Perhaps it's the right thing to do today, but if it happens in secret, if it happens unbeknownst to the American taxpayer, the American job creator, the American jobholder, who will ultimately have to foot that bill, then it's not the right course of action for America.

Let's have this debate. Let's talk about it in the light of day. And let's make that decision, Mr. Speaker. Balance those costs and those benefits and do what we know will be best for the American family for another generation to come.

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

#### NANNY-STATE GOVERNMENT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 5, 2011, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. KING) for 30 minutes.

Mr. KING of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, it is my honor and privilege to address you here on the floor of the United States House of Representatives and take up some of the issues that I think are so important to the dialogue before us here and the American people to consider as they listen to our discussion.

A number of things weigh on me as I come to the floor tonight. And one of them is something that I think is emerging in the consciousness of the American people, Mr. Speaker, in a way that really wasn't there before this administration took office, and that is the massive growth of the nanny state here in the United States of America.

We've watched as regulation after regulation have crept in on our regular lives, and some of the things that I've spoken about with you in the past fall down along those lines. For example, the curlicue light bulb. The idea that the Federal Government could ban our 100-watt light bulbs and prohibit us

from buying our patriotic Edison light bulbs and require us instead to substitute for those curlicue mercury-laden light bulbs.

Now I'll point out, Mr. Speaker, that I have a good number of those—I'll call them modern—light bulbs in my house. I put them where they make sense. And where they don't make sense, I put in the patriotic Edison bulbs. If I need quick light to walk into a room for just a minute, I want to have an Edison bulb there, not a curlicue, so it lights up right away. I can shut it off right away. It's not on much. It doesn't cost much electricity. If I'm going to have a bulb that's going to be on for quite a long time, then I want to have the energy-efficient bulb. That's a simple decision that a consumer can make—and especially a well-informed consumer. But when you end up with a one-size-fits-all that comes from the Federal Government, you end up with a lot of bad decisions so that it all fits into one formula. That's the light bulb.

Another one is shower heads. Several months ago, the Federal Government fined three companies for selling shower heads that let too much water out. Think of that. Too much water. One size fits all. The water supply in let's say Buffalo, up by Niagara, is different than the water in someplace like Tucson; different than someplace like New Orleans or Florida or Iowa. And so we have one-size-fits-all on shower heads. And here's the brilliant presumption on the part of the nanny state Federal Government: the conclusion that in all cases water is going to be more valuable than time. So people can stand under that shower head and wait for their feet to get wet because over the broad calculation of 300 million people you will save some gallons of water that are more valuable to the mind of the nanny state—certainly, more valuable in the mind of the nanny state—than the time that it takes for someone to stand there and wait to get wet.

Here's another one. The 55-mile-an-hour speed limit that was imposed a long time ago in this country under the belief that if we all drove 55 miles an hour we would save gas and that would help our energy independence and keep us less dependent upon foreign oil. So the Federal Government dialed the speed limit down to the "double nickle," as we called it, and everybody in the country drove 55 for a long time, even on the interstates, with the misguided idea that gas was always worth more than time.

So one day, Mr. Speaker, I was driving down the road in Iowa at 55 miles an hour and I came through this intersection on a county road and I could look in my mirror and see a mile in my mirror, not a car in sight. A lot of cornfields. Looked right, looked left. I could see a mile in either direction. I could see a mile ahead of me. I could cover 4 miles of road by looking out three windows and into a mirror.

And there I am driving down the road looking at cornfields, which I love to

look at, at 55 miles an hour. I thought, Why am I doing this? Well, it must be the nanny state that has imposed this on me. And I picked up my phone and called—now there's a law against that in the nanny state—but I called my secretary in one of our offices and said, I want to know how many passenger miles are traveled on the rural roads in Iowa each year. Can you get me that number? She came back to me a little later and said, I can't give you the passenger miles but I can give you the vehicle miles on rural roads.

So I did one of those little calculations on my calculator that works out like this: if we all drove 65 miles an hour instead of 55 miles an hour, that's 10 miles an hour faster. You calculate how much sooner you arrive at your destination by driving 10 miles an hour faster.

