



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 113th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 159

WASHINGTON, THURSDAY, FEBRUARY 14, 2013

No. 24

House of Representatives

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

DESIGNATION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

WASHINGTON, DC,
February 14, 2013.

I hereby appoint the Honorable CHRIS COLLINS to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

JOHN A. BOEHNER,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

MORNING-HOUR DEBATE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of January 3, 2013, the Chair will now recognize Members from lists submitted by the majority and minority leaders for morning-hour debate.

The Chair will alternate recognition between the parties, with each party limited to 1 hour and each Member other than the majority and minority leaders and the minority whip limited to 5 minutes each, but in no event shall debate continue beyond 11:50 a.m.

STRONG LEADERSHIP AND MEANINGFUL REFORMS ARE NEEDED

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

Mr. MULLIN. I began running a business when I was only 20 years old. Back then, if you worked hard and followed the rules, you had a pretty good shot at getting ahead. Today, it seems the deck is increasingly stacked against those who work hard and pursue their own dreams, especially if you're a business owner.

More and more, businesses are faced with consistent uncertainty caused by

Washington's inability to take action on today's pressing problems. The failure of uncertainty, with tax rates near chaos in the markets and a never-ending stream of impractical regulations, is a cloud of doubt that has been cast over the entire economy. For most business owners, it is a daily struggle just to keep the doors open in large part because the government itself is a consistent obstacle.

The National Federation of Independent Businesses recently released figures from December indicating the mood of businesses is at a recession level. Seventy percent of business owners that were surveyed identified the current environment as a bad time to expand, and political uncertainty topped the list for the reasons not to attempt economic growth.

Lee Buddrus, a resident of Muskogee, Oklahoma, and president of Acme Engineering & Manufacturing Corporation, told me that a lot of small businesses are struggling just because they had to go in debt to stay afloat during the recession. Mr. Buddrus went on to tell me, "Now they're not able to make the kind of money they need to to pay down their debts," due in large part to the environment the government has created.

As a freshman Member, I join a small group of Members in Congress who have owned a business. I have felt the weight of the current hostile business climate and faced unprecedented difficulties in ensuring my business succeeded. I step on the floor of the United States House of Representatives with a firsthand understanding of how high the hurdles are for a business to succeed and just simply jump over.

Last month, when President Obama was sworn in to his second term, I was reminded of something he said 4 years ago, in his first inauguration. The President said:

The question we ask today is not whether our government is too big or too small, but

whether it works—whether it helps families find jobs at a decent wage, care they can afford, a retirement that is dignified.

Unfortunately, all we have seen from this President is reckless spending and heavy-handed regulation.

At the time of the President's first inauguration, the national unemployment rate was 7.8 percent. At the time of his second inauguration, it was exactly the same, and this month unemployment rose to 7.9 percent. While the rate of unemployment has been mostly stagnant, the national debt has not. In the past 4 years of failed Obama policies, the Nation has added \$6 trillion of new debt onto the backs of citizens and businesses. Today, our national debt stands at \$16.4 trillion. Broken down by American citizens, that's \$52,210 for every man, woman, and child in this country.

We must get back on the right track and bring optimism into the business climate. First, we must pull back some of the regulations that bind the hands of our Nation's job creators. Second, Congress must make the difficult decisions we were elected to make and restrain government spending. Businesses cannot grow or expand in a climate of higher interest rates and higher taxes. Third, we have to be about creating a job-friendly environment.

I came to Congress as a businessman who simply got fed up with the government hindering my ability to create jobs. My mission every day is to make it easier for businesses to start to expand and to be successful.

In business, we know first you must face a problem honestly and then come up with real solutions that actually solve the problem. The economic policy of government trying to spend its way to prosperity has failed. Those of us in business know it's the private sector that creates real jobs, not the government.

Strong leadership and meaningful reforms are needed to move the looming

□ This symbol represents the time of day during the House proceedings, e.g., □ 1407 is 2:07 p.m.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.



Printed on recycled paper.

H505

cloud of doubt from our economy. Adding more hurdles will not get this job done. It is time we as elected leaders lead. Sometimes it's lonely, but it's the right thing to do.

REPUBLICANS APPROVE OF HARMFUL SEQUESTER

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

Mr. HOYER. The gentleman who preceded me is new to the Congress of the United States. I've been here for a little longer than that, some 32 years. This is the least confidence-building Congress, last Congress and this Congress, in which I have ever served. It is taking us from fiscal crisis to fiscal crisis. It is creating cliffs where no cliffs ought to exist, and they undermine the confidence of business, America, Americans, and indeed, the rest of the world that needs a stable and secure America to ensure that we keep the kind of stability that Americans want here at home and around the world.

We will be dealing with a bill today and tomorrow that could be considered in an hour. We're going to take two days to consider it. And while we consider that, while we fiddle, while the sequester threatens to burn our economy, jobs, and confidence, we do nothing. We have not done anything to avoid the sequester for the last 7 weeks of this year, and nothing in this Congress. As a matter of fact, other than completing the work of making sure the folks who were damaged by Sandy were assisted, which should have been done in the last Congress, we've done nothing here of real substance in 7 weeks, but we are about to confront the sequester.

I want every American to know, I want every person who relies on the Federal Government—and that is mainly all of us—that if Democrats were in charge of this House the sequester would not go into effect. Why? Because we would adopt an alternative policy that would cut spending so that we could move towards deficit and debt reduction, which we need to do as a country, and we would make a balanced proposal that the Senate Democrats will offer this day, and that we wanted to offer and CHRIS VAN HOLLEN offered last night in the Budget Committee, but which as not made in order.

□ 1010

In his State of the Union speech, the President talked about the American people deserve a vote. He's right. The American people deserve to know how Members are going to vote on issues of consequence to them, their families, their lives, their jobs, and their country. But we were denied a vote last week on this issue, which was a substitute for the sequester, and we are again denied this week a substitute for the sequester.

Some of my Republican friends try to say, Oh, it's the President who wanted

the sequester. That is dead flat wrong. Rob Nabors did mention the sequester after the Republicans passed the sequester in this House in July of 2011. They call it the Cut, Cap, and Balance Legislation. Its fallback position was "sequester." It was a policy that all, I think, but two Republicans voted for when it passed this House. It was a policy that they promoted and supported. It is a bad policy. It's an irrational policy. It is a policy that will have great adverse consequences.

At a town meeting, I said the sequester works like this: if you have a food budget and a movie budget and somebody loses their job, the sequester says you cut food by 10 percent and movies by 10 percent. No rational American family would do that. They'd say this month we're not going to the movies or this 6 months we're not going to the movies, but we're going to make sure we put food on our table. Sequester says, No, we cut food by 10 percent and movies by 10 percent.

Sequester is an irrational response to our failure as a Congress, correct, to get our finances on a sustainable path. We need to do that. And Democrats are suggesting a balanced way to do it. By the way, every bipartisan commission that has dealt with this issue has recommended a balanced process to get from where we are to where we need to be.

We're going to go on break next week as if we've done our job. We haven't. We ought to be spending time today, tomorrow, next week, and the week thereafter in avoiding the irrationality of the sequester process, but I have a list of Republicans here, all of whom say, Bring it on. The sequester is okay. Well, if we do the sequester, we're going to find out it's not okay.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the majority leader and I urge the Speaker to bring forth substantive legislation that is balanced and which will avoid the sequester taking place. It's bad for our people; it's bad for our country. It's bad policy.

DR. JULIAN DAVIDSON, AN AMERICAN PATRIOT

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

Mr. BROOKS of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, Dr. Julian Davidson passed away on January 31, 2013.

I have personally known Julian Davidson and his wife, Dorothy, for only a few years. But I know enough about Julian Davidson, what he did, and how he lived to know that he was an American patriot who will be sorely missed by his family, the Tennessee Valley, America, and me.

Julian Davidson was born in the small town of Oakman in Walker County, Alabama, on September 2, 1927. He was a proud son of Oakman and Walker County; however, his destiny lay elsewhere.

At the age of 17, Julian Davidson hitchhiked to Montgomery, Alabama,

and without permission and despite being underage, enlisted in the Navy during World War II. He served with distinction on gunships loading heavy ammunition into gun turrets. Julian Davidson's naval service gave him an enduring respect and admiration for America's warfighters who serve in harm's way.

After the Navy, Julian Davidson attended classes during the day and worked at a pool hall at night to obtain an electrical engineering degree from Auburn University. After graduation, Julian Davidson joined the Tennessee Valley Authority where he rose to senior design engineer.

In 1961, Julian Davidson began work for the United States Ballistic Missile Defense Organization as an aerospace research engineer, thus beginning his life's passion in a career in missile defense that spanned half a century.

Julian Davidson once briefed Secretary of Defense Robert McNamara concerning using the Nike Zeus missile system for a possible anti-satellite role. Army leadership didn't believe McNamara would do it, so they sent in Julian Davidson, then a junior member of the briefing team to make the presentation. Julian related that "for some reason, McNamara was very interested and asked how long it would take and how much it would cost." I answered 15 months and \$15 million. He didn't flinch. He said, Do it. We went through about six decision milestones in that 15-minute briefing.

In time, Julian Davidson became Director of the Advanced Ballistic Missile Defense Agency and one of the youngest people to achieve the rank of senior executive service with the Federal Government.

In 1979, Julian met Dorothy Smith. In 1981, they married in Fairfax, Virginia. Julian loved and admired Dorothy for her intelligence and spark. Julian Davidson used to say that Dorothy "is the glue that holds everything together." He wrote in a speech:

I'd like to thank my wife, Dorothy, who in addition to running her company, takes care of family matters, allowing me to do the things that interest me the most, missile development and testing.

Julian Davidson was quick witted when he added:

I want you to know the rumor is not true that Dorothy does all the maintenance jobs around the home because I refuse to. I would be happy to do these tasks, except she will not allow me to borrow her tools.

In the 1990s, Julian and Dorothy Davidson settled in Huntsville, Alabama, a community Julian loved very much. Julian started Davidson Technologies in 1996 with just two employees.

Julian Davidson emerged as a leading figure in the Tennessee Valley and believed that if everyone worked for the betterment of the community, regardless of personal gain, everyone benefited. Julian sought to leave our community and country better than he found it, and he did that.

Julian Davidson is a former chairman of the Air Force Studies Board of

□ 1020

the National Research Council, member of the Defense Sciences Board, and vice chairman of the Technology Assessment Committee of the United Space Command for the National Research Council.

Julian Davidson twice received the Army Exceptional Civilian Service Award. He has received the Air Force Meritorious Civilian Service Award, the MDA Pioneer Award, and the Medaris Award. He is a member of the United States Army Strategic Defense Employees Hall of Fame, the Alabama Technology Hall of Fame, and the Auburn Alumni Engineering Council.

Julian Davidson's impact on America is enormous. He is known by many as the "father of missile defense in America."

Julian Davidson is survived by his wife, Dorothy; his four children, Diana Lyn, Janice Faye, Randall Eugene, and Robert Lee; his two grandchildren, Wendy Faith Holderfield and William Blair Peyton; and three great grandchildren, Teagan Holderfield, Shelby Holderfield, and Michaela Holderfield.

America and the Davidson family have lost a great man and a true patriot, and we are all better for having known Dr. Julian Davidson.

END HUNGER NOW

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

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, President Obama's State of the Union speech was memorable and important for a number of reasons. I'm pleased the President talked about gun violence, climate change, voting rights, and, of course, jobs and the economy.

I'm especially pleased that, for the first time in more than a decade, the State of the Union had a real focus on poverty and the need to help those who economically are the most vulnerable in our Nation.

Poverty is the root cause of many of our Nation's problems. Those in poverty face challenges that middle- and higher-income families simply do not have to face. And to be frank, there are too many voices in the United States Congress that are silent on this issue.

So I commend the President for talking about poverty, which we must confront and address if we are truly to fulfill our mandate to form a more perfect Union.

One of the most devastating effects of poverty is hunger, and we cannot end hunger now if we're not talking about it. This is a big problem, and it is a costly problem. This is a problem that is not going away unless we act.

Mr. Speaker, over 50 million people are hungry in America. There are more than 50 million people who struggle to put food on their tables. Many of these are hardworking people whose jobs just do not pay enough to feed their families. Many are jobless, and many are homeless.

We need to use every opportunity we have to talk about it and to shine a light on the plight of the hungry, to take hunger out of the shadows and re-dedicate ourselves to the need to End Hunger Now.

As I said last week, just because over 50 million people in this country struggle to put food on their tables doesn't mean that we have mass starvation in America. Thankfully, we have developed a safety net that helps protect the vast majority of the hungry. SNAP, or food stamps, is one of the most important parts of that safety net.

There are a myriad of different initiatives being used to combat hunger in America. There are public, private, and nonprofit initiatives that are all very successful in their own ways. The problem is that these efforts—from Federal to State to local governments and from nonprofits, like churches and food banks, to for-profit businesses—are often working independently of each other. They are not always connected.

Mr. Speaker, we need to work smarter and more efficiently if we are going to End Hunger Now. We need to bring everyone together and connect the dots. We need a plan. That's why I've called for a White House Conference on Food and Nutrition. Over the years, there have been citywide, countywide, and statewide hunger summits. Food banks, hospitals, colleges, and universities have all held these events, but there has not been one nationwide hunger summit convened by the White House since President Nixon hosted such a summit in 1969—over 44 years ago.

We need this conference today more than ever because hunger is getting worse in America, not better. Our deficit and our debt are forcing us to do more with less, and that means we need to be more efficient and streamlined with our resources. Our Federal agencies should be talking to each other and addressing hunger in a more comprehensive and holistic way.

