

legacy of accomplishments that have made a greater America and are worthy of being celebrated in any month.

#### LET'S HELP AMERICAN WORKERS

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

Mr. PAULSEN. Mr. Speaker, 4 years ago, the American people were told that the President's new health care law would create 4 million new jobs. Well, it turns out supporters of the law were only off by 6 million, because yesterday the nonpartisan Congressional Budget Office revealed that over 2 million jobs will actually be lost under ObamaCare.

One problem is the law drastically changes the definition of full-time work to 30 hours per week. Because of this so-called "30-hour rule," millions of Americans working in education, small business, hospitality, retail, food service, and public safety are now having their hours and their wages cut by up to 25 percent. And this comes at a time when there are already 7.8 million Americans working part-time who want full-time work.

America's workers deserve better, and, thankfully, there is bipartisan support for the Save American Workers Act to restore a common understanding in America that full-time work is 40 hours. The bill passed the Ways and Means Committee and is headed for the floor.

Mr. Speaker, let's have some common sense and eliminate this onerous mandate so we can get people back to work.

□ 1845

#### LEGISLATION PROTECTING THE FOURTH AMENDMENT

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

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, yesterday in the Judiciary Committee, we had a very vigorous hearing and discussion on the questions of the National Security Agency and privacy for the American people. I have introduced H.R. 2434, the Civilian Contractors Engaged in Intelligence Activities Reduction Act, which has seen a large support from the White House and others about the importance of considering and looking at reduction of outsourcing of our intelligence activities and really bringing in-house the training and the expertise of those handling America's intelligence.

I introduced H.R. 2440, which is the FISA Court in the Sunshine Act, which I am very glad that part of it is in H.R. 3361, Uniting and Strengthening America By Fulfilling Rights and Ending Eavesdropping. This is the bill that deals with the mega trolling that has occurred under the NSA of business records.

What America wants is security but balanced with privacy and the respect for the Fourth Amendment, prohibiting unreasonable search and seizure. It is important for this Congress to come together in a bipartisan way to stand up and be on the American people's side so that we can secure them, secure the homeland, but we can also provide for their privacy.

#### CELEBRATING THE 80TH BIRTHDAY OF HENRY "HAMMERIN' HANK" AARON

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

Ms. FRANKEL of Florida. Mr. Speaker, Henry "Hank" Aaron is one of the great athletes to ever set foot on any field, renowned for breaking home run records and racial barriers.

With grit and natural talent, he became the home run king of baseball while playing at a time of ugly segregation, having to sleep in separate hotel rooms from his teammates and facing countless threats on his life.

On Saturday, a portrait of this extraordinary man I am proud to call my friend and neighbor will be unveiled at the National Portrait Gallery as friends and family join Hank and his wife, Billye, in celebration of his 80th birthday.

Cheers to you, Hammerin' Hank. Thank you for a lifetime of courage and inspiration.

#### THE AMERICAN HEART ASSOCIATION

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

Mrs. BEATTY. Mr. Speaker, I rise this evening in support and honor of the American Heart Association. Today, women, Democrats and Republicans, stood together in honor of the American Heart Association because we understand that cardiovascular disease is the number one killer for women.

The American Heart Association and Stroke Association asks us to wear red in support of educating and giving awareness to the American people. We asked all citizens this Friday, February 7, to wear red. Stand with us as we stand for educating and making our citizens aware of this killer disease.

#### HEROIN ABUSE

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

Mr. FOSTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to discuss the grave epidemic of heroin abuse. The media has shone a bright light on this issue this week, but for too many in my district, heroin abuse is all too common. The number of heroin deaths that we have seen in

the counties I represent has been staggering.

In Kane County, Illinois, there were 20 heroin-related deaths in 2013. In Will County, there were 35. DuPage County reported 46 heroin-related deaths, including one period last summer when 15 overdose deaths were reported in just 17 days.

Heroin abuse affects people of every race, income and education level. These are mothers and fathers, friends and neighbors.

Community leaders are working to fight back, and, yet, at the Federal level we have not only failed to increase our efforts to combat drug abuse, we have reduced resources. Funding for the Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration was cut by over \$210 million in 2013. The DEA's budget was cut by nearly \$120 million.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today because we cannot ignore this epidemic which is ravaging our country.

#### BURDENSOME EPA REGULATIONS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. PITTEMBERG). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2013, the gentlewoman from Missouri (Mrs. HARTZLER) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mrs. HARTZLER. 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 subject of my Special Order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mrs. HARTZLER. Mr. Speaker, today, back in Missouri, this frigid cold snap is really making life miserable for everyone. We have below-zero temperatures and wind chills and a lot of snow. In fact, a lot of children are home from school today, and it is on snowy days like this back in Missouri and across much of America that we really appreciate the ability to go to our thermostats and to turn up the temperature and be able to sit by a nice fire to keep warm. What we don't need is the government interfering in that. Safe, affordable and reliable energy is vital for all of us as Americans, and it is being threatened by the Environmental Protection Agency. They are increasing burdens and making our regulations more difficult and costly for hard-working taxpayers.

While I support commonsense regulations designed to protect my constituents and the environment, many of the EPA regulations have gone too far, threatening to raise electricity rates during these cold winter months and hurting markets designed to provide rural homes with proper heating systems.

County officials, farmers and city administrators, as well as moms and dads

all across Missouri who have to pay the electric bill every month, are constantly coming up to me with stories of the burdens that the EPA regulations have placed on their families, their businesses and their communities.

It is time for this to stop. It is time for the EPA to begin working with my constituents, with local officials and with State governments to bring commonsense, consensus-driven changes to the regulations instead of the typical, heavy-handed Washington bureaucracy. Many of these regulations are stifling small businesses and local communities, leading to slow economic growth, stagnant jobs and less opportunities for the next generations of Americans.

So, today, my colleagues and I would like to outline some of the most egregious EPA regulations and offer commonsense solutions to fix, replace or eliminate previous EPA actions that are hurting the average American.

For example, the EPA's recently proposed rule on source performance standards for new power plants has raised serious concerns among ratepayers, utilities and small businesses in my district. My main concern with these proposed regulations remains focused on Missouri's need to provide affordable and reliable electricity. However, in a State like Missouri that derives over 80 percent of our power from coal, the EPA has proposed a rule that would create a de facto ban on building any new coal-fired power plants by requiring the use of something called carbon capture and storage technology.