□ 2020

Then you calculate that each one of us on the day we were born was granted the actuarial number—at that time I figured it at 76 years—when you figure those hours that you have in your lifetime at 76 years and then you figure out how many hours you spend unnecessarily looking out the windshield at 55 miles an hour, and you calculate the lifespan, and you divide it into the time saved and the miles that are traveled on rural roads in Iowa each year. And it came down to this: that if we drive 65 instead of 55, we will have saved 79.64 lifetimes of living, in other words, getting to our destination, doing something productive. That has value too.

That calculation wasn't made by the nanny state. The nanny state only calculated gas is always worth more than time.

Not so in Germany where people get out on the Autobahn and drive as fast in some locations as they have the nerve to drive under the idea that you get them out on the highway, you get them off the highway, you get them out of the way where they're not going to be congesting traffic, and you get people engaged in doing their regular living in life.

That's the speed limit, the shower nozzles, the curlicue light bulbs, all examples of the nanny state.

But, Mr. Speaker, the examples of the nanny state have surpassed the imagination of almost every one of us that has common sense.

When I look at what has come out of the U.S. Department of Agriculture, for example, the rule that cooperated with the Department of Labor, worked in conjunction with the Department of Labor, and I asked this question under oath of one of the Under Secretaries of the Department of Labor before the Small Business Committee, did the U.S. Department of Agriculture work in cooperation with the Department of Labor to produce these rules that would regulate farm youth labor? The answer was, yes, they worked in cooperation with the Department of Agriculture.

Ag is supposed to know about what goes on in farm families. So Ag worked with Labor and produced rules that said to parents you can no longer control your own children or manage your own children or entrust them to go to work for the neighbors even if those neighbors are aunts or uncles or grandparents of these children.

So they wrote the rule that would prohibit farm youth, other than those that are working right there on a family farm for their parents, outside of that zone, farm youth were prohibited under the rule from being more than 6 feet off the ground so they could go out and climb a tree, but they couldn't go out there and get up on a scaffold and paint the undereaves of the machine shed, for example.

They were prohibited from being engaged in any kind of herding of livestock in a confinement. So they couldn't walk into a hog building, for example, and have any engagement there. They couldn't herd livestock even outdoors from horseback or from any motorized vehicle.

So you'd say to kids, you can't ride horses out here if it has anything to do with what's work. You might be able to do it recreationally, but not with work.

I remember a rule coming at me from a convenience store several years ago, and all they wanted to do was just sell sandwiches and pizza and gas and do those things that come out of a regular convenience store.

The Department of Labor went into the community and interviewed the high school students that were working there, learning a good work ethic, by the way, how to count change, how to hold up their end of the workload.

They interviewed them and they asked them questions. For example, Have you ever worked after 7 o'clock on a school night? One or two of them said, yes, once or twice, and there were two violations of working after 7 o'clock on a school night.

Then it was, Have you ever operated the pizza dough maker? Well, no. None of them had operated the pizza dough maker, but once or twice, one or two of them said, yes, I washed the pizza dough maker, but I didn't operate it.

These kinds of silly things came out of the Department of Labor, and they levied a significant fine against this good family convenience store operation because they alleged that these youth had violated the rule on working past 7 o'clock on a school night and that they had not operated the pizza dough maker, but they had washed it. That little egg beater inside there that turns, they had washed that. That was too much of a risk for a 15-year-old to have their hands on something like that, surely.

So they concluded that the rule reads: operator otherwise use. So washing the pizza dough maker turned into "otherwise use," and levy a fine against this family operation.

Why would anybody stay in business if they had the nanny state gestapo

hunting down their employees, interviewing them in their home, these kids that don't have any idea why the Federal Government's sticking their nose into something like this, a completely safe and harmless operation regulated by the Department of Labor when we've got all kinds of laws that can't be enforced and aren't enforced. We've got people doing that.

Or here's another thing that is idiocy on the part of our child labor laws and that is that a 17-year-old young man cannot get on the lawnmower and cut the grass around the gas station if he's working for somebody else. Violates the rule. But he can get in a car that runs 120 miles an hour and turn the radio up and put his girlfriend over there next to him and drive down the road with one hand, talking and laughing. I didn't say he was driving 120, I might point out, for those people who are willfully ignorant, Mr. Speaker, a car that has the capability of going that fast. We'd hand that vehicle over to somebody that's that age, but they can't run the lawnmower. This is going on just constantly.

But the USDA farm labor piece of this thing has gone way too far. And I know they just withdrew the rule, not because they changed their mind, but because there's a political liability involved. I want to keep turning up that political liability so they don't get any more crazy ideas out of that place.