Why shouldn't the Departments of Labor, of Health and Human Services, of Housing and Urban Development, and, yes, the Department of Defense sit down and talk about the impact hunger and nutrition have on their efforts and how best they can address this problem?

As these agencies coordinate, we will need to involve antihunger safety net nonprofits, like our food banks, religious institutions, schools, and hospitals; and we need to bring in the business community, including the food and beverage community, financial institutions and manufacturers. We need to bring our doctors and nurses, our teachers and pastors, our business leaders and politicians, and, yes, the hungry together in one room to develop one plan to End Hunger Now. Then we need to agree to implement and execute the plan.

Mr. Speaker, hunger is a political condition. We have the means and the

knowledge to End Hunger Now. We just don't have the political will. While hunger is a political condition, it should not be a partisan issue. A White House Conference on Food and Nutrition is the forum that we need to galvanize political will to finally end hunger in America.

Ending hunger takes bold leadership. It takes Presidential leadership because the President is the only one who can call everyone together, who can get everyone in the same room and on the same page in order to come up with one meaningful and achievable plan. We need the President to rise to the occasion and to say that we are going to End Hunger Now.

Mr. Speaker, I call on the White House to host a Conference on Food and Nutrition. I call on the White House to commit to ending hunger in America just as they are working to reduce obesity and to improve nutrition. I call on the White House to End Hunger Now, and I ask my colleagues, Republicans and Democrats, to join in all efforts to End Hunger Now. Mr. Speaker, ending hunger now is more than a nice phrase. It is something we must do. It is our moral obligation. It is what a great country like America should do—End Hunger Now.

SEQUESTRATION AND DEFENSE SPENDING

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

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, part of the air of unreality in Washington is the myth of our inability to contend with budget reductions and the threat of sequestration in stabilizing America's financing. No doubt the draconian hand of across-the-board cuts in every program from food safety to border control to air traffic control would be foolish and destructive.

Let me be clear. The major problem in all of this is here in Congress and our political structure, which creates self-inflicted crises. Sequestration and the postal deficit are just two examples. We know what to do, but you would never know it because we spend most of our efforts around here describing and decrying the problems rather than doing something about them.

Let me repeat. The amount of budget reduction is something that can, in fact, be managed if only we change how America does business. Nowhere have the cries been more anguished than about the impact of sequestration on the Department of Defense, ironically, from many of the same people who insisted on the sequestration gimmick in the first place. As is widely recognized, sequestration over the next 10 years when applied to the Pentagon's budget would only reduce it in inflation-adjusted terms to what it was in 2007 when the most powerful military in the world was engaged in a war in Iraq and the challenge in Afghanistan.

If Members of Congress pay attention to the facts, they will see a clear path to dramatically reduce Pentagon spending without undermining America's position of being the most powerful Nation on the planet.

Nobody has done a better job of highlighting a path forward, an area of opportunity, than Walter Pincus, writing in the pages of *The Washington Post* over the course of the last couple of years as he details the sweep of our nuclear weapons program and the spending trajectory. This morning is his latest offering and should be required reading for every Member of Congress, and the ones who whine the loudest should be forced to read it twice. He details the vast array of nuclear weapons that are ready to be deployed within 30 minutes, a relic of our contending with the former Soviet Union, where deterrence was the order of the day and when we were relying on massive assured mutual destruction of that huge country with overwhelming force.

Now, not even the most delusional think we need a fraction of that firepower for today's threats, like North Korea, and it certainly wouldn't work against a nuclear weapon falling in the arms of some radical extremist. That, by the way, is most likely to happen with Pakistan's proven nuclear capability than Iran's, which is still being developed.

The cost of this overwhelming force, including its three delivery systems, ought to give people pause. Consider the 14 Ohio class submarines, each with 24 ICBMs and each missile armed with five warheads, each three times the explosive power of the bombs dropped on Japan. We've got 118 B-52 strategic bombers and, of course, all of the land-based missiles where people are in the silos, ready to launch at a moment's notice. It is, by any stretch of the imagination, extravagance that borders on lunacy.

The \$80 billion the White House was forced to promise for the upgrades on the nuclear weapons complex and the at least \$100 billion to replace the strategic delivery systems that were extracted in return for votes to pass the START treaty are obvious places to begin retrenchment. There are tens, if not hundreds, of billions of dollars to be saved over the next 10 years by refocusing our defense posture for the threats of today and the likely ones of tomorrow. Let's start cutting this massive Cold War deterrence based on the threat of nuclear weapons we've never been able to use, don't want to use, shouldn't use, and can't afford.

I invite my colleagues, especially those on the other side of the aisle, to join us in getting real and getting specific. There is a clear path forward that should command the support of Republicans and Democrats alike to achieve fiscal stability. Let's rein in outrageous crop insurance abuses. Don't fight health care reform—accelerate it. The work we're doing in Oregon, if applied nationally, could save up to \$1.5

trillion over the next 10 years. Pay for the privilege of taking America's mineral wealth by reforming the Mining Act of 1872, and slash the fossilized nuclear weapons program.

SOBER TRUTH ON PREVENTING UNDERAGE DRINKING ACT

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

Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD. Mr. Speaker, last week, I introduced H.R. 498, to reauthorize the Sober Truth on Preventing Underage Drinking Act, better known as the STOP Act.

The original STOP Act passed with bipartisan support in 2006. It was based on the recommendations of the 2003 Institute of Medicine report, which outlined the extent of the underage drinking problem in the United States. At that time, 20 percent of eighth graders, 42 percent of 10th graders, and 58 percent of 12th graders reported being drunk in their lifetimes.

□ 1030

Designed to address this public health crisis, the STOP Act established an interagency committee to coordinate Federal efforts to reduce and ultimately prevent underage drinking.

The law financed public health research on underage drinking, and it authorized a national media campaign to educate parents about the dangers of consuming alcohol before the age of 21.

The STOP Act also provided grants to communities throughout the country to enhance their underage drinking prevention efforts. As a result of this comprehensive approach, we have seen positive results in both national statistics and in communities across America.

According to the 2012 Monitoring the Future survey, the lifetime use of alcohol by 8th-, 10th-, and 12th-graders is at the lowest level in years. Unfortunately, there is more that needs to be done.

Despite the progress we have made, alcohol continues to be the number one drug of choice among youth, and the consequences are devastating.

In addition to costing society over \$62 billion a year, underage drinking by youths 15-20 years of age is a major cause of homicide, suicide, and motor vehicle accidents. And it results in the deaths of approximately 5,000 youths every year. Adding to this tragedy is the fact that all of these consequences are preventable. This makes reauthorization of the STOP Act even more necessary.

H.R. 498 continues the successful programs of the original STOP Act and adds a grant program to train pediatric health care providers on the best practices for screening and treating substance abuse among youth.

Mr. Speaker, the reauthorization of the STOP Act is an important bipartisan effort to help prevent the need-

less suffering and costs associated with underage drinking. I urge my colleagues to join me and my original cosponsors, Congressman FRANK WOLF and Congresswoman ROSA DELAURO, by cosponsoring the STOP reauthorization bill, H.R. 498, so we can continue to move forward in our efforts to address this public health crisis affecting our children.

DOING NOTHING IS NOT AN OPTION

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

Mr. KILMER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today with sincere appreciation for the opportunity I have to represent my region in our Nation's Capital. Throughout the past year, whether it was in Gray's Harbor or Port Angeles, Bremerton, or Tacoma, what I heard from folks around my region is they want solutions to our problems. People want to get back to work. They want to start new businesses. They want to explore new frontiers of science and technology. They want to help build our Nation's bridges and roads. They want to refurbish our schools and buildings. I'm passionate about these issues, and I'm committed to working with my colleagues from both sides of the aisles to find new ways to move this economy forward.

Over the past 6 weeks, I've had the opportunity to meet with constituents to talk about their top concerns. And whether it's back in Washington State, or visits with folks who've traveled 3,000 miles to our Nation's capital, the number one thing that I hear about is the reckless and devastating impact that impending across-the-board cuts would have on our families and on our communities.

I've heard from educators and administrators that they face dramatic cuts that would lead to ballooning class sizes and significant cuts to financial aid.

I've heard from parents who are afraid for their kids who have autism, fearful that their kids won't be able to get the services that they rely on.

I've heard from tribal leaders who say that these cuts will scale back community policing on our reservations and jeopardize patient access to the Indian Health Service.

And as someone who has spent the last decade working in economic development, I've heard from small business owners who say that all of this uncertainty is making them hesitant to hire new workers and expand their production lines. Virtually every meeting that I have had has detailed how reckless and wrong-headed these across-the-board cuts would be.

Yesterday, testifying before the House Armed Services Committee, Deputy Secretary of Defense Ashton Carter pointed out that these cuts aren't happening because we've

thought about them strategically. They're not happening because we've identified wasteful spending. They're not happening because we've discovered some new technology that makes it cheaper to keep our Nation safe. They're only happening because they are, as he put it, "the collateral damage of political gridlock."

We've already seen the effects of these looming cuts in Washington State. The Puget Sound Naval Shipyard, the largest employer in my district, had to postpone its career fair because of all of this budget uncertainty. This is a no brainer—we have the work and we have the workers, but they can't hire because Congress hasn't done its job. Puget Sound Naval Shipyard needs to be able to actively recruit and hire workers. Our local economy needs it, and our national security depends on it. And yet, here we are.

Later today, we will be focusing on legislation that doesn't solve this problem, isn't going to pass the Senate, and isn't going to become law. And after we finish legislative business tomorrow, we're all being sent home for a week. This leaves us with just 4 legislative days for us to act before these across-the-board cuts go into effect.

We were elected to this body to help people. Stopping these damaging, non-strategic, across-the-board cuts to avoid undermining our economy should be our top priority. We should be working day and night until we have a solution. By doing nothing, we risk putting our fragile economy back into a recession. By doing nothing, we refuse the commitments we've made. We're cutting education, kicking kids off Head Start, hurting small businesses, and gutting research and innovation—the foundations of our long-term economic growth.

By doing nothing, we hurt the men and women who spend their days protecting our Nation and providing essential services to the American people. And by doing nothing, Congress is spending the wrong message to the American people.

Mr. Speaker, we need to get America back to work. And, Mr. Speaker, we need to get Congress working again, too. Doing nothing is not an option. Let's put an end to these gimmicks, and let's stop kicking the can down the road. Let's stop these series of self-imposed crises that fissure the trust and predictability that the private sector needs.

Let's work together to reach a balanced compromise to replace the across-the-board cuts with a smart, balanced approach to addressing our fiscal challenges and getting our economy growing again. Let's maintain our commitment to our Nation's most vulnerable and preserve retirement security for our seniors. And let's get America back to work.

PROTECT FUNDAMENTAL RIGHT TO VOTE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON) for 5 minutes.

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, this month the Supreme Court will hear arguments in *Shelby v. Holder*, a case that challenges the constitutionality of section 5 of the Voting Rights Act. It is imperative that the Voting Rights Act be upheld in its entirety, for without it, a fundamental piece of our democracy will be out of reach for millions in this country.

Mr. Speaker, I stand here after two decades, and I'm supposed to be standing here representing a district that has been altered twice. But, Mr. Speaker, I stand here representing a district that has been altered three times—that many times—in this last two decades. As we saw in the recent election, discrimination on the basis of race is a persistent reality throughout many localities in States protected by section 5 of the Voting Rights Act. Without these protections, voters are at risk of losing their fundamental right to vote and to have that vote counted.

The Voting Rights Act provides a remedy to protect voters, either by addressing actual instances of discrimination or by preventing discrimination from happening in the first place.

□ 1040

Section 5 provides localities the opportunity to prove that they are fully committed to ensuring everyone has the right to vote, and sets out clear criteria for doing so. In this way, section 5 of the Voting Rights Act encourages localities to establish fair voting practices, but demands real proof of the progress.

I cannot tell you how many cases that come to the attention of the Justice Department, almost on a monthly basis, of discrimination in this area. The Constitution is unequivocally clear that the Congress has the authority to protect voters. That is why Congress spent so much time in 2006 reviewing all the data and hearing from all sides.

The 2006 reauthorization was recognition that discrimination still exists but that Congress has a responsibility to ensure that every voter must continue to exercise their right.

If every State would prove to the voters that they are willing not to discriminate, there would not be the need; but that has not happened. Even States not covered have had difficulty of allowing minorities to express themselves.

Now, I have been a victim of discrimination through redistricting and cracking and packing and every other technique that can happen in redistricting. Mr. Speaker, until we, in this country, can guarantee that voters will be handled fairly, there is no way that we should be talking about doing away

with section 5 of the Voting Rights Act.

CELEBRATING THE 150TH ANNI- VERSARY OF KANSAS STATE UNIVERSITY

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

Mr. HUELSKAMP. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the first land-grant college in America. Founded on February 16, 1863, Kansas State University has faithfully served the people of Kansas and this great Nation for 150 years.

K-State was one of the first schools to offer a degree in home economics. K-State has helped feed a hungry world through innovative wheat, beef, and sorghum research; and Kansas State University is preparing for the next generation of animal research with the construction of the National Bio and Agri-Defense Facility Research Laboratory.

Let me extend my heartfelt congratulations to Kansas State University for the last 150 years as we look forward to many more successes in the next 150 years.

REAUTHORIZATION OF SECTION 5 OF THE VOTING RIGHTS ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE) for 5 minutes.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I've always had such great respect for this distinguished body, the holder and interpreter of democracy, the institution that proudly protects the Constitution that was written by those who saw in this land this bright and shining sun from sea to shining sea, enormous opportunity for freedom.