This technology has not even been proven commercially viable anywhere, and the small pilot projects used as a basis of the EPA's analysis have been highly subsidized by the government and are not commercially available.

Congressional intent in the Clean Air Act is clear. The EPA is required to complete a cost-benefit analysis and base their regulations on the best commercially available technology. It is clear that these standards have not been met.

The good news is that there is a bipartisan solution for this regulation. Congressman WHITFIELD and Senator MANCHIN have introduced the Electricity Security and Affordability Act. They designed the bill to require that any greenhouse gas standard set by the EPA for new coal-fired plants are achievable by commercial power plants operating in the real world, including highly efficient plants that utilize the most modern, state-of-the-art standards that can be met by all States in a way that is not economically damaging to local ratepayers and small businesses.

All we ask is that the EPA work with us to find commonsense solutions for real world problems.

Another example of needless regulation is the EPA's proposed rule on future production of wood-burning stoves like the one in this picture right here. My constituents are concerned that

this regulation could provide another de facto ban of the production and sale of 80 percent of America's current wood-burning stoves, which are the world's oldest heating system.

The EPA's stringent, one-size-fits-all policy goes against the will of the people, and it requires the same stringent standards in a cottage in the woods that it applies to a high-rise building in downtown New York. For the first 10 years of my marriage, my husband and I heated our home with a wood-burning stove like this. I am concerned for the many constituents who have used these stoves for years to heat their home, that they will have to turn in their old furnaces for scrap and make costly upgrades if they choose to remodel.

So, again, I implore the EPA to apply a little common sense to these onerous regulations and not finalize this burdensome rule.

These are just two examples of the many concerns of the EPA overreach that I hear on a regular basis.

I pause now to invite my colleagues to share experiences and issues that their constituents face dealing with this agency. So I would like to start with my dear friend from Colorado, DOUG LAMBORN.

Representative LAMBORN, what would you like to share?

Mr. LAMBORN. Well, I thank my friend and colleague, the gentlelady from Missouri, for her leadership on this issue and for putting this time together. This is an important topic.

Mr. Speaker, I hear from Coloradans every day who are struggling just to make ends meet. Unemployment remains high, and Americans are striving to provide necessities for their families. Prices at the pump have doubled since President Obama took office. According to the Energy Information Administration, they are on a trajectory to rise even higher.

Sadly, as American families and small businesses continue to suffer from these high energy prices, the Obama administration's response has been to impose job-killing and expensive rules through the Environmental Protection Agency. These expenses are passed on to American consumers. These policies, such as attempting to regulate greenhouse gas emissions in the Clean Air Act, only end up hurting consumers.

As the chairman of the Natural Resources Subcommittee on Energy and Mineral Resources and a proponent for business-focused regulations, I have been vocal against many of these harmful regulations. The EPA's continued power grab ends up taking legislative authority out of the hands of those who are sent here in Washington to represent the American people and puts it in the hands of unelected bureaucrats carrying out the agenda and policies of the White House.

I have cosponsored numerous bills to repeal many of these regulations piece by piece to ensure Americans that they would have affordable energy. Colo-

radans and the rest of the country should not have to choose between heating their homes and feeding their families. I remain committed to seeing what I can do to stop this bureaucrat overreach.

Just for one example, and my friend and colleague alluded to this, the EPA wants to force American coal-fired power plants to use carbon capture and storage technology that does not even exist. Since it doesn't exist, this is an impossible mandate to obey.

The EPA is basing its regulations on wishful thinking, not sound science. They need to be brought under control. The ability of working Americans to pay their bills hangs in the balance.

I thank the gentlelady for putting this important time together.

Mrs. HARTZLER. Thank you, gentleman. Thank you for your leadership on this. You have been at the forefront of this, and this is so, so important. I love what you said about the EPA is basing this on wishful thinking and not sound science. I think most of us would appreciate if there was some science behind regulations. That seems to be common sense, but they clearly have gone beyond that, and it is hurting, as you say, people. It is hurting the bottom line. It is hurting when you pay your bills every month, and your electric bill is just going through the roof unnecessarily because of these onerous regulations.

So thank you, gentleman.

Now, I would like to turn to my friend and colleague from Utah, Representative CHRIS STEWART, to share his thoughts on this important topic.

Thank you, CHRIS.

□ 1900

Mr. STEWART. Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank my friend from Missouri for allowing me to speak tonight. Thank you for organizing this. I think this is an important issue. In fact, I would say that this is a critical issue. It is a great example of why the American people don't trust the Federal Government. Let me say that again. The American people don't trust the Federal Government. So much of what they do doesn't make any sense, and so much of what the EPA does doesn't make any sense.

I was the chair of the Subcommittee on the Environment, and we had direct oversight over EPA. Again and again, I saw examples of the things that they did that illustrated that they were an agency that is, in many ways, out of control. At one point, they had proposed regulations over ozone that were virtually impossible for many Western States to comply with, Western States like my home State of Utah. Their regulations would have been so restrictive that there was more naturally occurring ozone than they would have allowed. It doesn't make any sense.

There are multiple studies that were sponsored by the EPA concerning supposed contamination of groundwater from fracking that were so sloppy and

so obviously biased that even the EPA had to finally admit to them and withdraw their own studies. Once again, it doesn't make any sense.

Why would the EPA try to stop fracking, a technology that has led to cheaper energy, more efficient energy, jobs, and economic growth in many parts of our country? It doesn't make any sense.

There is the war on coal that I suppose many will be speaking about. As my friend, Mrs. HARTZLER, was saying, it drives up the cost of energy for every working family. It does nothing to reduce global carbon emissions.

I would like to take a minute and expand on, with a little more detail, what I think is one of the most egregious and troubling examples of EPA overreach. I want to speak on behalf of the thousands of landowners in my district, to my home State of Utah, that face a new threat due to the heavy hand of the EPA. This will affect farmers, it will affect ranchers, and even homeowners as they come into the crosshairs of an agency that has an ever-expanding regulatory agenda. The new actions of EPA are nothing more than a power grab that will have significant impact on infrastructure, on energy and land development.