But to pass a rule that farm youth can't be over 6 feet off the ground, that they can't herd livestock in confinement, that they can't herd livestock from horseback or from the seat of any motorized four-wheeler quad, that we would call it, that's all banned specifically by this rule. Right down to the point where HSUS must have been in the room writing these rules, because they also wrote rules that the youth cannot be around anything to do with livestock that inflicts pain upon the livestock.

Now, there are a number of things that happen that are painful to a newborn baby, I might add, Mr. Speaker, as well as to animals, that's for their best interest and best good, most of it.

But if a 15-year-old girl can go get her ears pierced without having any permission from her parents and presumably that inflicts pain upon those earlobes, I'm told it does, but that same girl who can opt into her own earpiercing cannot watch while a calf is being ear-tagged because the nanny state has decided that somehow that would damage her psyche to be around that operation.

This is nanny state run amok. It's a reach of the Federal Government into all of these aspects of our lives that's just so completely intolerable for a free people, and we need to push back, Mr. Speaker; and so we are pushing back on some of this.

But the one that stands out, I think, the most, it emanates from the First Lady, Michelle Obama. In the lame duck session in 2010, the discredited

Congress here and, I'll say, down the hallway in the Senate, passed a bill out of there. It's called the Healthy, Hunger-Free Kids Act, Mr. Speaker.

The Healthy, Hunger-Free Kids Act was written and passed to satisfy the wishes of the First Lady who had the Let's Move Initiative to get our youth in shape. Now, that on its face is okay, and it's probably pretty good that we inspire our youth to get some exercise. After all, that is a big part of the problem with overweight youth.

It's been well publicized that 30 percent of our youth are overweight. Now, I haven't gone back to question that number. It seems to be a number that's accepted. But if it could be a higher number, I think we'd probably hear that out of the White House.

Thirty percent of our youth are overweight, and there's your consensus number, true or not.

Clear back when Bob Gates was the Secretary of Defense under Barack Obama, Mr. Speaker, he made the statement that since 30 percent of our youth are overweight, it is a national security issue because we can't recruit enough troops to go through basic training and be able to keep them trained up into shape, to keep our Nation ready for whatever might threaten us because youth obesity was prohibiting our national security.

Now, that causes me to pause, Mr. Speaker, when the Secretary of Defense has all of these things to worry about, and you've got everything from missile defense to our ground troops and multiple places in the world where we have a presence and where we need a presence and threats all over the globe and the Secretary of Defense is making a political statement that 30 percent of our youth are overweight and national security is at stake, so therefore we need to do something to cut down on the weight of these kids.

So, I think how is it that we can't recruit enough people in our military, even if there are 30 percent that are overweight and the other 70 percent don't fill the ranks enough voluntarily. Wouldn't you go ahead and take somebody that's 5 or 10 or 15 or 20 or 50 pounds overweight, put them into basic training and just say you didn't make weight so you're still in basic training and we'll keep you in basic training until you do make weight?

□ 2030

That is not that complicated. How can a nation conclude that it's a national security issue, that we can't solve that problem.

You take an 18-year-old young man or woman, and if they're 30 percent overweight—and maybe that's 30 pounds overweight—it doesn't damage their skeletal system or their muscular system or their nervous system; it's just a matter of carrying too much weight around, and you shrink that down and they're good to go. If that wasn't the case, there wouldn't be so many healthy people around here that

formerly were obese. They turn themselves around, they get a good diet and exercise plan, they get slim—and a lot of them stay slim for life—and they live healthy and happy thereafter. And I'm glad to see that. That's what we should do. But we can't be a nation that throws up our hands and says America is in danger because we haven't addressed childhood obesity. That is over-hype.

I sat down with some food retailers shortly after Mrs. Obama brought her initiative to get people to lose weight in this country, and they said to me: We're going to take 1.5 trillion calories off the diets of our young people, and in doing so our goal is that they will lose weight and get back in shape. And so how are you going to do that? And their answer was: Well, there is this Power Bar that kids like, and it's 150 calories. We're going to reduce the calories in it down to 90. And then in the single-serving Dorito bags, we're going to take a couple of chips out of there, and then that way we're going to fool these kids into eating fewer calories because they must have a habit that they're going to only eat one Power Bar and they're only going to eat one single-serving bag of Doritos.