So many people came to this Nation, and they came in many different ways. We don't carry the way we came into the future, as much as the fact that we are grateful of the opportunity that this Nation has given us.

The Nation has been able to turn the tide on embracing democracy in its fullest because of the Constitution and the laws, because we adhere to the three branches of government. So although my ancestors came to this Nation in bondage that lasted for hundreds of years, slavery, that has its remnants continuously as we move throughout society, there are now laws that can ensure, no matter how you came to this country, no matter what language you spoke, you are, in fact, deserving of the protection of the Constitution.

And so out of that protection came the 14th and 15th Amendments. Those amendments provided that no State shall make or enforce any law which shall abridge the privileges or immunities of citizens of the United States, nor shall any State deprive any person of life, liberty or property without due process of law, and not deny any person in the jurisdiction equal protection.

The 15th Amendment provides that the right of citizens to vote shall not be denied or abridged by the United States or any State on account of its race, color, or previous servitude.

And, finally, each amendment allows this Congress to enforce laws; and that was the basis of the authority of the President that came from Texas, President Lyndon Baines Johnson, who joined with a young, brilliant minister of the gospel, a man who ultimately sacrificed his life, Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr., to engage in debates and discussion that resulted in the 1964 Civil Rights Act and the 1965 Voting Rights Act.

And here we are today with the opportunity for people from all walks of life and all communities to be able to vote and to have, as of September 28, 2011, the upholding of the pre-clearance provision, a very special provision of the Voting Rights Act by a district court, Federal court in the District of Columbia.

Shelby v. The United States now is before the Supreme Court. And my argument, Mr. Speaker, is that this is no time to eliminate pre-clearance. I'm reminded of a letter that I wrote to the U.S. Attorney's Office, Attorney General Eric Holder, just in my city alone, the city of Houston, to report 15 voter abuse cases.

Without the pre-clearance, where would we be?

Or the proposal to eliminate the North Forest Independent School District Board of Trustees over a school district that has worked hard to survive which will be subjected to the pre-clearance to determine whether not only the students will be denied their rights to learn in a school district they love and is fighting for their education, but that elected persons will be denied the right to serve and others denied the right to vote for them.

The Voting Rights Act protects all voters. It gives them all the right to vote—one vote, one person. And Shelby County has raised issue that they should not be subjected to pre-clearance, that they are beyond that. The district court, the Federal court decided, in Washington, D.C., that they were wrong, that pre-clearance is constitutional.

And we know that well because when we had the privilege of reauthorizing section 5 in 2006, building on the leadership of my predecessor, the Honorable Barbara Jordan, who came to the United States Congress only because, along with Andrew Young, the first who came out of the Deep South since Reconstruction, only because America had seen fit to pass the Voting Rights Act of 1965, because I can assure you, with personal stories from the Honorable Barbara Jordan told to us in her lifetime, that she ran and ran and ran and ran and could not be elected in Houston, Texas.

The Barbara Jordan that was admired by many could not be elected until after the passage of the Voting

Rights Act because there were abuses and prohibitions and intimidation of African Americans being able to vote.

And so today I believe it is extremely important that, as the Supreme Court takes this case up on February 27, that we stand in the midst of the 15,000 sheets of documentation, when I had the privilege of joining with my Judiciary Committee colleagues to reauthorize the Voting Rights Act and, specifically, section 5, and writing amendments to ensure its sanctity and security for a period of years, that we did not do it frivolously. We did it with authority, Mr. Speaker, and I am asking that America stand against the elimination of the Voting Rights Act. Join us on February 27.

I rise today to speak about the need to protect democracy, to protect the voice of the American people, and to ensure the right to vote continues to be treated as a right under the Constitution rather than being treated as though it is privilege.

If you are a Constitutional Scholar this is an exciting time because the United States Supreme Court has a very active docket this term, deciding on matters which have great import to every American.

And pursuant to that, in less than two weeks the Supreme Court will hear the case of Shelby County Alabama v. Holder. The issue in this case is whether Congress' decision in 2006 to reauthorize Section 5 of the Voting Rights Act under the pre-existing coverage formula of Section 4(b) of the Voting Rights Act exceeded its authority under the Fourteenth and Fifteenth Amendments and thus violated the Tenth Amendment and Article IV of the United States Constitution.

The challenge to the constitutionality of Section 5 in this case was brought by Shelby County, Ala., which is a majority white suburb of Birmingham.

In rejecting the County's arguments, Judge Bates agreed with an earlier unanimous decision, by a three-judge panel of the D.C. District Court, which likewise upheld the constitutionality of Section 5, in a case brought by a local Texas utility district, which is my home state.

That earlier decision, however, was vacated in 2009 when the Supreme Court decided that the utility district could pursue a statutory "bailout" from Section 5 coverage.

Unlike the Texas utility district, Shelby County freely admitted that it has a recent history of voting discrimination that disqualified it from "bailing out."

I am joined by my colleagues here today to call on all Americans to reject and denounce tactics and measures that have absolutely no place in our democracy. I call on African-Americans, Hispanic and Latino Americans, as well as Asian-American voters to band together to fight for their right to vote and to work together to understand their voting rights which are granted to citizens of our nation by our laws and our Constitution.

I call on these citizens to stand against harassment and intimidation, to vote in the face of such adversity. The most effective way to curb tactics of intimidation and harassment is to vote. Is to stand together to fight against any measures that would have the effect of preventing every eligible citizen from being able to vote. Voting ensures active participation in democracy.

As a Member of this body, I firmly believe that we must protect the rights of all eligible citizens to vote. Over the past few decades, minorities in this country have witnessed a pattern of efforts to intimidate and harass minority voters through so-called "Voter Id" requirements. I am sad to report that as we head into the 21st century, these efforts continue.

Never in the history of our nation, has the effect of one person, one vote, been more important. A great Spanish Philosopher, George Santayana once said "Those who cannot learn from history are doomed to repeat it." Our history has taught us that denying the right to vote based on race, gender or class is a stain on the democratic principles that we all value. The Voting Rights Act was a reaction to the actions of our passed and a way to pave the road to a new future.

The Voting Rights Act (VRA) was adopted in 1965 and was extended in 1970, 1975, and 1982. This legislation is considered the most successful piece of civil rights legislation ever adopted by the United States Congress. Contrary to the prevailing rumor that the Act is due to expire, leaving minorities with no rights, the Act is actually due for reauthorization in the 2nd session of the 108th Congress—there is no doubt about whether it will continue to protect our rights in the future.

The VRA codifies and effectuates the 15th Amendment's permanent guarantee that, throughout the nation, no person shall be denied the right to vote on account of race or color. Adopted at a time when African Americans were substantially disfranchised in many Southern states, the Act employed measures to restore the right to vote to citizens of all U.S. states.

By 1965, proponents of disenfranchisement made violent attempts to thwart the efforts of civil rights activists. The murder of voting-rights activists in Philadelphia and Mississippi gained national attention, along with numerous other acts of violence and terrorism.

Finally, the unprovoked attack on March 7, 1965, by state troopers on peaceful marchers crossing the Edmund Pettus Bridge in Selma, Alabama, en route to the state capitol in Montgomery, persuaded the President and Congress to overcome Southern legislators' resistance to effective voting rights legislation. President Johnson issued a call for a strong voting rights law and hearings began soon thereafter on the bill that would become the Voting Rights Act.

Congress adopted this far-reaching statute in response to a rash of instances of interference with attempts by African American citizens to exercise their right to vote—a rash that appears to be manifesting itself again in this nation. Perhaps a legislative measure is needed to respond in a way that the VRA did.

The Supreme Court upheld the constitutionality of the VRA in 1966 in a landmark decision—*South Carolina v. Katzenbach*, 383 U.S. 301, 327–28:

Congress had found that case-by-case litigation was inadequate to combat widespread and persistent discrimination in voting, because of the inordinate amount of time and energy required to overcome the obstructionist tactics invariably encountered in these lawsuits. After enduring nearly a century of systematic resistance to the Fifteenth Amendment, Congress might well decide to shift the advantage of time and inertia from the perpetrators of the evil to its victims.

It seems that the “obstructionist tactics” that threatened the aggrieved parties in Katzenbach have returned. The advantages of “time and inertia” that were shifted from bigoted bureaucrats to minority victims are slowly shifting back against their favor when educators, government leaders, and agencies are allowed to contravene the policy and legal conclusions given by the highest court in the country.

Several factors influenced the initiation of this civil rights legislation. The first was a large shift in the number of African Americans away from the Republican Party. Second, many Democrats felt that it was a mistake of its Southern members to oppose civil rights legislation because they could lose more of the African American and liberal votes.

No right is more fundamental than the right to vote. It is protected by more constitutional amendments—the 1st, 14th, 15th, 19th, 24th and 26th—than any other right we enjoy as Americans. Broad political participation ensures the preservation of all our other rights and freedoms. 3 State laws that impose new restrictions on voting, however, undermine our strong democracy by impeding access to the polls and reducing the number of Americans who vote and whose votes are counted.

VOTER IDENTIFICATION

There have been several restrictive voting bills considered and approved by states in the past several years. The most commonly advanced initiatives are laws that require voters to present photo identification when voting in person. Additionally, states have proposed or passed laws to require proof of citizenship when registering to vote; to eliminate the right to register to vote and to submit a change of address within the same state on Election Day; to shorten the time allowed for early voting; to make it more difficult for third-party organizations to conduct voter registration; and even to eliminate a mandate on poll workers to direct voters who go to the wrong precinct.

These recent changes are on top of the disfranchisement laws in 48 states that deprive an estimated 5.3 million people with criminal convictions—disproportionately African Americans and Latinos—of their political voice.

Voter ID laws are becoming increasingly common across the country. Today, 31 states have laws requiring voters to present some form of identification to vote in federal, state and local elections, although some laws or initiatives passed in 2011 have not yet gone into effect. Some must also be pre-cleared under the Voting Rights Act prior to implementation. In 16 of those 31 States, voters must (or will soon be required to) present a photo ID—that in many states must be government-issued—in order to cast a ballot.

Voter ID laws deny the right to vote to thousands of registered voters who do not have, and, in many instances, cannot obtain the limited identification states accept for voting. Many of these Americans cannot afford to pay for the required documents needed to secure a government issued photo ID. As such, these laws impede access to the polls and are at odds with the fundamental right to vote.

In total, more than 21 million Americans of voting age lack documentation that would satisfy photo ID laws, and a disproportionate number of these Americans are low-income, racial and ethnic minorities, and elderly. As many as 25% of African Americans of voting age lack government-issued photo ID, com-

pared to only 8% of their white counterparts. Eighteen percent of Americans over the age of 65 do not have government-issued photo ID.

Laws requiring photo identification to vote are a “solution” in search of a problem. There is no credible evidence that in-person impersonation voter fraud—the only type of fraud that photo IDs could prevent—is even a minor problem. Multiple studies have found that almost all cases of alleged in-person impersonation voter “fraud” are actually the result of a voter making an inadvertent mistake about their eligibility to vote, and that even these mistakes are extremely infrequent.

It is important, instead, to focus on both expanding the franchise and ending practices which actually threaten the integrity of the elections, such as improper purges of voters, voter harassment, and distribution of false information about when and where to vote. None of these issues, however, are addressed or can be resolved with a photo ID requirement.

Furthermore, requiring voters to pay for an ID, as well as the background documents necessary to obtain an ID in order to vote, is tantamount to a poll tax. Although some states issue IDs for free, the birth certificates, passports, or other documents required to secure a government-issued ID cost money, and many Americans simply cannot afford to pay for them. In addition, obtaining a government-issued photo ID is not an easy task for all members of the electorate. Low-income individuals who lack the funds to pay for documentation, people with disabilities with limited access to transportation, and elderly.

Americans who never had a birth certificate and cannot obtain alternate proof of their birth in the U.S., are among those who face significant or insurmountable obstacles to getting the photo ID needed to exercise their right to vote. For example, because of Texas’ recently passed voter ID law, an estimated 36,000 people in West Texas’s District 19 are 137 miles from the nearest full service Department of Public Safety office, where those without IDs must travel to preserve their right to vote under the state’s new law.

In addition, women who have changed their names due to marriage or divorce often experience difficulties with identity documentation, as did Andrea, who recently moved from Massachusetts to South Carolina and who, in the span of a month, spent more than 17 hours online and in person trying without success to get a South Carolina driver’s license.

Voter ID laws send not-so-subtle messages about who is and is not encouraged to vote. As states approve laws requiring photo ID to vote, each formulates its own list of acceptable forms of documentation. Another common thread emerging from disparate state approaches is a bias against robust student electoral participation.

Henceforth, students at Wisconsin colleges and universities will not be able to vote using their student ID cards, unless those cards have issuance dates, expiration dates, and signatures.

Currently, only a handful of Wisconsin colleges and universities are issuing compliant IDs. Nor will South Carolina, Texas, or Tennessee accept student identification at the polls.

Policies that limit students’ electoral participation are particularly suspect, appearing on the heels of unprecedented youth turnout in the 2008 election.

Four states with new voter identification mandates, including my home state of Texas, South Carolina, Mississippi, and Alabama, are required under the Voting Rights Act to have these voting changes pre-cleared by either the Department of Justice (DOJ) or a panel of federal judges. Before they may be implemented, DOJ must certify that these laws do not have the purpose or effect of restricting voting by racial or language minority groups.

Thus far, South Carolina and Texas both have submitted applications to DOJ that have been formally opposed in written submissions. DOJ has requested further information from both states, and the applications are on hold. Alabama’s ID requirements do not take effect until 2014, so the state has not yet applied to DOJ for preclearance. Mississippi’s voter ID requirement was approved by voters on November 8, 2011, so a preclearance request has not yet been submitted.