Back in September, the EPA published a drafted rule to more heavily regulate the Clean Water Act. Now, make no mistake, this rule is wholly in defiance of recent Supreme Court rulings that determined the Agency was out of step with current law. The drafted rule would allow the EPA to regulate virtually every body of water in the United States, including private lakes, small ponds, seasonal streams. Every depression, no matter how far away it was from a jurisdictional water, could fall under this regulation. It would require farmers to get approval from the EPA before they planted their crops. It would require permits from the EPA before you could build on your own property, and it would hand environmentalists another way to sue property owners. It would drastically increase the cost and the timeframe of building any piece of infrastructure, whether it is a highway or a power plant, all of the things that communities need in order to survive.

Everyone agrees that we should protect the environment. There is a reason that I chose to live in Utah. I love to rock climb. I love to hike. I love to ski. I grew up on a farm. I love the land. I want to protect the land. The presumption is that because I am a Republican I must hate the land, and I think it is absurd.

If you want to take a meaningful step towards restoring trust between the American people and the Federal Government, then rein in the power of the EPA. It appears that our President has exactly the opposite in mind, and that scares me to death. It, frankly, should scare every American. I hope that he doesn't. I hope we are able to control this Agency. I hope that this

discussion tonight helps move us forward towards doing that.

Mrs. HARTZLER. Mr. Speaker, excellent points there. I think you are right; we need to make regulations that make sense. What the EPA is doing does not make sense. It does feed into the distrust of government bureaucracy by the American people, and well-deserved when they have some of the regulations coming out that they have been proposing that are harming Americans. That is why we are here tonight, to raise these concerns and to fight against them.

I am so glad today to get to pass the baton to my friend from North Carolina (Mr. HOLDING).

Mr. HOLDING. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentlelady for bringing us here today to talk about this important issue.

Mr. Speaker, excessive and burdensome regulations have become a pattern under this administration. It is harmful to business and prevents growth in our economy.

One area of concern, amongst many that I have and my constituents have in North Carolina, is the proposed Environmental Protection Agency rule which would make changes to the Clean Water Act. The proposed rule by EPA would grant them control over essentially all waters, not just navigable waters as any commonsense person understands navigable waters and which is clearly defined in the Clean Water Act of 1972 and has been upheld by the Supreme Court.

In North Carolina, farmers are a critical part of this economy and community. Earlier this week, I had the chance to meet with a group of farmers from Wayne County, which is a large population center in my district. One of their greatest concerns was not a traditional farmer concern that you hear. It wasn't a concern about feed prices or soil fertility or farm equipment maintenance. It had to do with a Federal agency attempting to regulate any ditch, puddle, or dry creekbed within their property lines. This proposed rule from the EPA would take control away from these farmers and place it in the hands of a Federal Government bureaucracy.

Now, the EPA claims that it needs the authority to do this, but in reality, this expansion of power would unnecessarily put local and State issues in the Federal Government's hands. The EPA wants to expand the jurisdiction to intrastate waters, which could include isolated streams or ditches. This is extremely consequential to private property owners who could now be subject to EPA regulations even if they merely have a small pond in their backyard.

If the EPA is given this authority, private property owners will be vulnerable to lawsuits from environmental groups for not complying with regulations. In some of these cases, these waters have nothing to do with Federal interests and the rule could override State prerogatives. The rule would

allow EPA to regulate activities beyond the scope of interstate commerce, which is clearly not what was intended when the Clean Water Act was passed in 1972.

It is essential that we support policies that help farmers not only in North Carolina, not only in my district, but across the country to grow and produce their crops. They cannot afford to be laid low by overreaching government regulations. These are not large corporations. We are talking about local farmers who are farming sweet potatoes or soybeans or tobacco, and for them, these new regulations can be complex and compliance can be time consuming and expensive.

The Small Business Office of Advocacy has reported that Federal rule-making has imposed a cumulative burden of \$1.75 trillion on our economy. We should not add more to the problem with the proposed EPA rule; but, rather, we should be doing all we can to alleviate the burden on our farmers, small businesses, and our Nation's economy.

Again, I want to thank the gentlewoman from Missouri (Mrs. HARTZLER) for organizing this Special Order this afternoon.

Mrs. HARTZLER. I thank the gentleman very much, and I want to follow up on exactly your same story. I hear the same from my farmers in Missouri. And this picture on this poster, I hope everyone can see, because I want to show what Representative HOLDING was just talking about.

The Clean Water Act gave the EPA authority to regulate navigable waters, and those are the pictures here. They would be something that you would consider navigable waters, and they worked with the Corps of Engineers to develop regulations.

The pictures on the right are what I consider nonnavigable, and I think most people with common sense would. They are farm ponds, puddles, and ditches. This is what the EPA is trying to expand its reach to regulating. As Representative HOLDING said, this is going to impact every farmer and every property owner, and it is a violation of property rights.

The government should not have any control or say over how people manage their ponds, or if there is a puddle in the field, they shouldn't have to ask permission to be able to plant a crop there. And yet that is what you have, one of the things that EPA is doing. Thank you for bringing that up. And I wanted everybody to see how ridiculous this is and what an overreach of government it is. Thank you for showing that picture.

Now, I turn to ANDY BARR from Kentucky. He knows a little bit about coal and some of the other impacts of the EPA. Please share your thoughts on the topic.

Mr. BARR. I thank the gentlelady for organizing this Special Order and her leadership in highlighting a real problem in our country right now.

The President of the United States the other night in the State of the Union made an observation, and the President's observation was one where he described an economy in which inequality has deepened and upward mobility has stalled. Unfortunately, in many respects the President is right, but he is wrong about what has caused that problem to exist in our economy.

The truth is a major reason why upward mobility has stalled is because the Environmental Protection Agency, under his direction, has produced a deluge of red tape and regulations that are literally strangling the Nation's economy. The poor are worse off today than they were when President Obama took office. Seven million more Americans live in poverty today as compared to 2008. Median household income has fallen over \$2,000 in the last 4 years. Seventy-six percent of Americans live paycheck to paycheck, and the percentage of working-age people actually in the workforce has dropped to the lowest rate in 35 years in the Obama economy. The EPA is largely responsible for this.