Mr. Speaker, it's pretty simple: These kids aren't overweight because there were too many calories in the Power Bar or one or two too many chips in the single-serving Dorito bag; they're overweight because they have a voracious appetite, and they don't exercise enough. You cannot fool them by giving them a 90-calorie Power Bar; they will eat two of them and consume not 150 calories but 180 calories. And you can't fool them by taking a couple of chips out of the Dorito bag. They'll just open another bag of Doritos. That's the reality of real life. And somehow we get this myopic vision out of the nanny state that there's a way to trick people into getting slimmer.

This gets so bad, Mr. Speaker, that in marking up the previous farm bill in 2007, usually they like to bring somebody in to call for more food stamps that's maybe suffering from malnutrition, or at least they've been hungry part of lives. They couldn't, apparently, find any witnesses like that any longer because the food stamps have been pushed out so hard in this country that they seem to be ubiquitously available. And so they brought in Janet Murguia, the president of La Raza—that's the organization "The Race." This was in March of 2007. She testified that one of the growing problems of obesity is that even though most people know where their next meal is coming from, they don't know where all their meals are coming from. Therefore, they tend to overeat, and when they overeat they become obese. So if we would just give them an unlimited amount of food stamps, then they wouldn't be so concerned about this food insecurity. They would eat less, lose weight, and all would be well with the world.

That is a bizarre thought, Mr. Speaker. I can't embrace that way of thinking. I didn't even know how to argue against it. It caught me so far off balance that people are overweight because they don't have enough food stamps, so we'll give them more food stamps and they will lose weight. I deal with this kind of irrational irrationality here in this Congress constantly. It's no wonder that people call for a voice of common sense in this place.

So, Mr. Speaker, that's the food stamp argument, the nanny state argument. But it takes me to the school lunch program. The school lunch program is out of control. It is this Healthy, Hunger-Free Kids Act, which is the First Lady's bill, that regulates the diet of every kid going to school in America. I went into lunch at Remsen-Union here this week to sit down with them. First I gave them a program on the Constitution—they were great, and I look forward to going back there, I hope. Good, good, young people.

When I finished up, I said, Now it's lunchtime. I'm going to go eat your lunch. And they said, oh, you're not going to really, are you? Sure, I did. I sat down. And not picking on their program, it's rationed by the United States Department of Agriculture. They did not have the authority granted to them specifically in the Healthy, Hunger-Free Kids Act to ration calories to our kids, but that's exactly what they've done, Mr. Speaker. They've reached into and grabbed an authority that didn't exist and decided to opt into rationing calories to our kids in all of these schools.

So for the first time in the history of this country—we've had nutrition standards, nutrition minimums; you don't give them less nutrition, you don't give them fewer calories than this standard—and that standard has been published, and it's well known among our school lunch program. But Michelle Obama's Healthy, Hunger-Free Kids Act, as interpreted by Secretary of Agriculture Tom Vilsack, sets caps on calories that kids can get to eat.

So, for example, a high school football player, a senior high school, for example, 250-pound lineman—growing, robust, active, working out every day—is rationed to 600 calories for breakfast, 850 calories for lunch. That's 1,450 calories. Now, if you give them another dose of, say, 800 calories for supper, you'll fall far short of the calories he needs to maintain his exercise level and his weight.

For me, I need 2,841 calories a day to maintain my weight. That's the formula, and that's also something in practice that I've measured and charted on a spread sheet; 2,841. If you put me on that diet, the ration that the Department of Agriculture is giving these kids, every 8 days, if I'm constricted to that diet—and that's granting 850 calories for a third meal of the day—I would lose a pound every 8 days. I'm past my growth spurt. They exer-

cise a lot more than I do—or at least they should. That's how misguided this is.

Same number of calories for a kindergartner as for a fifth-grader. I believe the minimum number is 550 calories. And so a 30-pound kindergartner—which would be a small one—versus a 120-pound fifth grader—which would be a large one—get the same amount of calories. Generally, a fifth-grader is twice as large as a kindergartner. They get the same amount of calories, and it's capped.

Another thing that is so bad about this, Mr. Speaker, is that the youth that come in that have the money can go ahead and buy extra food a la carte. So they'll go back, if they've got the money, and buy an extra hot dog and go back and fill themselves up. But these kids that are on free and reduced lunches don't have that money in their pocket, and they're sitting there watching their better-off friends go back for a whole second helping, or the second helpings that they like. It is stigmatizing these kids that are on free and reduced lunch. It should not be. It sets up the wrong scenario in our schools.