In countries scattered across this earth, citizens are denied the right to speak their hearts and minds. In this country, only a few decades ago, the right to vote was limited by race, sex, or the financial ability to own land. When a vote is not cast, it is a referendum on all those who fought so hard and tirelessly for our rights. When a vote is cast, it is cast not only for you and the future but also for all those who never had the chance to pull a lever.

We are still working to make Martin Luther King’s dream a reality, a reality in which our government’s decisions are made out in the open not behind cigar filled closed doors.

The time to take back the country is at hand, and we are the ones with the power to do just that. To do so we must allow all citizens who are eligible to vote, with the right to excise this decision without tricks or tactics to dilute their right to vote.

Instances of voter intimidation are not long ago and far away. Just last year I sent a letter to U.S. Attorney General Eric Holder to draw his attention to several disturbing instances of voter intimidation that had taken place in Houston. In a single week there were at least 15 reports of abuse of voter rights throughout the city of Houston.

As a Senior Member of the House Judiciary Committee, I called for an immediate investigation of these instances. Many of these incidents of voter intimidation were occurring in predominately minority neighborhoods and have been directed at African-Americans and Latinos. It is unconscionable to think that anyone would deliberately employ the use of such forceful and intimidating tactics to undermine the fundamental, Constitutional right to vote. However, such conduct has regrettably occurred in Houston, and I urge you to take appropriate action to ensure that it does not recur.

I am here today in the name of freedom, patriotism, and democracy. I am here to demand that the long hard fought right to vote continues to be protected.

A long, bitter, and bloody struggle was fought for the Voting Rights Act of 1965 so that all Americans could enjoy the right to vote, regardless of race, ethnicity, or national origin. Americans died in that fight so that others could achieve what they had been forcefully deprived of for centuries—the ability to walk freely and without fear into the polling place and cast a voting ballot.

Efforts to keep minorities from fully exercising that franchise, however, continue. Indeed, in the past thirty years, we have witnessed a pattern of efforts to intimidate and harass minority voters including efforts that were deemed “Ballot Security” programs that include the mailing of threatening notices to African-American voters, the carrying of video cameras to monitor polls, the systematic challenging of minority voters at the polls on unlawful grounds, and the hiring of guards and off-duty police officers to intimidate and frighten voters at the polls.

My colleagues on the other side of the aisle have a particularly poor track record when it comes to documented acts of voter intimidation. In 1982, a Federal Court in New Jersey provided a consent order that forbids the Republican National Committee from undertaking any ballot security activities in a polling place or election district where race or ethnic composition is a factor in the decision to conduct such activities and where a purpose or significant effect is to deter qualified voters from voting. These reprehensible practices continue to plague our Nation’s minority voters.

VOTING RIGHTS ACT HISTORY

August 6, 2011, marked the 46th anniversary of the Voting Rights Act.

Most Americans take the right to vote for granted. We assume that we can register and vote if we are over 18 and are citizens. Most of us learned in school that discrimination based on race, creed or national origin has been barred by the Constitution since the end of the Civil War.

Before the 1965 Voting Rights Act, however, the right to vote did not exist in practice for most African Americans. And, until 1975, most American citizens who were not proficient in English faced significant obstacles to voting, because they could not understand the ballot.

Even though the Indian Citizenship Act gave Native Americans the right to vote in 1924, state law determined who could actually vote, which effectively excluded many Native Americans from political participation for decades.

Asian Americans and Asian immigrants also have suffered systematic exclusion from the political process and it has taken a series of reforms, including repeal of the Chinese Exclusion Act in 1943, and passage of amendments strengthening the Voting Rights Act three decades later, to fully extend the franchise to Asian Americans. It was with this history in mind that the Voting Rights Act of 1965 was designed to make the right to vote a reality for all Americans.

And the Voting Rights Act has made giant strides toward that goal. Without exaggeration, it has been one of the most effective civil rights laws passed by Congress.

In 1964, there were only approximately 300 African-Americans in public office, including just three in Congress. Few, if any, black elected officials were elected anywhere in the South. Today there are more than 9,100 black elected officials, including 43 members of Congress, the largest number ever. The act has opened the political process for many of the approximately 61,000 Latino public officials that have been elected and appointed nationwide, including 263 at the state or federal level, 27 of whom serve in Congress. And Native Americans, Asians and others who have historically encountered harsh barriers to full political participation also have benefited greatly.

We must not forget the importance of protecting this hard earned right.

VOTER ID

An election with integrity is one that is open to every eligible voter. Restrictive voter ID requirements degrade the integrity of our elections by systematically excluding large numbers of eligible Americans.

I do not argue with the notion that we must prevent individuals from voting who are not allowed to vote. Yet a hidden argument in this bill is that immigrants may “infiltrate” our voting system. Legal immigrants who have successfully navigated the citizenship maze are unlikely to draw the attention of the authorities by attempting to register incorrectly. Similarly, undocumented immigrants are even less likely to risk deportation just to influence an election.

If for no other reason than after a major disaster be it earth quakes, fires, floods or hurricanes, we must all understand how vulnerable our system is. Families fleeing the hurricanes and fires suffered loss of property that included lost documents. Compounding this was the devastation of the region, which virtually shut down civil services in the area. For example, New Orleans residents after Hurricane Katrina were scattered across 44 states. These uprooted citizens had difficulty registering and voting both with absentee ballots and at satellite voting stations. As a result, those elections took place fully 8 months after the disaster, and it required the efforts of non-profits, such as the NAACP, to ensure that voters had the access they are constitutionally guaranteed.

We need to address the election fraud that we know occurring, such as voting machine integrity and poll volunteer training and competence. After every election that occurs in this country, we have solid documented evidence of voting inconsistencies and errors. In 2004, in New Mexico, malfunctioning machines mysteriously failed to properly register a presidential vote on more than 20,000 ballots. 1 million ballots nationwide were flawed by faulty voting equipment—roughly one for every 100 cast.

Those who face the most significant barriers are not only the poor, minorities, and rural populations. 1.5 million college students, whose addresses change often, and the elderly, will also have difficulty providing documentation.

In fact, newly married individuals face significant barriers to completing a change in surname. For instance, it can take 6–8 weeks to receive the marriage certificate in the mail, another two weeks (and a full day waiting in line) to get the new Social Security card, and finally three-four weeks to get the new driver’s license. There is a significant possibility that this bill will also prohibit newlyweds from voting if they are married within three months of Election Day.

The right to vote is a critical and sacred constitutionally protected civil right. To challenge this is to erode our democracy, challenge justice, and mock our moral standing. I urge my colleagues to join me in dismissing this crippling legislation, and pursue effective solutions to the real problems of election fraud and error. We cannot let the rhetoric of an election year destroy a fundamental right upon which we have established liberty and freedom.

□ 1050

TIME TO GET TO WORK

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

Mr. GARCIA. Mr. Speaker, this afternoon a group of 20 freshman Members of Congress will gather to announce that we are putting aside our partisan differences to do the right thing for the American people. For Democrats, this means that 10 of us are willing to compromise on spending so long as we keep our promise to seniors that they can retire with dignity and have access to affordable, quality health care. My Republican colleagues have said that they are willing to compromise on revenues so long as Democrats meet them halfway.

Like most Americans, to those of us who are new to Washington, “compromise” isn’t a dirty word. It’s what regular, ordinary people do in their daily lives. The American people get it. If you have a problem that arises in your office, you and your coworkers may disagree on how to address it, but your company does not wait until it gets to the last minute to solve it. You simply meet with your colleagues, put differences aside, and find solutions. Not everyone will get what they want, but we move forward. And this is precisely what the American people have sent us to Washington to do. They have sent us here to solve problems on their behalf and not argue all the time.

Mr. Speaker, the challenges before us are serious, and they deserve serious proposals. While our economy is growing, we still have many families that are looking for work or waiting for our economy to grow more quickly. Many parents are working two and three jobs and yet cannot find a way to save money for retirement or send their kids to school. I see this all the time in my community in places like Kendall, Westchester, and Islamorada.

This status quo is unacceptable to me, just as I know it is unacceptable to my Republican colleagues. Yet it seems that when we gather in this Chamber, rather than finding common-sense solutions to our problems, we engage in ideological debates that are designed for political posturing that lead us to nowhere.

At a minimum, if we can’t agree on every issue, we should be working hard to solve problems. The American people may not know this, but the fact is that of the 31 days that we met here last month, Members of Congress only gathered six times. And in those 6 days, the only bill of any real significance was the Hurricane Sandy relief—a bill that should have been approved last year. Maybe this is the way Washington works; but in the rest of America, if you show up to your job less than 20 percent of the time—that’s about 1 day a week—you probably won’t have a job for too long. And yet some of my colleagues find this acceptable. Well, I don’t. And I know the

American people won't find this acceptable either.

So I respectfully invite each of my colleagues, Republican and Democrats alike, and even those of you who have been in Washington for a while, to join us for this moment of bipartisanship and work together on behalf of our fellow citizens. Let's remember that it is a privilege to serve the American people. It's time to get to work.

UPHOLDING SECTION 5 OF THE VOTING RIGHTS ACT

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

Mr. VEASEY. As oral arguments are being prepared for the February 27 U.S. Supreme Court hearing in the case of *Shelby County v. Holder*, which challenges the constitutionality of section 5 of the Voting Rights Act, I stand here today in strong support of upholding section 5 as evidence of its current critical necessity. In my home State of Texas, the need for section 5 of the Voting Rights Act is playing out in a very dramatic fashion.

I'm a plaintiff in the ongoing litigation involving the 2011 Texas redistricting case, *Quesada v. The State of Texas*. I can personally attest and flatly state that overt and deliberate racial discrimination is still used by leaders in Texas today. I wish that statement were untrue or out of date. It would be wonderful to say that we have progressed past the need for protection under section 5 of the Voting Rights Act. Sadly, this is not the case. Section 5 protects minorities from racial discriminatory voter ID laws, voter suppression tactics, and discriminatory redistricting plans. These protections are needed now as much as ever.

In 2011, just 2 years ago, a map was drawn by the Texas Legislature that didn't merely affect the politics of our State. Overt racial discriminatory tactics were used to isolate and suppress hundreds of thousands of minorities for the purpose of political gain by current partisan leaders of my State. Latino and African American citizens in the State of Texas suffered the most aggressive and deliberate discriminatory blows to our constitutional rights to fairly participate in elections.

Cold and heartless tactics were used that should be simply relics of the past—relics like “packing” millions of minority voters together into as few districts as people to dilute the impact of their vote by “cracking” the remaining voters to ensure that their vote has no impact at all. Minorities were packed precinct by precinct and block by block in order to contain the impact of their growing population. And yet here we are today, fighting to uphold section 5.

The right to vote and the right for one's voice to be heard through elected representation is a legally enacted and constitutional right that many have

bled and died for. Yet we are still fighting for this very right. Some say its time to move on. But, my dear friends, we must never move on while these rights are not just at risk but under attack. And when I detail the discrimination contained within the redistricting process, no one should think I'm acting as a partisan Democrat. The three-judge panel in Federal court that heard the evidence, questioned the witnesses, and delivered the opinion of the Texas redistricting case consisted of two judges appointed by Republican Presidents and one judge appointed by a Democratic President. Their finding of intentional discrimination was unanimous. They could not have made their views any clearer, stating:

The parties have provided more evidence of discriminatory intent than we have space or need to address here.

This was not a case heard 30 years ago, or even 10 or 5 years ago. The decision was released just last August, barely 6 months ago.

Lastly, those who tell you that there is no recourse for States that no longer discriminate are, at best, dangerously mistaken. The Voting Rights Act contains provisions for States that have over the years exhibited that they are no longer in need of pre-clearance. States can submit evidence to the Department of Justice or the D.C. District Court that they are no longer using racial discriminatory redistricting tactics and apply for a way out of section 5. As a matter of fact, since 2009, more States than ever before in the history of the Voting Rights Act have been granted the right out.

So why are we challenging the constitutionality of a law that is protecting its citizens from racial discrimination when there is, in fact, recourse? I will tell you the sad truth is because, unfortunately, in States like Texas, where the minority population is growing very rapidly and their voting strength is increasing, rather than work to earn the vote of minority citizens, State leaders would rather suppress voters through racially discriminatory tactics.

My friends, our country is better than this. We are better than this. That's why we are here today in support of upholding section 5 of the Voting Rights Act.

□ 1100

EXPANSION OF FEDERAL GOVERNMENT

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

Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, one thing that President Obama mentioned in his State of the Union speech the other night, which I hope he follows up on, is his effort to stop the cost of college tuition and fees from going up at such a rapid rate.

I spoke to a class at the University of Tennessee last week—and I've done

that many times—and whenever I speak to classes, it shocks the students when I tell them that in my first year at the University of Tennessee it cost \$90 per quarter in our tuition. In other words, I went to school for \$270. It went up to \$105, and then \$120, and then \$135 a quarter my senior year, so it went up \$405. But this was shortly after the Federal student loan program had come in.

Until that program came in, college tuition and fees went up at just the rate of inflation. It went up very slowly—in fact, sometimes less than inflation. But now, and ever since that program has come in, tuition and fees have gone up at three or four or five times the rate of inflation, so that today colleges and universities cost 300, 400, and 500 percent higher than they would have if we had just left things alone. Anything the Federal Government subsidizes, the costs just explode.

When I went to the University of Tennessee—my senior year in high school I had been a bag boy at the A&P making \$1.10 an hour—I got a big raise. As a freshman at the university, I became a salesman at Sears and worked there my first 2 years, and I made \$1.25 an hour.