The coal industry in my region in central and eastern Kentucky could be the poster child of this regulatory onslaught. According to the Commonwealth's recently released figures, more than 7,000 coal miners in the Appalachian coalfields have received pink slips since 2009; 2,232 of those jobs were lost last year alone, thanks in large part to the overreach of the EPA. The percentage of coal miners in our State is the lowest number of coal miners since 1927 in the coal labor market, and that is since they actually started keeping those statistics.

So whether it is deadlocking the permit process or trying to effectively ban coal-fired electricity through disastrous greenhouse gas regulations, EPA's arming of unelected bureaucrats has been very direct about their efforts to reshape entire sectors of our economy. In fact, the President's own climate adviser was reported as saying "a war on coal is exactly what we need."

So what bothers me about this is that there is a total disregard for the human cost to hardworking Americans, their families, who have lost these paychecks, who have been laid off with no other economic opportunity.

There is a problem with upward mobility in this country. There is income inequality, but it is because of this administration's policies that are devastating these coal-mining families. And make no mistake, these costs are generally borne by the Nation's most vulnerable who can least afford higher energy prices. A recent study analyzing government data found that, for the 180,000 families in Kentucky making less than \$10,000 per year, energy costs consume more than two-thirds of after-tax income.

□ 1915

That means for every \$100 they take home, about \$70 goes to covering the

cost of energy. The EPA's ruinous policies will only drive those rates higher, adding to the burdens on those already struggling to make ends meet. Folks like our seniors on fixed incomes, they can't afford these higher utility bills.

The President likes to talk about the war on poverty. My friends on the other side of the aisle like to talk about the war on poverty. Well, it is hard to win the war on poverty when you are waging a relentless war on jobs. That is exactly what is happening with the EPA.

EPA officials think that they know what is best for you, for your family, and for your community, whether you live in Kentucky or Texas or California, but when Congress has asked for some evidence to justify this one-size-fits-all approach, they fail to provide it.

While I am sure it was much easier for these bureaucrats to have listening sessions on greenhouse gas regulations in Washington, D.C., or San Francisco, California, the three States that produced the most coal—Kentucky, West Virginia, and Wyoming—they were not on the list where the EPA went to visit. I don't think the bureaucrats would have received such a warm welcome from the coal miners of my State whose jobs were lost, the small businesses that no longer have customers—many in my home district—the teachers whose schools have lost a major source of tax revenue. They no longer have those funds because of the war on coal and the loss of revenue.

As I have warned for some time, the impact of EPA regulations will not be limited to the coal fields of Appalachia. If the EPA has its way, rising electricity rates, like we have already seen this winter, will ripple through this economy, threatening the manufacturing renaissance; home heating bills will spike; goods and services will cost more, depressing consumer demand; businesses will have to devote money that could have gone to investment and hiring to cover higher energy costs at a time when they can least afford it; companies considering to locate here in the United States will leave because our energy advantage will instead go overseas, where labor and energy are cheaper and the regulatory environment is less suffocating. Americans are calling for more jobs, but the Federal bureaucracy is trying to make sure those jobs go elsewhere.

All of this is happening through agency rulemaking because that is the only way that the President's environmental wish list can come into being. Similar policies have repeatedly failed in the face of bipartisan opposition in Congress. The President and the EPA, deaf to the vehement refusals of the American people and their elected officials to go along with this extremist agenda, are resorting to the only means that they have left: legally questionable rulemaking and executive actions unilaterally administered by the executive branch.

The House has made its position loud and clear: these policies are at odds with the intent of Congress and not in the best interest of the American people. In fact, they are actually bankrupting many hardworking Americans.

Enough is enough, Mr. Speaker. I would encourage the President and the EPA to approach Congress with an open, transparent program that balances environmental protection with economic growth. It can be done if Congress has a willing negotiator in the White House, but continuing to impose these rules by executive proclamation unilaterally fails to benefit the environment and it serves only to harm our constituents and our democracy, if this President, if this Congress is serious about dealing with poverty, if we are serious about dealing with income inequality, if we are really genuinely interested in helping the poor in this country, let's not attack hardworking Americans. Let's focus on job creation and growth, and let's unleash the energy potential of the United States.

I thank the gentlelady for her leadership.

Mrs. HARTZLER. Thank you very, very much. I don't think anyone could say it any better than that.

I appreciate as well your comments about coal because in my district, I have the only working coal mine in Missouri. In Missouri, 85 percent of our energy comes from coal. It is an extremist agenda that would raise the price of energy unnecessarily, especially on the hardest hit Americans whose hours are being cut back because of other policies from this country coming forth, and whose paychecks are shrinking.

Why would you artificially raise the cost of their electric bills due to regulations that aren't even scientifically based and shut off a major source of energy in this country that is affordable, reliable, safe, and clean—and that is coal.

Thank you very much for sharing that.

Now I would like to go to my friend from Oklahoma, JAMES LANKFORD, to hear his thoughts about EPA and how it is hurting Americans and how we can provide better solutions.

Mr. LANKFORD. There are a lot of things that we have done as a Nation that really have greatly benefited the health and economy of our Nation. We have engaged. There are some that would say to Republicans that Republicans just want dirty air and dirty water and they just assume we want unhealthy kids and all those things. I have people who have complained to me here while I have been in the House of Representatives and say: Don't you care about kids with asthma? And I look at them and say: Yeah, my daughter is one of them. So don't throw back in my face we don't care about our own kids and we don't care about the environment.

My youngest daughter, a couple of years ago we were sitting at an intersection and the car in front of us took

off and black smoke came out of the back of it, and she said out loud: Is that car on fire? As a kid who grew up in the 1970s like I did, I thought: No, that is what every car did in the 1970s, but we have made real changes, and it has affected our environment.

It is fascinating to me now that the EPA and the rules that were put in place to protect all Americans have moved from where they were in the 1970s to now trying to get to the most granular small level that is pushing beyond health and safety down to a level that is actually controlling business and the basic operation of our economy. This is no longer about health and safety of people anymore. Those rules have long been changed and been in place. This is something different.