This Healthy, Hunger-Free Kids Act says this: The USDA has the right "to set nutritional standards for all foods regularly sold in schools during the school day, including vending machines, the a la carte lunch lines, and school stores."

That's what the bill says. The Department of Agriculture and Secretary Vilsack have decided they're going to cap the calories. It doesn't give the specific authority; they just decided they're going to cap the calories so that—now, here's the formula: 30 percent of kids are overweight by their estimate, so 100 percent of them go on a diet. That's the mentality of the nanny state, Mr. Speaker.

And where does this food come from? Agriculture, of course. We have been working to push a farm bill through this Congress for a long time. About a year ago last May, I and my staff and a number of others began putting together a bill. As we went out into the Ag community and asked them for their input on what they'd like to see and what changes in the bill, one thing that came back that stood out above all others is we need a good risk management program. That means crop insurance is the centerpiece of it. I set about to hold that together, and we did the research and laid the foundation. And so far we've held that crop insurance. I think, together pretty well, Mr. Speaker. But that's the crop insurance piece.

Many other pieces—the nutrition side of this. We've gone from 19 million people on food stamps to up now to 47 million people on food stamps. That, Mr. Speaker, is a number that creates expanded dependency in the country. The intention of the President and his party. An expanded dependency class votes more for them.

□ 2040

An independency class votes more for us guys. So they have pushed food stamps out into people. They've spent millions of dollars advertising food stamps so more people sign up on the SNAP program; and in doing so, they expand the dependency people, those that rely on government. That's been part of the mistake. We set about reforming that.

We have a tattoo parlor with a neon light that says we take EBT cards. So, food stamp money goes for tattoos.

We also have a fellow that bailed himself out of jail with his EBT card. They're being sold for cash and discounted.

That's some of the things that are going on. We need to tighten that up, and the House Ag Committee tightened it up. We tightened it up to reduce those dollars going in so that the people that should not be receiving the food stamps are less likely to get them, and that saved about \$16 billion out of the duration of this program, Mr. Speaker. That's one of the reforms in the farm bill.

Holding the risk management program together for agriculture and reducing the waste and the fraud and the corruption in food stamps was an important thing. That's what the House Ag Committee bill is about, Mr. Speaker, and I want to see it come to the floor, the committee product come to the floor. I'd like to see it come to the floor just under a closed rule. Let's vote it up or down and let's see where it goes. If it fails, it fails. Then we can go back to the drawing board. If we fail to try, that will be labeled a failure.

I came to this city this week to make that point over and over again, Mr. Speaker. We need to move a farm bill out of this House of Representatives. And I recognize that procedurally, at this point, as I stand here tonight, that is an impossibility under the rules of this House. So the best that we can hope for is to bring a farm bill to the floor as soon as we come back after the election.

I've asked the Speaker to do this. I've asked the majority to do this. I'm working closely in direct cooperation with the chairman of the Ag Committee, FRANK LUCAS of Oklahoma, who has done a stellar job on bringing a good bill out of committee and preparing it for floor action. He was an utter maestro in putting that bill together, and the work that was done by the chairman and many others, including Ranking Member PETERSON, Democrats and Republicans, resulted in a bill coming out of the Ag Committee that only had 11 "no" votes, and it was a bipartisan support for the bill. The opposition was also bipartisan, but it was only 11. So whatever the bar was, however high it was, we've cleared the bar.

We need to bring a bill to the floor. We need to provide that kind of stability and predictability to the ag community so that they can plan next year's crops and plan their lives.

What comes out of this House and out of this Congress and is signed by the President affects land prices, equipment purchases, land sales, farm rentals, the whole configuration, a lot of it is looking down on this farm bill.

So let's get it done. I'm looking for that full 100 percent commitment to bring the bill up to the floor when we come back. We've gotten a strong statement out of the Speaker that that's what will happen. I'm looking for reinforcement on that statement before we gavel out tomorrow, Mr. Speaker.

But it's essentially important to us that we know which direction we're going on agriculture. It isn't so critical, the policy standpoint, between now and December 31, but knowing, for planning purposes, is valuable. And if we get to, say, December 31 without a farm bill, then we do have a problem on our hands.