Almost everybody who needed to could work part-time and pay all of their expenses and fees in college. Nobody had to borrow money to go to colleges or universities; nobody got out of school with a debt. Then the Federal Government decided to help. And now, what it has resulted in is almost everybody has to borrow money to pay their tuition and fees, and almost everybody gets out of school with some kind of huge debt.

We've seen the same thing happen in medical care. The Federal Government decided to help out. Before the Federal Government got involved in medical care, medical care was cheap and affordable to almost everybody. Doctors even made house calls. We took what was a very minor problem for a very few people and now we've turned it into a massive, major problem for everyone. That seems to be the history of the Federal Government.

I just came from a hearing in the Oversight and the Government Reform Committee, and I will return to that shortly. But in the GAO report on the New York Medicaid program—which is the largest in the country—it tells about a daily payment method resulting in a \$5,000 daily rate for institutional residents in the State of New York—\$5,000 daily payments. The New York program is paying over twice as much as the average around the country.

We sometimes hear that Medicare and Medicaid can't be cut. We certainly don't want to hurt any lower-income people, but there are some people and companies getting ridiculously, fabulously wealthy off of Medicare and Medicaid. And almost every government program ends up being some sort

of a sweetheart, insider-type deal, giving contracts to companies who hire former Federal employees. It's just scandalous what is going on in this country and it's really hurting this Nation badly—and especially hurting the middle income people that the President says he's so eager to help, but who he will be hurting worse than ever if he keeps expanding the Federal Government at the rate that he wants to.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess until noon today.

Accordingly (at 11 o'clock and 3 minutes a.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1200

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mrs. MILLER of Michigan) at noon.

PRAYER

The Chaplain, the Reverend Patrick J. Conroy, offered the following prayer: Loving God, we give You thanks for giving us another day.

As we meditate on all the blessings of life, we especially pray for the blessing of peace in our lives and in our world. Our fervent prayer, O God, is that people will learn to live together in reconciliation and respect, so that the terrors of war and of dictatorial abuse will be no more.

As You have created each person, we pray that You guide our hearts and minds that every person of every place and background might focus on Your great gift of life and so learn to live in unity.

May Your special blessings be upon the Members of this assembly in the important, sometimes difficult, work they do. Give them wisdom and charity, that they might work together for the common good.

May all that is done this day in the people's House be for Your greater honor and glory.

Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair has examined the Journal of the last day's proceedings and announces to the House her approval thereof.

Pursuant to clause 1, rule I, the Journal stands approved.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Will the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. GARDNER) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. GARDNER led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will entertain up to 15 requests for 1-minute speeches on each side of the aisle.

KYLE CARPENTER, AN AMERICAN HERO

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

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. Madam Speaker, in February of 2009, Corporal Kyle Carpenter, a constituent and resident of Lexington, South Carolina, enlisted in the United States Marine Corps and went on to complete recruit training at the Marine Corps Recruit Depot at Parris Island, South Carolina. A little over a year later, Corporal Carpenter was deployed to Marjah, Afghanistan, with his unit to carry out his service and protect our families in Operation Enduring Freedom.

On November 21, 2010, Corporal Carpenter suffered devastating injuries when an enemy hand grenade exploded while he was on post. Because of his heroic actions, Corporal Carpenter potentially saved the lives of countless others and has been decorated with a Purple Heart and awarded the Combat Action Ribbon.

I have had the privilege of visiting with Kyle, his mother, Robin, and his father, Jim. Throughout his recovery with the dedicated staff at Walter Reed in Bethesda, Kyle has served as a testament to hard work and valor. Today, Kyle is an intern serving with Chairman JEFF MILLER of the Veterans' Affairs Committee.

I have no doubt that because of Corporal Carpenter's service, American families are more secure. I want to thank Kyle and the Carpenter family for your dedication to our Nation.

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

LET'S ACT NOW TO GET RID OF SEQUESTRATION

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

Ms. HAHN. Madam Speaker, when I first came to Congress, I didn't vote for that bill that created the threat of sequestration. I thought it was a bad idea then, and I think it's a bad idea now. Automatic triggers that institute automatic cuts across the board in spending in this country are a bad idea. This manmade crisis is now threatening both our Nation's economy and our national security.

Here are just a couple of ways that that would happen. Ten percent of the FAA's workforce of 40,000 would be furloughed on any given day, resulting in reduced air traffic controllers, longer delays, and economic losses for air transportation and tourism. Fewer air traffic controllers means fewer flights, which means less tourism, and that means fewer jobs in hotels and restaurants—a ripple effect that could cripple our economy.

The Coast Guard would be cut by nearly 25 percent, jeopardizing maritime and navigation safety, the safe flow of commerce along U.S. waterways, and drastically reduce our ability to fight drug trafficking.

The clock is ticking once again. We cannot take our economy and our safety backwards at a time when the American people have worked to build it up.

Let's act now to get rid of this terrible sequestration.

INJUSTICE TO THE VILLAGE OF KING COVE, ALASKA

(Mr. YOUNG of Alaska was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Madam Speaker, this is an injustice what the Secretary of the Interior and the Fish and Wildlife has done to a village called King Cove in Alaska. We had hearings, we had the lands transfer, we had everything going to work so these people could be safe—be safe to go to hospitals, be safe to fly out when the weather was bad. It was an agreement between the State, the Congress, and the village of King Cove. And along comes the Fish and Wildlife and denies them the trade that has to be necessary for this transportation corridor.

I'm urging my Senators to put a hold on the new Secretary of the Interior so she's not confirmed until this Secretary can, in fact, sign the law that will allow them to have safety once and for all. This process has been going on for more than 20 years. We finally got to a solution that's being stopped by this administration, the lack of knowledge about human life, who would rather protect something that does not exist.

This refuge has over 300 miles of road in it, but these people are being denied and need the safety. I'm asking Secretary Salazar, in fact, to take and do his job: overturn the Fish and Wildlife's recommendation, allow my people to be safe, and make sure they can continue to live their lives without the threat of the weather when it can be solved by an act of the Secretary.

COMMEMORATING THE 2-YEAR ANNIVERSARY OF UPRISING IN BAHRAIN

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

Mr. MCGOVERN. Madam Speaker, 2 years ago today the people of Bahrain took to the streets in peaceful protest. They called for democratic freedoms and an end to human rights abuses. The Government of Bahrain responded with violence. It attacked protestors, killing more than 30, and imprisoned and tortured thousands of others. Even doctors who treated protestors were arrested, tortured, and prosecuted.

Two years later, the situation has not improved. In fact, it may be getting worse. More protestors have died, hundreds of political prisoners remain in jail, and authorities responsible for the use of torture remain free.

Despite an active public relations campaign, the Government of Bahrain is not—and I repeat, is not—making a good-faith effort to meet the legitimate demands of its people.

The Obama administration needs to change course with Bahrain and begin implementing a policy that holds Bahrain accountable and promotes democratic freedoms so that we are not here again saying these same things on the third anniversary of the protests.

□ 1210

THE SEQUESTER

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

Mr. DEFAZIO. Sequester. Well, that's inside-the-Beltway jargon. It means stupid, indiscriminate, across-the-board budget cuts. Cut things that are valuable—Coast Guard Rescue—and cut things that are obsolete and unneeded—registration for a draft that doesn't exist—the same percent.

Now, the Republicans are pointing fingers, but I think the finger's going to get pointed right back at them. They're calling it the "Obamaquaster"? Come on now, you've got to be kidding.

Don't they remember their tax pledge to Grover Norquist that has ever forever bound them to starving the Federal Government of revenue? Now look where that got us, when they threatened to default on the debt. It got us the sequester. They refused to compromise and forced us into another self-made arbitrary crisis.

No, it's not an "Obamaquaster"; it's a "GroverNorquaster."

ATTACK ON CAMP LIBERTY

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

Mr. POE of Texas. Madam Speaker, as the sun was rising in the Iraqi desert, three dozen mortars rained down on Camp Liberty. Camp Liberty is where innocent Iranian exiles, including women and children, live. This unprovoked attack left six people dead and dozens wounded.

Now, who was responsible? Was it the Iraqis, the Iranians? Looks to me like

both governments should be held accountable. These dissidents stand for an Iran free of the extreme mullahs and the tyrant Ahmadinejad.

Over 3,000 unarmed freedom fighters currently live at Camp Liberty and remain in imminent danger. The Iraqi Government has proven on more than one occasion it is unwilling to protect Iranian dissidents in Iraq.

The United Nations has the responsibility to ensure these people are moved to safer locations and even other countries. Not one more life should be stolen by those who protect the oppressive Iranian regime and the little fellow from the desert, Ahmadinejad.

And that's just the way it is.

RACE TO THE TOP GRANT ANNOUNCEMENT FOR UNION CITY SCHOOLS

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

Mr. SWALWELL of California. I rise today to congratulate the New Haven Unified School District in Union City in the 15th Congressional District for being named one of 16 nationwide winners in the U.S. Department of Education's Race to the Top grant program. The district will receive over \$29 million in funding, which will provide training and equipment to support the outstanding students, teachers, and staff of New Haven Unified.

This is a tremendous achievement, and I am proud of the school's superintendent, Kari McVeigh, and school board members Linda Canlas, Jonas Dino, Michael Ritchie, Sarabjit Cheema, and Michelle Matthews, who had the good sense and worked hard to apply for this competitive grant. I know the 13,000 students from New Haven Unified will benefit from the technology and educational improvements in their schools.

In Union City, this critical funding will help to expand after-school programs, student support, and access to health care for the most vulnerable students, and will provide teachers with the training and techniques needed to improve our classrooms.

I am proud to represent New Haven Unified, Union City, students, educators, and administrators, and look forward to hearing of their many successes.

IT'S TIME TO GET THIS ECONOMY MOVING AGAIN

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

Mr. STUTZMAN. Madam Speaker, this week, President Obama outlined his vision for America: job-killing tax hikes, a job-killing national energy tax, job-killing wage controls, and job-killing stimulus spending.

Equally telling were the items that the President did not mention. He of-

fered no plan to pay off our \$16 trillion of debt, no plan to replace the sequester cuts to national defense that he proposed, no plan to save our broken social safety nets, and no plan to restore the confidence of Americans in the real economy.

President Obama believes that every problem can be solved with big government and another tax hike. President Clinton once declared that the era of big government is over. Not this President. President Obama believes more government is the solution to all of our problems.

It's time to get this economy moving again, and my colleagues in the House are ready to work toward real solutions that encourage job growth, empower individuals, and break Washington's spending habits.

SEQUESTRATION

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

Mr. SIREs. Madam Speaker, if we face yet another fiscal cliff in 2 weeks, it is imperative that this Chamber produces a real solution to ward off a financial disaster that could deeply impact the American people.

The idea behind sequestration was to create a worst-case scenario that was so severe that it would force both sides to work together and find a balanced approach to passing a realistic budget reducing our deficits.

Instead of setting the stage for yet another battle to be resolved in the 11th hour, we should be focused on creating jobs and growing our economy. If sequestration goes forward, programs and services that millions of Americans rely on, like Head Start, supplemental nutrition programs like the WIC program, and even FEMA, would be decimated by drastic cuts in our funding.

Additionally, sequestration would slash critical support to police who keep our streets safe, our air traffic controllers who manage our skies, and food inspectors who ensure the food that we eat is safe.

Instead of jeopardizing critical services to our citizens, we need to begin to work on an approach that will avoid sequestration while sensibly reducing our deficit.

HONORING THE LIFE OF DR. BEN CLAYBURGH

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

Mr. CRAMER. Madam Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to the legacy of a treasured North Dakotan who touched the lives of his wonderful family and all who knew him. Dr. Ben Clayburgh left this world for a better place on January 21, my birthday.

Ben earned many titles during his life. He was a surgeon, a U.S. Army private, a professor, and a passionate political leader. But above all, he was a

healer and a diplomat who inspired those around him.

Grand Forks, North Dakota, will always remember Ben Clayburgh. After serving his country in the U.S. Army as a flight surgeon, he established himself in Grand Forks as a trusted man in medicine and politics, two of his greatest passions.

He served as North Dakota's Republican National Committeeman for 12 years and, in 2004, was honored in becoming the Presidential elector for George W. Bush. His picture hangs in the Hall of Fame at the Ronald Reagan Center in Bismarck, and the memory of his tremendous character will always be in the hearts of those who knew and loved him.

May God bless Ben's memory, his wife, Bev, and the Clayburgh family, his greatest legacy.

HONORING THE SERVICE OF DONALD E. DEVANEY

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

Ms. HANABUSA. Madam Speaker, today I wish to honor Mr. Donald E. Devaney, Retired, the first civilian provost marshal to be appointed by the United States Army. In March 1984 he assumed the position at Tripler Army Medical Center in Hawaii.

During a nearly 30-year assignment at Tripler Army Medical Center, he established a provost marshal office and police department that gained great notoriety by many elements of the United States Government and the local community during a time of uncertainty and many wartime missions. Through Mr. Devaney's leadership, the Tripler Provost Marshal Office has been recognized as a leading law enforcement and security department.

Mr. Devaney's service as a Federal employee is built upon a 30-year career in the Army. In 1953, at the age of 17, he enlisted in the Rhode Island National Guard during the Korean conflict to join his peers in doing his part to serve America. A year later, he switched to Active Duty and was sent to locations in Japan as a military policeman.

As cochair of the U.S. Army Hawaii Retiree Council for more than three decades, he has provided invaluable service to our retiree families and, as a result, facilitated an understanding by them of the ever-improving and changing medical delivery systems we employ.

Madam Speaker, I ask you to join me as we offer our gratitude today to a man that has dedicated his life to service to our country.