The basic rules:

There is a rule that probably no one tracks. It is a 316(b) rule. No one has heard of the 316(b) rule, but what it does with power plants, most power plants, as people drive past all the time and see them, they have a lake around them. In that lake there are, typically, fish. Quite frankly, for many power plants that are there in many parts of the country, the power company actually built that lake and then stocked it. In Oklahoma, some of the best fishing lakes are right around power plants because the water is a little bit warmer and the fish multiply. The water that comes in through one side of that lake actually goes underneath the power plant to actually cool the power plant. It is not the steam that comes out of the top. It is just like a big radiator that comes in.

There is a grading screen that keeps all the fish out and everything else because they don't want them going underneath the plant as well and hurting the tubing and such. Occasionally, a fish gets what is called impinged on that screen. They are typically minnows, what we use in Oklahoma for fishing bait.

So the EPA is stepping in to power companies and making massive changes in their requirements to the screens around the outside of that to keep fish—minnows, bait fish—from being caught on that. Well, the offer has been made to say, if 100 bait fish are killed on this screen during this time, can we just buy 100 bait fish and put it in? We can go down to the local bait shop and get 100 fish and just restock it—and they say no. It requires millions of dollars of change to go around that screen to prevent that.

Who pays for that? Ratepayers pay for that. The President made a statement in his State of the Union address when he said: these things will be hard, but they are right for the environment. Do you know who it is hard on? The poorest in our society, elderly people that are on fixed incomes. That electricity bill matters to them, and you can't just flippantly say, Mr. President, this is going to be hard but we have got to do it, when the people that it is going to be hardest on and are

going to be affected the most are the people that this government should protect rather than just look at them and say: this is going to be hard, but you are going to pay a higher bill.

Simple things like regional haze. Rules were made years ago on regional haze. Regional haze is a rule dealing with aesthetics, what the air looks like. Not air quality, not what we breath, not health, just aesthetics. So the rule was made if this is just about aesthetics, not about health, the State should make those rules.

Then there was what's called a "sue and settle" agreement. This administration allowed a lawsuit, broke off separately from the normal judicial process, made an arrangement with these environmental groups, and then came back to States and said, a judge is imposing that. A judge is not imposing that. They made a deal with environmentalist groups around the people that it would affect and are now imposing it on States.

What is the result of that? Higher prices for electricity. Not because of health, but because of aesthetics. Again, the President's statement: this is going to be hard, we are aware. It is going to be hard on the people that should be protected by this Nation, not just someone stepping into their house and saying: sorry your electricity bill is higher, this is going to be hard. That doesn't help anyone. Families know that day-to-day life is hard. They don't need this government making it harder for them.

We need to stand up and protect them. It is important that we have clean air and clean water. It is also important that we protect our families and not bring them undue expense that matters nothing for basic human health and population.

I thank the gentlelady for hosting this time and for this conversation because these EPA issues are not just Washington issues; they are issues that matter to our families. They are issues that do change the price of our electricity and our energy. When people say all the time: Why doesn't my check go as far as it used to go, why does life seem to cost so much now, I say to them: Welcome to the regulation world that we live in, where someone from D.C. says: this is going to be hard and you pay more.

Mrs. HARTZLER. We have turned sadly into a regulation Nation, and it is wrong, but some of us—and the ones here tonight speaking—are not going to sit by and allow this and stand idly by. We are fighting against it, and that is why we are here.

I totally agree with my colleague that it is wrong to just tell people: well, this is going to be hard, but you are going to have to pay more on your electric bill basically because of this new regulation because we care more for a minnow than we do about people. That is wrong. It is time to change things.

I appreciate my friend from Ohio, Representative ROBERT LATTA, being

here tonight and welcome your comments on this issue.

Mr. LATTA. Thank you very much. I appreciate the gentlelady for organizing this Special Order tonight.

The issue about the EPA and what it is doing back home and across our Nation is an issue that we all have to really pay attention to. I serve on the Energy and Commerce Committee, and we look at this all the time in our subcommittee. We have hearings continually. People back home always ask: What's going on, why is this happening, as the gentleman from Oklahoma just said.

My district is unique. I have 60,000 manufacturing jobs, and I also represent the largest number of farmers in the State of Ohio. When I am home, over the last 16 plus months I have probably done about 40 to 50 different meetings in my district visiting manufacturing plants, farmers, and small businesses. I also ask them: What is the issue that you are most concerned about? The number one issue I hear from them all the time on, the number one issue is regulations. Regulations are the number one thing that are holding back Americans from creating more jobs in this country. It is very important that I ask them: Well, who is it, what regulations? It is the EPA. That is the number one agency I hear about from my constituents all the time.

Earlier this session, I offered H.R. 724. H.R. 724 is a piece of legislation that received bipartisan support here in the House. Not only did it receive bipartisan support, it passed unanimously. What that bill does is it gets rid of a piece of regulation that is no longer necessary under the Clean Air Act.

There is a regulation on the books out there that requires small to large to medium auto dealers in this country that they would have to go out and give the buyer a piece of paper telling them that, yes, it met all the requirements. Well, it is no longer a piece of paper that needs to be given. It is something that should have been gotten rid of a long time ago because it is online, it is on the cars, it says right there that that car meets all the emission standards.

So what we need to do is just start paring back these types of regulations. That bill has gone over to the Senate. I hope our friends over there in the very near future take that up because, again, it is something that helps the communities. Again, when you talk about folks back home, the folks back home—it is like the auto dealers—they are the ones that sponsor Little League teams, they are the ones that are out there making sure that they are donating. So let's give them more time to do things like helping their community and, by the way, selling more cars, putting more people to work. That is very, very important.

Also, as the speaker from Oklahoma also mentioned, there is nobody out

there that doesn't say that we don't want clean air and clean water. We all want that, but in recent years the EPA has put forward broad-reaching regulatory proposals that are either unachievable or lack sufficient cost-benefit justifications. One of the most harmful proposals includes the greenhouse gas emission standards for new power plants that aim to stop the use of coal as an energy source.

We have all heard from folks tonight talking about how much coal is being used not only in their districts, but their States. In the State of Ohio, 78 percent of our electricity comes from coal-fired plants.

When you talk about what is going to happen if all these regulations go on, who is that going to affect?

