

I actually think the gentleman came forth with a good piece of legislation, and this may be an expedited way of getting it through, but hallelujah to him and hallelujah to people who will not wait on a prolonged system to bring about equity for people and justice for people who have suffered as long as my staff director has, for 15 years, paying taxes in two places, earning that money in a different place altogether.

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

Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from California. He said it best thus far, and he has personal experience, does the gentleman from California, with a staffer, on the simple injustice which we are attempting to cure here today, albeit we did not conform to the procedures that the gentleman from Oregon would force upon us on a question that many times would have been cured by unanimous consent in any event.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I just wanted to point out that when I began my statement this afternoon, I indicated that I was not going to object only because of the need here at the end of the session to move along, noting that the process is dreadful. I am a member of the subcommittee chaired by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GEKAS], and I know that we could have sorted through issues such as those raised by my colleague from California that are broad and potentially national in scope. I certainly would be willing to do that. But as I am hearing more and more, I am seeing that what in fact may be a sensible, small exception, has raised questions about a nationwide scheme.

Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. DEFAZIO].

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Speaker, in response to my colleague on the opposite side of the aisle, there were a number of times when I objected to the procedures under my own majority party, and there were times I voted against continuing resolutions, because I said we had not been given the opportunity to read them and understand them even if they were written by Democrats in the majority.

To say that because the Democrats, which I am fully willing to admit, at times abused their power or abused the rush to adjournment, then we should do it too, would it not be nice to change things around here? I thought we were going to have a revolution and do things in regular order.

This is not something that began last week, last month, this year, last year. This bill was originally introduced by Jay Inslee from Washington when the Democrats were in the majority. It received no action then. For some reason, whatever reason, it received no action, no hearings, no markup.

The esteemed gentleman from Pennsylvania chairs the subcommittee. I am certain in his busy schedule he could have found 2 hours, sometime in the last 6 months, to hold a hearing on this issue, and invite in the opposing parties and understand fully what we are entering into and doing here.

But that was not done. That was not done. It was not done under the Democrats, it has not been done under the Republicans. The only difference is in this case a few Members from Washington, despite the fact the former Speaker was from Washington, apparently had more clout with the leadership and they can jam something through that has not had hearings, it has not been heard, and no one fully understands the implications of.

The gentleman from California [Mr. MARTINEZ] opened an extraordinary Pandora's box here with what he is proposing, although I think there is a mistake. I think his staffer needs a new accountant. When I was a staffer and lived in Maryland, I paid taxes in Oregon. They once asked me to pay taxes in Maryland and I sent them my Oregon return. They said, are you crazy? Your taxes are much higher. You should be paying taxes here, but since you paid taxes in Oregon, you do not have to pay them here. So I am a bit puzzled by what is happening to his poor staffer.

But there are a whole host of issues here and a whole host of commuter taxes out there that are being paid across the country, and what precedent are we setting, if this is legal and constitutional?

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

Ms. LOFGREN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Texas, Ms. SHEILA JACKSON-LEE, a member of the committee.

□ 1400

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman from California for yielding this time to me.

Mr. Speaker, I rise really on a point of inquiry that I will probably have a colloquy with myself on. The concern I have, and as a member of local government we had the same experience—

Mr. GEKAS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentlewoman yield?

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. If the gentleman would be kind enough to let me finish.

Mr. GEKAS. If the gentlewoman would yield, I simply want to tell her I am available for any inquiry that she might want to pose, and I would be glad to engage in a colloquy.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, having this experience with local government, we are familiar with the concept of one entity and its citizens benefiting by salary from another entity and the question of taxation. The question that I would raise that I think is important, even as we may be trying to remedy this for certain isolated areas, process is important.

This does not fall into the category of correction or one that can be aptly categorized as appropriate for suspension, for as far as I may know this may be an appropriate procedure for the entire Nation.

Have we determined that there is in fact a problem between Oregon and Washington? Have we determined in fact that that problem does not find itself relevant to California, to Texas, to Virginia, to Ohio, to New York? If we are doing this isolated legislation, why should it not then create an opportunity for precedent to solve problems across the Nation?

I do not want double taxation, but what I am concerned about is that I am not being helped in the State of Texas. Those in Ohio are not being helped. Those in New York are not being helped. Those in the Washington-Virginia area are not being helped.

So we have a piece of legislation that has no basis in credibility for us on the Federal level to be dealing with, without hearings, to suggest that there is need to correct the entire problem.

I would hope that we would have an opportunity to address this not from the question of whether it is right or wrong, because I do not think anyone would rise to the floor of the House and support double taxation. They do raise the question, however, what is the precedent, the data, the basis for making this decision, whether there is a fair applicability of State laws in Oregon and Washington, and whether or not there is a penalty that is being assessed against those citizens by this legislation without precedence, hearing and process.

Ms. LOFGREN. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GEKAS] that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 3163.

The question was taken.

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 5 of rule I and the Chair's prior announcement, further proceedings on this motion will be postponed.

#### GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. GEKAS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on the bill just under consideration.

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

There was no objection.

#### RESIDENT REVIEWS FOR NURSING FACILITIES UNDER MEDICAID

Mr. BILIRAKIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 3632) to