DÉJÀ VU ALL OVER AGAIN

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

Mr. KILDEE. Madam Speaker, it's déjà vu all over again. Here we are just

2 weeks—5 legislative days—away from sequestration, and yet the House is about to leave town for a 9-day recess. That's unacceptable. We should be working every day to avoid this sequester and to avert it.

My colleagues on the other side of the aisle seem determined to make sequestration a reality. Democrats stand ready to work in a bipartisan manner to avoid this.

Yesterday I met with Federal employees and college leaders from Michigan who are deeply concerned about how the cuts will affect middle class families, students, and senior citizens. Here's sequestration by the numbers:

- 750,000 jobs eliminated by October;
- 20 percent reduction in the Pentagon's operating budget;
- 70,000 children kicked out of Head Start;
- 21,000 fewer food and drug inspections;
- 4 million fewer meals served through the senior nutrition programs.

We need to find a balanced and responsible approach to reduce our deficit, for sure, but not let irrational, across-the-board cuts take effect. Doing so will devastate this economic recovery.

□ 1220

INVEST IN AMERICA AND GROW OUR ECONOMY

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

Mr. COHEN. I join in concern about our budget. Advancements to health would be cut in a major way. When I was a child, I had polio, and it has effects on people who have polio in later years. But because of the Federal Government's investment in research like the Salk vaccine and the Sabin vaccine, it has saved many families and children from that devastating disease. And around the world it's been successful, too. There are other diseases like heart disease, Alzheimer's, and cancer that the National Institutes of Health is primarily responsible for the research.

I'm worried about health and also jobs, and a major driver of jobs is research and development, education, and infrastructure spending by the Federal Government. Most of our great advances, whether it's railroads or the Internet or health care, have come through Federal Government partnerships with the private sector. We need to continue those to create a middle class—consumers that can grow our economy out of these problems. It's not just President Obama who says it. It's also who I call the three wise men: Krugman, Stiglitz, and Robert Reich.

Austerity hasn't worked. We need to invest in America and grow our economy.

LET'S DO THE JOB THE AMERICAN PEOPLE SENT US HERE TO DO

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

Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas. Madam Speaker, more and more, the voices are being raised about the devastating impact of a sequester, a self-inflicted wound of this Congress because we could not come together as the American people have directed us to do. The security of the United States will be in jeopardy if we have the sequester. Men and women who stand on the front lines in protecting this Nation will be in jeopardy. All of those who depend upon Head Start funding, early education funding, title I funds and housing funds, and opportunities for young people to go to college will be in jeopardy.

And so I think it is unfortunate that we are discussing and debating on the floor today H.R. 273, to eliminate the 2013 statutory pay adjustment for federal employees. All of those people who put themselves on the line for us and have already had a pay freeze; all we're talking about is 0.5 percent. None of that will bring down the debt or help the deficit. We're just making noise. What we should be doing is focusing on coming together around a growth and innovation budget and bringing the deficit down. What we should be doing is honoring the Sandy Hook and other victims and passing real gun violence prevention like universal background checks and storing guns.

Madam Speaker, let us do the job the American people sent us to do.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess until approximately 1:30 p.m. today.

Accordingly (at 12 o'clock and 22 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1330

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mrs. MILLER of Michigan) at 1 o'clock and 30 minutes p.m.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 273, ELIMINATION OF 2013 PAY ADJUSTMENT, AND FOR OTHER PURPOSES

Mr. WOODALL. Madam Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 66 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 66

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider in the House the bill (H.R. 273) to eliminate the

2013 statutory pay adjustment for Federal employees. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. The bill shall be considered as read. All points of order against provisions in the bill are waived. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and on any amendment thereto to final passage without intervening motion except: (1) one hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform; and (2) one motion to recommit.

SEC. 2. During any recess or adjournment of not more than three days, if in the opinion of the Speaker the public interest so warrants, then the Speaker or his designee, after consultation with the Minority Leader, may reconvene the House at a time other than that previously appointed, within the limits of clause 4, section 5, article I of the Constitution, and notify Members accordingly.

SEC. 3. It shall be in order at any time through the legislative day of February 15, 2013, for the Speaker to entertain motions that the House suspend the rules, as though under clause 1 of rule XV, relating to a measure condemning the government of North Korea and its February 12, 2013 test of a nuclear device.

SEC. 4. On any legislative day during the period from February 16, 2013, through February 22, 2013—

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

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

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

POINT OF ORDER

Mr. POLIS. Madam Speaker, I raise a point of order against H. Res. 66 because the resolution violates section 426(a) of the Congressional Budget Act. The resolution, waiving all points of order, waives section 425 of the Congressional Budget Act, therefore causing a violation of section 426(a).

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Colorado makes a point of order that the resolution violates section 426(a) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974.

The gentleman has met the threshold burden under the rule and the gentleman from Colorado and a Member opposed each will control 10 minutes of debate on the question of consideration. Following debate, the Chair will put the question of consideration as the statutory means of disposing of the point of order.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. POLIS. Madam Speaker, I raise this point of order not necessarily out of concern for unfunded mandates, although there are likely some in the underlying bill H.R. 273, but rather as well to demonstrate that in many ways this bill and this process has been a travesty of the civics lesson that Americans learned in school.

I would like to make, Madam Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman shall state it.

Mr. POLIS. What is the process that a Member can use to demand a division of the question on a bill?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. If a matter is divisible, any Member may demand that the matter be divided.

Mr. POLIS. Further parliamentary inquiry.

Does the rule being considered today prohibit a Member from demanding a division of the question?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will not interpret the content of the pending measure.

Mr. POLIS. Having heard from the Chair that a motion can be made by any Member to divide the question, I would like to ask unanimous consent to demand a division of the question on today's bill before us.

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

Mr. WOODALL. Madam Speaker, I object.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Objection is heard.

Mr. POLIS. I thank the Speaker, and I understand that it sounds like sitting here in the Chamber one Member objected to a division of the question. I would like to point out that over 400 Members did not object to the division of the question.

I will not ask for a recorded vote on this, although I think it's clear that my side would win over 400—some to 1, perhaps. I did not hear any additional objections from anybody in the Chamber.

Mr. WOODALL. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. POLIS. Madam Speaker, a point of parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman shall state it.

Mr. POLIS. Is the time under my control yieldable?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman controls his time and may yield.

Mr. POLIS. Thank you, Madam Speaker. If we have additional time later, I will yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Again, there was one objection, one objection in this entire body, to what I believe would be the overwhelming will of this body, which is to simply divide this question, because there are fundamentally two issues before us.

This bill, H.R. 273, introduced 3 weeks ago, was not seen or heard in any committee of jurisdiction of the House, rushed through the Rules Committee under a closed rule to the floor of the House, and yet despite the fact that this bill failed to undergo any appropriate committee of jurisdiction review process, here it is in the House with limited debate at a time when we are edging closer and closer to the spending cliff that our country faces in 2 weeks, which this bill does nothing about.

I know that many of us in this body, myself included, have been tireless advocates for supporting efforts to lower

our deficit and balance our budget through a balanced approach. But as Republicans on the Rules Committee acknowledged last night, including Congressman BISHOP, this particular bill would do nothing to solve our Federal debt, as it does not even change the spending caps agreed to in the Budget Control Act. What it does instead is include two completely unrelated measures.

When you consider that the House Republicans have here coupled a Federal employee pay freeze with a freeze on Members of Congress' salary, it leaves the suspicion that is being speculated on by many outside this Chamber that this might, this just might be being done for political purposes and posturing. And one wonders why this institution is held in such low esteem by so many members of the public. It is precisely this kind of political trick.

Let there be no disagreement: This body, since I've joined this body, has never given Members of Congress a pay raise. It simply hasn't. This has largely been an uncontroversial measure. When times are tough economically, Members of Congress should absolutely be the first in line to say, Look, we're not going to take a pay increase. And, in fact, Members of Congress have already foregone their pay increase through October of this year.

So let that come up through the appropriations process, as it is traditionally done. I'm confident this body will act with regard to Member pay. But let us not tie it up with this issue of whether all Federal employees at all different wage levels should have any raise at all this year or not.

Now, an amendment was brought forth yesterday by Congressman BERA of California and Congressman CONNOLLY of Virginia, that divided the bill, just as we tried to do today. And by overwhelming majority, 400 some to 1, we did not do, because it was unanimous consent that was required. Unfortunately, the idea was shut down by the Rules Committee.

I would like to yield 2½ minutes to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. CONNOLLY).

Mr. CONNOLLY. Madam Speaker, I appreciate the comments we've just heard. The bill before us today is just the latest partisan jab at Federal employees who are on the front lines protecting and serving our constituents every day.

□ 1340

I remind my colleagues that more than 85 percent of Federal employees do not work here in the D.C. region. They live and work in your districts. They are the law enforcement agents, park rangers, researchers, and health inspectors who make our communities safer. These are middle class families struggling to make ends meet just like everybody else, yet House Republicans have routinely used them as a punching bag, chipping away at their pay and their benefits. So far, the tab is \$103

billion and counting. It is time to say, "Enough."

I was pleased to join with Congressman BERA and 10 of our colleagues in cosponsoring the amendment Mr. POLIS referred to this partisan bill that at least would have separated the questions of freezing our pay from that of Federal employees. In fact, three such amendments were submitted, but each was rejected by the Republicans in the Rules Committee, underscoring that this really is nothing more than another political potshot at Federal employees and using us as the subterfuge.

If anyone's salary should be frozen as a result of our Nation's fiscal paralysis, it's ours; it's Members of Congress. That's why I introduced an alternative bill, H.R. 636, with Ranking Member CUMMINGS from the Oversight Committee, to freeze Member salaries for the duration of this Congress. Of course, my Republican colleagues fail to acknowledge that we already voted to freeze Member salaries through September of this year, as Mr. POLIS indicated, so there is no real sense of urgency here.

Why aren't we spending this time working on a bipartisan solution to avert the devastating consequences of sequestration 2 weeks from now? The \$85 billion in across-the-board cuts in defense and domestic spending for the rest of this fiscal year would slam the brakes on this economy and throw us potentially back into recession.

GDP performance in the fourth quarter shows that. It declined by one-tenth of 1 percent, largely because of shrinkage in public sector investments. That was led by a 22 percent drop in defense spending, the largest since the end of the Vietnam War. My colleagues on the other side of the aisle have shown almost no interest in addressing this threat, despite the pleadings of the Secretary of Defense.

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

Mr. POLIS. I yield 15 seconds to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. CONNOLLY. An amendment by our colleague, Mr. VAN HOLLEN from the Budget Committee, to replace sequestration was also rebuffed by the Rules Committee just last night on a partisan vote.

To make matters worse, the House is about to go into recess again tomorrow. In fact, we spent 15 of the 19 weeks from July through the lame duck in recess.

Let's do something productive for the United States economy.

Mr. POLIS. Madam Speaker, I would like to make an inquiry as to how much time remains.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Colorado has 3¼ minutes remaining, and 10 minutes may be claimed by an opponent.

Mr. POLIS. I would like to yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. MORAN).

Mr. MORAN. I thank my good friend from Colorado.

In 1729, an Irish satirist by the name of Jonathan Swift proposed a novel solution to child hunger and general poverty in Ireland. He recommended that Ireland's poor pull themselves up by their own bootstraps by selling their children as food to the rich. That would nourish the rich, earn the poor parents some much-needed cash, and solve the child hunger problem all at once. Some people took him seriously. Most realized the point that he was trying to make.

Today, the House majority has a somewhat similar kind of modest proposal, without Mr. Swift's sense of humor or irony. To ensure that our elderly are cared for, let's cut the pay of those responsible for their health. To make sure our food and drugs are safe, let's diminish the benefits of those whose job it is to screen for safety and unintended effects. To find a cure for cancer, let's punish the researcher who works daily to save millions of Americans from that disease. To care for our wounded veterans who are sent by this body to fight in foreign lands, let's make their caretakers find a second job.

Madam Speaker, my colleagues on the other side of the aisle may justify their vote today by boasting of freezing their own pay, but that was already accomplished in the fiscal cliff legislation. The bill before us today will freeze, for the third year in a row, every Federal employee's pay. It's an effort to denigrate our Federal workforce in the hope that the government becomes unresponsive, inefficient, and unworthy of our best and brightest. That's why I urge a strong "no" vote on H.R. 273. Enough is enough.

Mr. POLIS. Madam Speaker, why are we debating a bill that had to bypass regular order to rush to the floor in February when there's already a moratorium on the increase of pay for Members of Congress, and we should be debating spending, eliminating the deficit, the sequestration?

With 6 legislative days remaining before that fiscal cliff, here we are instead discussing something with regards to Member pay that doesn't even occur until October, and that which has been the tradition of this body for the last 4 years—not to allow Members of Congress a raise—and conflated it with a separate issue with regard to the proper compensation level so that our Federal employees and Federal agencies can compete in the marketplace with private employers and attract the talent they need to succeed.

This rule and this bill suffer from the stench of politicization, and the House should divide these two issues.

Madam Speaker, I'd like to ask unanimous consent to amend the rule to allow for consideration of amendment 4, the Bera-Connolly amendment, with 10 minutes of debate on each side.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The majority manager would have to yield for that request.

Mr. POLIS. Excellent. Well, I hope that no one objects.

Again, but for three votes cast in the Rules Committee by a 7-4 vote, and but for one solitary objection out of 435 Members of this House of Representatives, we would have divided the question and this body would have avoided being dragged into yet another political game that continues to jeopardize the standing of this body among the American people.