□ 1930

It is going to affect the very vulnerable citizens in our districts. For the senior citizens out there on fixed incomes, it is going to increase the costs for them. They are going to have to make the choice about heating their homes or about refilling those life-saving prescriptions that they might have to have.

So, when we look at the EPA and when it fails to consider what those real-life impacts are on all of these proposals that it is proposing out there; or the small business owner who struggles to make the payroll; or the newly hired employee facing the reduced hours; or, again, senior citizens who are on fixed incomes and trying to budget in these tough times, those are the things that have to be considered.

One of the things, I think, that was really staggering was that, in 2011, the SBA—the Small Business Administration—came out with a report stating that we have \$1.7 trillion of regulations in this country today. Unfortunately, that got up to \$1.8 trillion, and that is what we are dealing with in this country. People wonder why jobs aren't being created in this country. You just have to look at Washington. What are we doing to them here?

What we need to do, in my opinion, is invite the EPA to visit our districts. I have actually had some folks in my district say that they would be glad to have them come in to show the EPA. In one company, they had all of these different manuals and books and everything on the table that they showed me, and they said one thing—that they would love to have them come in because it doesn't even apply to their plants. That is what is going on. They are trying to take a round peg and drive it through a square hole. We have got to do that in order to help our hardworking American taxpayers meet these goals and to create more jobs, to help their families, and to help the future.

With that, I thank the gentlelady again for hosting this tonight.

Mrs. HARTZLER. Thank you so much, gentleman. Thank you for your leadership on that. That is a great bill,

and we really need more of that to push back on these onerous regulations by the EPA, like you pointed out, that cost the taxpayers \$1.8 trillion a year overall just to comply with paperwork. That is wrong.

Now I would like to turn to my friend from Florida, Representative TED YOHO, to share his thoughts.

Mr. YOHO. I would like to thank the gentlelady from the great State of Missouri (Mrs. HARTZLER) for the privilege of being able to address one of the greatest issues facing our Nation today—the unilateral imposition of regulations coming out of an administrative agency known as the EPA, the Environmental Protection Agency, and the strangulating effects those regulations have on business development and on our economy.

Mr. Speaker, my home State, the great State of Florida, is fortunate enough to play host to a myriad of beautiful animals, landscapes, waterways, and beaches, and I believe that we all play a role in being good stewards of our natural resources. We all want clean water. We all want clean air. As Mr. LANKFORD was talking about his child's having asthma, I have asthma, and I know the importance of this. So, yes, we do want a clean environment.

Many rural districts like mine often have unique needs, whether it is the farmer farming to put food on his table in order to keep his family fed or to feed a Nation or to keep the lights on at the storefront or bringing jobs back to our districts. Through projects like the dredging of the St. Johns waterway, which is a crucial infrastructure project in our district, it would create thousands of jobs, and yet we have to deal with EPA regulations.

Congress must ensure that efficient and effective policies are being implemented that both boost the economy and uphold environmentally friendly industry standards. However, the EPA has overstepped its authority time and time again by imposing unwarranted, costly Federal regulations on States and on individuals. Last year, the EPA issued 1,624 rules and notices. In this year alone, the EPA has issued 148 new rules and notices.

To sum this up, since the beginning of the 113th Congress alone, the EPA has issued 1,759 new rules and notices. In a little over 12 months, the EPA has issued, on average, just under 147 new rules and notices per month. That is just under 34 a week, just under 11 new regulations a day. This is an incredible rate. Every industry is affected, and they are finding it harder and harder to keep up.

Take, for example, the highly debated cap-and-trade emissions standards the EPA and the current administration are pushing. This is going to affect every American.

The EPA Web site says:

Cap-and-trade is an environmental policy tool that delivers results with a mandatory cap on emissions while providing sources

flexibility in how they comply. Successful cap-and-trade programs reward innovation, efficiency and early action, and provide strict environmental accountability without inhibiting economic growth.

This is simply not true. It strangles businesses; it costs money; and it stifles economic growth.

Overzealous regulations like cap-and-trade by the EPA, which is, again, an administrative agency, handcuff our economy and make America less competitive in the world because emerging markets like China and India will never adopt such destructive taxes; yet they put our manufacturers in a hold and make America less competitive, further restricting the opportunities in this country and lowering the job growth in this country.

I have just a few stories I would like to share with you. One of them is about a constituent of mine. We have talked about this, and you held up the navigable waterways:

He is a dairy farmer. He has been in battle with the EPA for over a couple of years. It has cost him over \$400,000—\$200,000 in fines. It is for a depression on his property that has been there for years. It is a depression that, when it rains, it fills up and it evaporates, yet he has fought the EPA on this for over 2 years at the cost of \$200,000 in fines—\$200,000 to fix it and in lawyer fees. This can't go on. It drives people out of business;

In our area, I visited a power plant. That power plant was tasked with meeting a new EPA standard for their emissions. It cost them over \$500 million, and they had 4 years to complete it. They got halfway through the project, and the EPA came out and said, Never mind. We changed the rule. They have already spent half the money, yet the EPA says, You don't have to comply.

We see this over and over again. According to the new EPA studies, by their own admission, they said that the new rules on the carbon capture standards would have an insignificant effect on human health and our environment, yet it is going to cripple every American in this country and cost him a lot more in money.

Our role in government is to legislate in order to make America safer and economically stronger, not to govern by an administrative agency which has little oversight and that winds up stifling business development and our economic growth. It is high time Congress reminds the EPA of what its original purpose was, and that is to protect human health and the environment by writing and enforcing regulations based on the laws that we pass, not regulations that stifle America.

I would like to thank the gentlelady from Missouri for the opportunity and for organizing this. You did a great job and a great service to the American people.

Mrs. HARTZLER. Your comments were very, very helpful to what we are doing tonight, which is making people



aware of how these EPA regulations hurt real people. I think your example of the 2-year fight and the \$200,000 fine just for a low area in your yard that fills with water is just too much.

Mr. YOHO. It wound up costing him over \$400,000 by the time he was done, and he just threw up his hands. This is happening all over America. So I thank you again.

Mrs. HARTZLER. Thank you. That is why we are here fighting tonight.