In the meantime, it's my strongest urging that we hear that kind of commitment from the Speaker and the other leadership, that we'll take this bill up and take it to the floor. It's a strong message now. I'd like to see it become a full commitment before we leave this House tomorrow afternoon to go back for our elections.

So, Mr. Speaker, I have vented myself to some degree. I think I've helped inform this body about the nanny state that threatens to subsume this God-given American liberty and issued my urging that we move a farm bill and that we get a commitment to do so when we come back in November.

I appreciate your attention and the work that we've done here together as Democrats and Republicans and how we've reflected the voice of the American people. After the election, I hope we get the kind of help in the Senate that we received in the House in 2010.

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

#### HOUSE BILLS APPROVED BY THE PRESIDENT

The President notified the Clerk of the House that on the following dates, he had approved and signed bills of the following titles:

June 29, 2012:

H.R. 6064. An Act to provide an extension of Federal-aid highway, highway safety, motor carrier safety, transit, and other programs funded out of the Highway Trust Fund pending enactment of a multiyear law reauthorizing such programs.

July 6, 2012:

H.R. 4348: An Act to authorize funds for Federal highways, highway safety programs, and transit programs, and for other purposes.

July 9, 2012:

H.R. 33. An Act to amend the Securities Act of 1933 to specify when certain securities issues in connection with church plans are treated as exempted securities for purposes of that Act.

H.R. 2297. An Act to promote the development of the Southwest waterfront in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes.

July 18, 2012:

H.R. 3902. An Act to amend the District of Columbia Home Rule Act to revise the tim-

ing of special elections for local office in the District of Columbia.

July 23, 2012:

H.R. 4155. An Act to direct the head of each Federal department and agency to treat relevant military training as sufficient to satisfy training or certification requirements for Federal licenses.

July 26, 2012:

H.R. 3001. An Act to award a Congressional Gold Medal to Raoul Wallenberg, in recognition of his achievements and heroic actions during the Holocaust.

July 30, 2012:

H.R. 205. An Act to amend the Act titled 'An Act to authorize the leasing of restricted Indian lands for public, religious, educational, recreational, residential, business, and other purposes requiring the grant of long-term leases', approved August 9, 1955, to provide for Indian tribes to enter into certain leases without prior express approval from the Secretary of the Interior, and for other purposes.

August 3, 2012:

H.R. 2527. An Act to require the Secretary of the Treasury to mint coins in recognition and celebration of the National Baseball Hall of Fame.

August 6, 2012:

H.R. 1627. An Act to amend title 38, United States Code, to furnish hospital care and medical services to veterans who were stationed at Camp Lejeune, North Carolina, while the water was contaminated at Camp Lejeune, to improve the provision of housing assistance to veterans and their families, and for other purposes.

August 7, 2012:

H.R. 5872. An Act to require the President to provide a report detailing the sequester required by the Budget Control Act of 2011 on January 2, 2013.

August 10, 2012:

H.R. 1369. An Act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 1021 Pennsylvania Avenue in Hartshorne, Oklahoma, as the "Warren Lindley Post Office".

H.R. 1560. An Act to amend the Ysleta del Sur Pueblo and Alabama and Coushatta Indian Tribes of Texas Restoration Act to allow the Yslets, del Sur Pueblo Tribe to determine blood quantum requirement for membership in that tribe.

H.R. 1905. An Act to strengthen Iran sanctions laws for the purpose of compelling Iran to abandon its pursuit of nuclear weapons and other threatening activities, and for other purposes.

H.R. 3276. An Act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 2810 East Hillsborough Avenue in Tampa, Florida, as the "Reverend Abe Brown Post Office Building".

H.R. 3412. An Act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 1421 Veterans Memorial Drive in Abbeville, Louisiana, as the "Sergeant Richard Franklin Abshire Post Office Building".

H.R. 3501. An Act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 125 Kerr Avenue in Rome City, Indiana, as the "SPC Nicholas Scott Hart Post Office".

H.R. 3772. An Act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 150 South Union Street in Canton, Mississippi, as the "First Sergeant Landres Cheeks Post Office Building".

H.R. 5986. An Act to amend the African Growth and Opportunity Act to extend the third-country fabric program and to add South Sudan to the list of countries eligible for designation under that Act, to make technical corrections to the Harmonized Tariff Schedule of the United States relating to the textile and apparel rules of origin for the Dominican Republic-Central America-United