It's clear that each of these issues deserves a separate discussion and a vote. With regard to Federal employee pay, let it come through regular order. Let the committees of jurisdiction debate how the issue is handled, and let it be placed within the context of balancing our budget and an overall budget solution to the automatic cuts that are far more severe than a Member pay freeze and may include unpaid furloughs and other extreme measures within a couple of weeks instead of engaging in stale political gamesmanship.

Let's reduce our debt and deficit and avert the impending sequester.

I yield back the balance of my time. Mr. WOODALL. Madam Speaker, I rise to claim time in opposition to the point of order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Georgia is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. WOODALL. I'd like to say to my friend that I endorse, Madam Speaker, his request to do away with stale political gamesmanship. I would put in the stale political gamesmanship category making a point of order against an unfunded mandate in the bill and then failing to make any indication that you actually believe there's an unfunded mandate in the bill, but simply using this time to talk about an issue that we have already litigated in a multihour hearing last night.

That said, I know, Madam Speaker, the gentleman's heart is felt in this issue. I would say to the gentleman that, while there was only one objection in this body, I make that objection out of great affection for the gentleman because, as I read the underlying bill, I see absolutely no way to divide this legislation into the components that the gentleman would like to debate.

The gentleman would like to debate a Member pay freeze. The gentleman would like to debate a Federal employee pay freeze.

Mr. POLIS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOODALL. I yield to the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. POLIS. The way to divide them is precisely the Bera-Connolly amendment that was brought to our committee yesterday. On a functional level that does divide it.

Mr. WOODALL. I thank the gentleman. In fact, I thought that's where the gentleman's heart lay.

As the gentleman knows, the reason the Bera-Connolly amendment is not on the floor today, among others, is that it is nongermane to this legislation. We cannot subdivide this piece of

legislation to include nongermane components, which, again, I know the gentleman wants to debate those components. And, Madam Speaker, when the House schedules those bills, I look forward to having that debate, too; it's just not in this bill.

One of the great pleasures I've had in this body, Madam Speaker, has been being a part of a majority that is bringing bills that are simple to read and simple to understand. This is a front-and-back bill. I happen to have mine on two pages because I like to flip, but if I had been more conservative with my printer, it would have been a front-and-back page here, Madam Speaker.

What we talked about in the Rules Committee all last night—and it would have created more points of order for germaneness issues and others—was adding amendment after amendment after amendment that did not affect this language, but instead created brand-new debates about brand-new issues.

□ 1350

Again, I associate myself with the comments of my friend from Colorado. I think the American people are absolutely fed up with the way that this process works. But what I think they're fed up with are those bills that stack a transportation issue beside a health care issue beside a Commerce Department issue beside a military issue beside a child care issue, all of these things that are completely unrelated to one another, Madam Speaker.

In this bill, one issue and one vote. And the gentleman is absolutely right: in a vote in the Rules Committee last night, Madam Speaker, we decided not to allow this bill to be complicated with nongermane issue after nongermane issue after nongermane issue. Those measures, these debates can actually come to the floor one item at a time, but we were not going to allow that to subsume what is also an important debate, and that's on the provisions that actually are contained in H.R. 273.

So given, Madam Speaker, that the gentleman observed no unfunded mandates in this bill, because there are no unfunded mandates in this bill, I ask the Chair to reject the point of order for there being unfunded mandates in this bill.

Madam Speaker, if I could conclude by just asking that in order to allow the House to continue its scheduled business for the day, I urge the Members to vote "yes" on the question of consideration of this resolution.

I yield back the balance of my time. The SPEAKER pro tempore. All time for debate has expired.

The question is, Will the House now consider the resolution?

The question of consideration was decided in the affirmative.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

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

Mr. WOODALL. Madam Speaker, for the purposes of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentleman from Florida, my friend, Mr. HASTINGS, pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume. During consideration of this resolution, all time yielded is for the purpose of debate only.

GENERAL LEAVE

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. WOODALL. Madam Speaker, House Resolution 66, this rule that we're considering today, will allow for debate on the underlying bill, H.R. 273.

This rule that we're considering today is a little bit unusual in that it not only allows for the underlying resolution, but it also takes care of some housekeeping business that we have here on the floor of the House. For example, all of America, Madam Speaker, has read of the nuclear tests that happened in North Korea, and this resolution allows us to consider tomorrow a bill under suspension of the rules to condemn that activity in North Korea. It's very important business that we are able to take care of here in the House. We would not be able to take care of it but for this rule. I'm glad we considered that here in the rule.

In this underlying bill, Madam Speaker, we're continuing what the President himself continued through March of this year. We're continuing through the end of the calendar year a freeze on the automatic increases in Federal employee pay. Again, I brought down a copy of the resolution, that small, front-and-back bill.

So often you see findings in these bills, Madam Speaker, you see findings about what the Congress believes and why this bill is coming to the floor. And I promise you, Madam Speaker, if you read this resolution—and, again, it's only a page and a half long, so it will be easy to do—you will not find one finding of contempt for Federal employees. In fact, if you had listened to the hearing in the Rules Committee last night, what you saw is universal praise for the hard work that our men and women in the civil service are doing for this country.

We have a lot of work that has to be done. I know it's a popular sport in some districts to kick Federal employees. Federal employees, by and large, work hard, though I'm happy to say you can distinguish, for example, the love and affection that so many of our constituencies have for our men and women in uniform. You see those pay-raise bills move through very quickly, versus a little suspicion that you have from time to time from folks who say, well, golly, I was just down at XYZ Federal office, and I didn't get great service. Golly, Rob, I was on the tele-

phone trying to get results from X, Y or Z agency, and they kept me on hold for 3½ hours. What are my dollars paying for?

I blame us for that, Madam Speaker. We owe better to our Federal employees than to put them in that circumstance. And gradually, not nearly fast enough, but gradually, our Federal employee system is moving towards recognizing hardworking, successful and dedicated employees through merit pay, through merit increases, through bonuses and through bumps—ways to say, do you know what, service matters. Service matters. And a one-size-fits-all pay scale does not work across the Federal system.

I'm very proud, Madam Speaker, I've just been appointed to the Oversight and Government Reform Committee in whose jurisdiction this bill is. I hope we're going to be able to take up those issues and build on that progress that has been made. But in all the conversation you'll hear on this floor—I won't say "rhetoric," Madam Speaker, because, again, I know people's hearts are in this issue—in all the debate you will hear on this House floor, what you will not hear is that \$1 is being cut from those merit bonuses. What you will not hear is that \$1 is being removed from agencies that have an opportunity to say, Do you know what, job well done. You deserve a bonus. What you will not hear is that \$1 is being taken that would have gone to recognize performance above and beyond in the service of our citizenry.

What you will hear is that in line with the recommendations of the much-discussed Simpson-Bowles Commission, a 3-year freeze on Federal automatic salary increases will be continued, upheld. It's been in effect for 2 years and 3 months, and it will continue through the end of the year.

Now, so often I hear, Madam Speaker, my constituents say, Rob, I just want to make sure that Congress is abiding by the same rules you ask everybody else to abide by.

I want to make that clear. That's what my friend from Colorado was discussing. It's not actually a provision in this bill that's extra. It's a function of law. Members of Congress' pay will absolutely be frozen for just as long—just as long. The same rules that apply to everybody apply to the Vice President, Mr. Speaker, apply to the executive branch, apply to folks back home in Georgia, apply across the board to Federal employees, and apply to everybody here in this Chamber.

We had one of the longest, and I would argue most intensive, hearings of our Rules Committee cycle last night, Mr. Speaker, where we explored this bill line by line, detail by detail. I was pleased to be part of that debate. I'm glad we had an opportunity, really, for unlimited time in which to do that. But I believe we crafted a good rule, Mr. Speaker, that will allow for thorough debate of this underlying bill.

Again, I would remind you, Mr. Speaker, and all Members, this bill,

posted on the House Rules Committee Web site, front and back of a sheet of paper, is simple and direct for everyone in this House to be able to read and everyone back home to be able to read so that we can have a thorough debate on this bill this afternoon.

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

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I thank my good friend, the gentleman from Georgia, for yielding the customary 30 minutes to me. I rise obviously in opposition to the rule for consideration of H.R. 273, to eliminate the 2013 statutory pay adjustment for Federal employees.

I just heard my colleague from Georgia say that this is a good rule; but I've also heard him say what I agree with very frequently, and that is that this body should proceed toward regular order, allow the committee process to go forward in a meaningful way, to have hearings, and to let the will of the body be worked here in the people's House. I've also heard him talk about closed rules; and it's for that reason that I believe that this process is not a good process because it is a closed rule, and this couldn't, in that sense, be good. There were no hearings.

He talks about this one week, one bill. Why this week for Federal employees? Last night, I talked with six members of the American Federation of Government Employees, some of them older, some of them younger, and all of them agonizing, as are Federal employees around the country.

□ 1400

Let me get to the point. The Republicans have decided that they want to continue in the same shortsighted and counterproductive campaign against Federal employees that we saw in the last Congress. When they introduced this very same bill in the 112th Congress, it passed the House and then went nowhere and accomplished absolutely nothing. I'm quite certain—and I'll bet—that it will face the same fate this time around.

Just last week, the Rules Committee considered H.R. 444, the Require a PLAN Act, which should have been called the "Republicans Have No Plan Act." Instead of offering real solutions to the challenges facing our Nation, my Republican colleagues continue to introduce do-nothing legislation that will do nothing to help the American people.

Obviously, all of us know that we face \$85 billion in sequestration cuts in a matter of weeks. These cuts were intended to be a fail-safe. They were supposed to be so unpalatable, so horrible for everyone, that Congress would never allow them to go into effect. Yet, instead of making sure that these massive cuts don't threaten the progress that we've made, my friends on the other side would rather play politics at the expense of the middle class and the working poor, underscoring the working poor.

As the President put it in his State of the Union address: "Arbitrary deficit reduction is not an economic plan."

Deficit reduction is a means to an end, not an end in and of itself. It is just one tool that will help us get our country back on the right track. You can't build a house with just a saw. Deficit reduction needs to be part of a comprehensive economic plan, one that will stimulate growth and create jobs.

A serious economic plan is one that does not take potshots at our economy and our Nation's full faith and credit for political purposes. We must, in this people's House, move beyond politics and work to avoid a dangerous backslide in our Nation's economic recovery.

For the life of me, I can't even begin to understand why House Republicans continue to pick on Federal employees. It's as if the people that keep the Capitol clean, the police officers that keep us safe, the countless people that work right here on this Capitol complex do not deserve this paltry raise and are to be picked on.

My AFGE friends were saying to me last night that Federal employees have already contributed \$103 billion towards deficit reduction. Furthermore, Federal employees and retirees have contributed \$15 billion in savings over 10 years through an increased pension contribution. A 2-year Federal pay freeze has been in effect since 2011 and will produce an additional \$60 billion in savings. The reduction and delay of a 2013 pay increase included in the current continuing resolution will yield \$28 billion in savings.

At what point does enough, as my friend from Virginia said, become enough? What's more and puzzles me—and I asked the question of the scrivener of this bill last evening—is: Why aren't Federal contractors, who make twice as much as Federal employees, included in this pay freeze? He gave me some political fogging. I don't know what it was and don't care to even bother to try to remember.

During the debate over the fiscal cliff, Republicans said that we shouldn't ask corporations and the wealthiest in our society to pay their fair share. The reason that was put—this is a while back during the debate on the fiscal cliff—was that if we tax the wealthy, they won't work as hard if they're taking home less money. What about Federal employees? Why is it that that logic does not apply here? It's incomprehensible that we find ourselves in this position.

Mr. Speaker, if the Federal Government is not paying realistic salaries, then we can't expect to be able to provide for people to allow for themselves and their families to have a decent living.

Mr. Speaker, the fact of the matter is that the Federal workforce is smaller now than it was in 1988, a historic low compared to the size of the national population. There are fewer Federal

workers now than at any time during President Reagan's administration. Something has got to give.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 90 seconds to say to my friend, I always appreciate the eloquence of his words. My only saving grace, Mr. Speaker, is that the facts are on my side. If the world was as the gentleman from Florida had described it, I'd probably be where the gentleman from Florida is in terms of position. That's not the case.

Every dollar we spend in this town, Mr. Speaker, has consequences. The \$11 billion that we're talking about in this bill is not money that's being cut from the Federal budget; it's money that's not being given as an automatic inflator to every Federal salary in the land. Instead, it remains available to those agencies to perform the services that they were created to perform.

Let me just be clear, Mr. Speaker. That means for every dollar that is not going into a clerk's pocket at the Veterans Affairs Administration, that's a dollar that's going to go to implement Veterans Affairs services. For every dollar that's not going to be an automatic pay increase in my hometown at the CDC, it is going to go for critical research and infrastructure there to perform the very important role the CDC was created to perform.

We have to make choices, Mr. Speaker. Google "Greece and pay cuts." Google "Greece and pension cuts." In fact, don't just use Google. Use Yahoo. Use Bing. Use anything you'd like, Mr. Speaker. You will see where we are headed.

When you refuse to make the tough decisions that my friends are refusing to make with respect to the Federal budget, you know where those cuts are going to fall.

With that, Mr. Speaker, I'd like to yield 5 minutes to one of our very distinguished freshman Members, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. WILLIAMS).

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, I stand here in support of H.R. 273, a common-sense bill to overturn President Obama's recent executive order that authorizes a .5 percent pay raise for Federal workers.

With the looming threat of sequestration just weeks away, Federal agencies should be focused on how to do more with less, like every other business does in America and every other family does in America. But the President's order would cost taxpayers more than \$10 billion over 10 years.