I would like to turn it over now to my friend from Arkansas, which is just a little south of me, to Representative RICK CRAWFORD.

Mr. CRAWFORD. I thank the gentlelady and her staff for arranging this Special Order to discuss this issue that we have been talking about—the egregious overreach of the Environmental Protection Agency.

I want to talk about an issue that is very close to you and near and dear to you and that you have helped me on, and that is the spill prevention and containment countermeasures issue, which is facing farmers across the country.

Mr. Speaker, we have taken action on this. If you are like me and if your staff is like my staff, we have fielded countless phone calls from farmers who are concerned about these new rules that the EPA was attempting to roll out with respect to on-farm fuel storage at, really, an unmanageable level. 1,320 gallons was the threshold that would require that the farmers construct these spill prevention and containment countermeasures. For those who don't know what those are, those are berms, or protective dikes, around a storage facility that can cost tens of thousands of dollars to ag producers. Farmers may be land rich—capital rich—but they are not cash rich by any stretch of the imagination, so this adds cost to their operations.

Really, who pays for that?

We have talked about it with our power plants. The ratepayers pay. The American people pay for that because prices go up. Generally, while the farmer bears the burden initially, ultimately, those costs are passed on to the consumer, which is the case in nearly every one of these issues where we see the EPA engaging in overreach.

So we took to the floor to try to change this, and we were successful, not once but twice, in passing by voice vote the FUELS Act. That would have changed the threshold from 1,320 gallons to 10,000 gallons. Between 10,000 and 42,000, you would be required to build the structure, but above 42,000, you would then be required to engage the services of a professional engineer for certification in order to meet that standard for EPA's compliance.

Now, the University of Arkansas did a study on the FUELS Act which addressed the spill prevention and containment countermeasures, and they estimated nationwide that this bill, which was passed successfully on the House floor, would save American

farmers \$3.3 billion. I don't know about you, but I think this \$3.3 billion could do our economy a heck of a lot better service than chasing this problem that really doesn't exist.

Why do I say this problem doesn't exist?

A decade ago, the USDA did an analysis of the spill prevention and containment countermeasures, and they discovered there was little, if any, evidence of farms having any oil spills. In fact, 99 percent of farmers had never experienced an oil spill, and that means that the compliance cost of \$3.3 billion is essentially a solution in search of a problem. It really doesn't exist.

What we did was we took that 10,000-gallon threshold directly from the underlying law—the Clean Water Act—that regulates on-farm fuel storage, and they defined, in their own words, 10,000 gallons as being a proper definition of a family farm, of small farm fuel storage. The commodities at this scale are certainly storing more than 10,000 gallons on their farms. Being a farmer yourself, you know that you store in greater quantity than 10,000 gallons, particularly if you are engaged in a larger scale operation. So, number one, the evidence just isn't there to support the 1,320-gallon threshold.

Number two, we had over 30 commodity organizations and agricultural organizations that were in support of the bill. We passed it twice on the floor. The Senate will not move. The EPA continues to move forward, and we continue to be concerned about the EPA's drive to overregulate on-farm fuel storage.

Again, I want to thank the gentlelady for her leadership on this and for bringing this to the attention of the American people, because everything that we have heard tonight and everything that has been talked about has a direct impact on their bottom lines and on the quality of life for their farmers.

I would also like to echo what my colleagues have said. We certainly don't want to see poor air quality or poor water quality. I have kids at home. I love my kids. You love your kids. I know you have small ones at home, too. We are just as committed to a clean environment as anybody is, but we are also committed to the quality of life, to the costs incurred in that quality of life and to a more responsible approach.

Mrs. HARTZLER. Thank you for your leadership on this. That issue is just so important to farmers all across this country and to rural communities, which could certainly use that \$3.3 billion.

Now I would like to turn to my friend from Oklahoma, MARKWAYNE MULLIN, to share his thoughts on the EPA.

Mr. MULLIN. I would like to thank the gentlelady from Missouri.

Mr. Speaker, this is something that is very near and dear to my heart. The only reason I stand in front of you is that I realized one day that the biggest

threat that I had to my family business was the Federal Government from its overregulation. I woke up one day and realized that I was literally spending 40 cents on every dollar that came into our company to simply comply with different mandates and regulations that came down from this area.

I never dreamed I would ever stand up here one day as a Congressman. It was never a thought. I never even owned a suit until after I won the election. My family is strongly rooted in entrepreneurs—from farming to plumbing, all the way to banking—and we understand regulation well, but the biggest threat we have to this economy is overreaching regulation.

□ 1945

Let me share just a real quick story. My uncle, Darryle Mullin, is from Clearfork, Oklahoma, a big metropolitan area I am sure everybody around here has heard of. It is the same place he was born and raised, the same place my dad and his brothers and sisters were born and raised. He has been raising chickens there since 1971. For 42 years, he has raised chickens. He raised a family by raising chickens and farming.

The EPA came in and started fining people on little, silly stuff, including feathers. Fining poultry growers, chicken farmers, on feathers.

Now you are going to tell me that in a place where my Uncle Darryle grew up his entire life, he doesn't have pride on the land that he lives on? You are telling me people that never stepped foot in Oklahoma, and probably never on a farm, but they are up here in D.C., know how to manage our land better than we know how to manage our land?

I find it a joke. It is embarrassing, and they should be embarrassed. Because they are going to kill the entrepreneur spirit. They are going to run small farmers out of business.

2013 was the last batch of chickens my Uncle Darryle got. It wasn't because of his health. It wasn't because he didn't want to still manage it. He just got to the point where it wasn't profitable for him to be able to do it anymore. Rather than doing what he loves, he was spending his time trying to comply with mandates that the EPA is putting down on small farmers all over the country.

What we are seeing is these small farmers have raised families, and they were raised on the same farm. Generations of farmers are starting to have to sell out. Large corporations that have more people to balance the pay, to balance the cost around, are having to come in and take the spot of these small farmers that started the same way my uncle did.

Now you tell me, what good are they doing? Are they helping America? No. They are killing the entrepreneur spirit of America. They are costing us jobs. They are taking away our life. They are ruining families.

This country was built on the backs of farmers. The work ethic that we

have as Americans came from the farming community. We get up every day, we pull our boots on, we go to work, and we take pride because we accomplish something that no one else can accomplish—and we did it that day.

We overcome challenges every day. More and more challenges we overcome. It is something we take pride in. You can't tell us we can't do a job. We are the only one that can tell us we can't.

But one challenge we haven't been able to get over—and that is right here in Washington, D.C.—is bureaucrats that get up every day and try to tell us how to live our lives. Yet we survived all these years without them.

As I stand in front of the gentlelady from Missouri today, the EPA is the biggest threat we have to this country right now. They are the biggest threat we have to our way of life right now. They are doing nothing but costing us jobs by trying to say they are saving us from ourselves. It is embarrassing, but I am sure glad I am up here standing in front of you today to fight for our way of life.

I would like to thank the gentlelady from Missouri for giving me this time and the opportunity to stand in front of you. Thank you for exposing the EPA for what they are instead of what they hide behind.

Mrs. HARTZLER. I am glad you are here tonight. I am glad you are here representing the common person in this country who is fighting these regulations every day, who has had real-world experience dealing with the EPA, like many of us have.

You are exactly right. It is stifling jobs and hurting people, whether it is the families back in Missouri who are dealing with the big 10-inch snow that we got yesterday, and they are wanting to heat their home with a wood-burning stove or turn up the thermostat and worry about their electricity bills at the end of the month, or whether it is the farmer out there who is trying to raise chickens and provide poultry and meat for this country, and then they have the government trying to regulate their feathers.

Last year, the EPA tried to regulate farm dust. Now they are trying to expand the definition of navigable waters to regulating farm ponds and ditches and little depressions in the fields, and asking for permission from Americans to be able to farm their land.

There are other regulations we haven't even talked about tonight dealing with permitting and being able to spray crop protection products on their crops. Farmers get this every day. So do manufacturers. So do businesses, and so does anyone who has to pay an electric bill every month, with the President's war on coal.

So that is why here in the House we are standing strong against the EPA. We are exposing what they are doing and how it is hurting Americans and why it is important for the Senate to

move on our bills to rein in the EPA, to bring common sense back to Washington, and to return this government of the people, by the people, to start working for the people once again.

With that, 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 February 3–6 on account of attending to family acute medical care and hospitalization.

#### BILLS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Karen L. Haas, Clerk of the House, reported that on February 4, 2014, she presented to the President of the United States, for his approval, the following bills:

H.R. 2860. To amend title 5, United States Code, to provide that the Inspector General of the Office of Personnel Management may use amounts in the revolving fund of the Office to fund audits, investigations, and oversight activities, and for other purposes.

H.R. 2642. To provide for the reform and continuation of agricultural and other programs of the Department of Agriculture through fiscal year 2018, and for other purposes.

#### ADJOURNMENT

Mrs. HARTZLER. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 7 o'clock and 50 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, February 6, 2014, at 9 a.m.

#### EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

4670. A letter from the Chief, Planning & Regulatory Affairs Office, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule — Automated Data Processing and Information Retrieval System Requirements: System Testing (RIN: 0584-AD99) received January 27, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

4671. A letter from the Director, Defense Procurement and Acquisition Policy, Department of Defense, transmitting the Department's final rule — Defense Federal Acquisition Regulation Supplement: Proposal Adequacy Checklist Revision (DFARS Case 2013-D033) (RIN: 0750-A115) received January 27, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Armed Services.

4672. A letter from the Director, Office of Legislative Affairs, Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, transmitting the Corporation's final rule — Community Reinvestment Act Regulations (RIN: 3064-AD90) received January 27, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Financial Services.

4673. A letter from the Chief, Planning and Regulatory Affairs Office (PRAO), FNS/

USDA, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's "Major" final rule — Certification of Compliance With Meal Requirements for the National School Lunch Program Under the Healthy, Hunger-Free Kids Act of 2010 [FNS-2011-0025] (RIN: 0584-AE15) received January 27, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

4674. A letter from the Deputy General Counsel, Pension Benefit Guaranty Corporation, transmitting the Corporation's "Major" final rule — Payment of Premiums; Large-Plan Flat-Rate Premium (RIN: 1212-AB26) received January 17, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

4675. A letter from the Director, Regulations Policy and Management Staff, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the Department's final rule — Medical Devices; Pediatric Uses of Devices; Requirement for Submission of Information on Pediatric Subpopulations That Suffer From a Disease or Condition That a Device Is Intended to Treat, Diagnose, or Cure [Docket No.: FDA-2009-N-0458] (RIN: 0910-AG29) January 22, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

4676. A letter from the Chief of Staff, Media Bureau, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule — Amendment of Section 73.202(b), Table of Allotments, FM Broadcast Stations. (Ehrenberg, First Mesa, Kachina Village, Munds Park, Wickenburg, and Williams, Arizona); Application of Univision Radio License Corporation KHOV-FM, Wickenburg, Arizona [MD Docket No.: 11-207; RM-11517; RM-11518; RM-11669] (File No.: BPH-20080915AFP; Facility ID No.: 29021) received January 27, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

4677. A letter from the Acting General Counsel, Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule — Protection System Maintenance Reliability Standard [Docket No.: RM13-7-000; Order No. 793] received January 22, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

4678. A letter from the Director, Office of Personnel Management, transmitting the Office's final rule — Collection by Offset From Indebted Government Employees (RIN: 3206-AM14) received January 16, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

4679. A letter from the Director, Office of Personnel Management, transmitting the Office's final rule — Federal Employees' Group Life Insurance Program: Election Opportunities for Pathways Participants (RIN: 3206-AM98) received January 16, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

4680. A letter from the Director, Office of Personnel Management, transmitting the Office's final rule — Federal Employees' Group Life Insurance Program: Election Opportunities for Pathways Participants (RIN: 3206-AM98) received January 22, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

4681. A letter from the Director, Office of Personnel Management, transmitting the Office's final rule — Collection by Offset From Indebted Government Employees (RIN: 3206-AM14) received January 22, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

4682. A letter from the Director, Office of Personnel Management, transmitting the Office's final rule — Federal Employees Health Benefits Program and Federal Employees Dental and Vision Insurance Program: Eligibility for Pathways Programs Participants