Here are the facts: in the last decade, the average Federal civilian salary has increased by 62 percent. When you factor in benefits and total compensation packages for Federal employees, it tops \$126,000, compared to less than \$63,000 in the private sector. I haven't heard the other side say anything about that.

I'm a business owner. I have been in business for 41 years. I still own a business, and I hope to stay in business. When I pay pay raises to my employees, it's because of their loyalty and

hard work, not simply because they're on payroll.

My constituents in the 25th District of Texas are fed up with a government that spends, borrows, and grows too much. Let's protect hard-earned taxpayer dollars and pass this common-sense solution, H.R. 273.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I would advise the gentleman that I was a businessperson, too, and there is a distinction between private businesses and civil servants of the Federal Government.

I'm pleased at this time to yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman on the Rules Committee and my good friend from Massachusetts (Mr. MCGOVERN).

□ 1410

Mr. MCGOVERN. I thank the gentleman for yielding to me.

First of all, Mr. Speaker, let me urge my colleagues, Democrats and Republicans alike, to vote against this closed rule. This is a closed rule by which the entire process has been shut down. The committees of jurisdiction held no hearings. There was no markup. It came to the Rules Committee. What did the Rules Committee do? They shut it down. They shut out all possibilities for Democrats or Republicans to offer amendments. My friend from Georgia is proud to defend this closed, iron fist policy, but I think it's wrong, especially on a bill like this, number one.

Number two, this is a rotten thing to do to Federal employees. It really is. I mean, these are hardworking men and women. These are people who work at NIH, who try to find cures for diseases that, by the way, will not only improve the quality of life for our people but will save money. This is about denying a pay increase to DEA agents on the borders and to the CIA agents who tracked down Osama bin Laden. This is a rotten, rotten thing to do. And for what? To score some cheap political points.

I'm a little confused. My friend from Georgia says it's really not a cut, that we're not reducing the deficit at all. The gentleman from Texas said we need to save the American taxpayers money. The bottom line is that this is a cheap political stunt. The victims here are working people, and none of us should be surprised, because this is the Republican kind of signature issue: go after working people. Do you want to find ways to balance the budget? Punish working people. Do you want to find this or that? Go after working people. Enough. Enough of this war against working families in this country.

Mr. Speaker, what is also really frustrating is that here we are debating a bill that's really going nowhere, that's about a press release. The Republicans are going to go on vacation tomorrow. We're not going to be back for a week, and then we'll have 4 legislative days left to deal with this thing called "sequestration." On March 1, all of these

across-the-board cuts go into play. And guess what? We're going to lose at least 750,000 jobs. That's not my estimate. That's what the head of OMB says. There will be 750,000 Americans unemployed because of their inaction. Guess what? What are these people going to do? They're going to have to look for employment. They're going to be without work. It's going to slow down our economic growth. Give me a break. There should be some urgency here.

My Republican friends, instead of bringing this to the floor, you ought to be finding ways to avoid this fiscal sequestration cliff that we're about to go over.

When my friends talk about the deficit and the debt, they don't talk about unpaid-for war costs, and they don't talk about all the money that they don't pay for that's sent over to Baghdad and Kabul. Instead, we have fights on the floor of whether or not to provide emergency hurricane relief aid to the victims of Hurricane Sandy in our own country. Only about 48 of my Republican friends voted for that. I mean, that's where their priorities are. We should be trying to put the American people first.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. POE of Texas). The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. I yield the gentleman an additional 30 seconds.

Mr. MCGOVERN. What we should be talking about on this floor is jobs—jobs, jobs, jobs. That is how we get this economy going again. That is how we reduce our deficit. That is how we reduce our debt. Instead, you're punishing American workers. This is shameful. We should be spending our time doing something that will actually benefit this economy and this economic recovery. This is not it.

I urge my colleagues to vote "no" on this closed rule and to vote "no" on the underlying bill, and I urge the leadership to get serious about avoiding sequestration. It is not good for our country.

Mr. WOODALL. I yield myself 4 minutes to talk about cheap political stunts because I see a few cheap political stunts down here from time to time. I don't want to characterize anybody's behavior in that way as I don't think that's appropriate, but what I would say is, if we go to the very top of the GS scale and take a good senior person, like a GS-14 who is making \$84,000 a year, this one-half percent pay increase that the President did by executive order and that we're saying won't go into effect until next year is going to give that one working person, that income earner for that family, \$2,000 for that family to use over the next year.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Will the gentleman yield for 10 seconds?

Mr. WOODALL. I will yield to the gentleman to answer this question: The gentleman sees here \$10,793. That's the additional burden that the gentleman,

when he controlled this Congress for 2 years with the President of the United States, also of his party, added to this working family's burden.

Now, when you come to the House floor and profess your affection for the working people in my district and when you express that affection by ensuring that, this year, one-half percent of their pay is going to go up, you're adding \$10,000 for that worker, \$10,000 for that worker's wife, \$10,000 for that worker's oldest child, middle child and youngest child—for a family of five in my district. The gentleman added \$50,000 in debt and deficit that has to be repaid.

Now, I know the gentleman was using his heart when he passed those programs that did this. I don't question the gentleman's motivation at all. What I do is take offense that the gentleman questions my motivation in shifting \$2,000 from workers' salaries into programs—programs for veterans, programs for research, programs for health—and that he questions my commitment to working class people when, while he did this, he voted "yes" after "yes" after "yes" with no remorse whatsoever.

I'd be happy to yield to my friend, the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. MCGOVERN. What I take offense at is the gentleman's party is about to lay off 750,000 workers in this country. For the life of me, I don't know how that helps our economy. That's what I take offense at. We should be talking about avoiding sequestration. Instead, my friends on the other side of the aisle are talking about how to lay off more American workers. That's what I take offense at.

Mr. WOODALL. In reclaiming my time, I welcome my friend to the sequestration debate, the one that we tried to have last May with absolutely no assistance whatsoever.

Here we are at midnight on sequestration day, saying, Hey, let's do it. Folks, let's do it. Let's do it. Back in May, we passed a bill here. Let's do it with the bill we passed in August to solve the fiscal cliff. Let's do it with the one we passed in September. Let's do it with the one we passed in December.

There is not a person in this body I don't want to work with to solve these problems—there is not one—but when we do it here at the eleventh hour and say, Golly, I wish folks had gotten serious about it earlier. Mr. Speaker, we've been trying to get serious about it for 18 months. When the President passed the law of the land and signed this sequestration into law after the Joint Select Committee failed, the question isn't why are we having to plan for sequestration today; the question is why wasn't the administration planning for it 13 months ago, when we knew the law of the land was going to put it into effect come March 1, 2013?

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

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, before yielding, I would ask

my good friend from Georgia a question: If we are leaving here, as I suspect we will tomorrow for a week, why don't we just stay here and get this done rather than go on vacation or waycation or whatever we do?

Mr. WOODALL. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. WOODALL. I actually asked that question—or a version of it—of the distinguished gentleman from Maryland, the minority whip, last night.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. He doesn't control the House, Mr. WOODALL.

Mr. WOODALL. If the gentleman would continue to yield.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. I continue to yield.

Mr. WOODALL. I asked, What would it have taken to get that Joint Select Committee to succeed? Because that's why we're here in sequestration; that's why we're dealing with these things. He said he did not know what more we could have done to find agreement then.

So I say to the gentleman that those same challenges the minority whip observed last night that were preventing agreement then are those same challenges that are preventing us, whether we work until midnight tonight or not, from solving them today, though I would be happy to stay with the gentleman just as long as there is work to be done here in this House.

I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. In reclaiming my time, one thing is absolutely certain: the majority whip controls the floor, and the Speaker controls the House, and if they chose for us to stay here, we could stay here.

With that, I am pleased to yield 5 minutes to my very good friend, the distinguished gentlewoman from New York, who is my ranking member on the Rules Committee, Ms. SLAUGHTER.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. I thank my colleague from the Rules Committee.

Mr. Speaker and everyone who is listening, you know by now and what you've heard by now is they want sequestration. The local papers and the ones that we've printed on Capitol Hill today all say they want sequestration. The excuse they're giving is they're going to wait and see what the Senate will do, that we're not going to take any action here, that we're just going to be bystanders until we find out they want sequestration.

Over 700,000 workers are going to lose their jobs. A lot of economists tell us that this could be worse than the Great Depression, but they're willing to do it. They're willing to do it because they want to fight this President. I think that means a whole lot more to them than doing their job here as elected Members of Congress. As we've heard before, we only have 6 legislative days left. When we come back from a week's vacation, we will have these cuts that will have this devastating impact on our economy and on the well-being of every American citizen.

□ 1420

I urge the CEOs of America who are very worried, and they've said so for months and months, that they're concerned desperately about the prospect of sequestration, to talk to their Members here and get them to change their mind, if they can.

This is really dire. We're not kidding around here. This is serious business. We are literally facing a fiscal cliff. But the solution we've made to this, as you all know, a manmade crisis here, they take a swing at their favorite punching bag and hold hostage again the people who make their living serving all of us.

Last night was the first time I really heard that what we're doing, we're not going to save anything. Now, bear in mind that the Federal employees have already given in salary give-backs over \$100 billion over the next 10 years. That should be enough sacrifice from them, but no, we're going to go for more. But we're not going to use it to reduce the deficit, it is going to be made available to agencies.

Well, there's a lot of "Alice in Wonderland" sort of sense in Congress these days. Alice, one of the things that I liked about her the most, and she's a very strange little girl, but she said that she practiced as hard as she could to try to believe six impossible things before breakfast. And I'm trying to put this in that same category, and it simply is impossible for me to believe that we gain anything in the world by taking away the salary and income of hardworking government employees to put back in Federal agencies. Frankly, if any of you can really understand that, I'd appreciate it if you'd let me know.

We had a chance—in the last 2 weeks, we've had two chances—to do away with the sequester in a commonsense way and also to cut the deficit with a sensible solution. Mr. VAN HOLLEN, who is the ranking member of the Budget Committee and deserves our respect, was not allowed to do anything.

As you pointed out, and I also heard Mr. MCGOVERN say so, the Rules Committee now runs the House. There's no committee action on any of these bills. No chance for Republicans and Democrats in the committee setup, which the Founding Fathers did, and which we followed for generations and hundreds of years here, no possibility for them to discuss it. It simply is brought to Rules.

Now, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, his sensible solution here, which really does make sense, was simply not allowed to be put on the floor so that we could discuss it and give people a vote. A bipartisan group of the Members of the House don't want this bill passed. I'm going to put a letter in from one of the most thoughtful Members and a friend, Representative WOLF from Virginia, about what he thinks this is about. He calls this a cheap political trick, and I think that pretty well sums it up.

Now, already cuts totaling \$1.5 trillion have been made to discretionary

spending. And as a result, because of the layoff of employees, our economy experienced an unexpected economic contraction in the final quarter of 2012, which we should pay heed to.

Sequestration would compound our economic troubles even further. George Mason University says sequestration would cause 2.14 million American employees to lose their jobs. Meanwhile, important Federal programs would be crippled because of irresponsible cuts. I need to mention a few of them again.

FAA, which makes flying safer, they would experience a great cutback. The people who guard the border, who do drug interdiction, who keep our border safe and strong, they would have a severe cutback. Sequestration would mean that vital research would be slowed. And as a scientist, let me assure you that research cannot be turned off and on like a faucet. It is necessary for us to maintain that research with dollars because, as it's been pointed out before, we want to keep our population healthy.

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

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. I yield an additional 1 minute to the gentleman.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. How important that is for us, not only for our economic well-being, but for the well-being of our citizens.

This is a foolish thing that we're doing here today, and I can't imagine anybody in the Senate would even contemplate bringing it up. So all of this is simply a waste of time, as we do here so many times.

I urge my colleagues on both sides, vote "no" and please give us a chance to let Mr. VAN HOLLEN bring his bill to the floor—or some bill from the Republican side. I don't care where it comes from. We have to stop sequestration.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
Washington, DC.

VOTE NO ON H.R. 273

DEAR REPUBLICAN COLLEAGUE: Next week, the House is scheduled to consider H.R. 273. I urge you to vote no on this legislation.

Let's be honest: this bill is nothing more than a political stunt that targets the hardworking, dedicated men and women of the civil service, who have already had their salaries frozen for more than two years. Everyone knows they are an easy target. But we are kidding ourselves if we think we can balance the budget on the backs of federal employees. It's a drop in the bucket towards deficit reduction and a hollow gesture absent meaningful mandatory spending reforms. Worse, this is just busywork as our economy faces the sequestration meat ax.

I believe that the federal government must be able to recruit and retain qualified individuals in order to deliver government services in an efficient manner. And about half of all federal employees make less than \$60,000 a year. These are individuals who haven't had a pay raise in more than two years. And now we're talking about freezing their pay for a full third year. The president's proposed .5 percent adjustment is cheap grace (\$225, since a quarter of it has already been frozen) and won't bring civil service pay close to the private sector, but it will at least attempt to tell these employees that they are valued.

And just who are these federal employees? They are the people you call when you need help, and 85 percent of them live outside of the Washington, D.C. metro area.

They are the CIA agents who planned the raid to kill Osama bin Laden. They work side-by-side with our military. Those agents depicted in *Zero Dark Thirty*? They haven't had a pay raise in more than two years.

They are the FBI agents you call when your child has been kidnapped. Those agents who rescued the 5-year-old kidnapped and held hostage in a bunker in Alabama? They haven't had a pay raise in over two years.

They are the Customs and Border Patrol and DEA Agents who are working to stop illegal immigrants and human traffickers and drug runners. The border patrol agents who worked side-by-side with slain Border Patrol Agent Brian Terry haven't had a pay raise in over two years.

They are the nurses and doctors at the VA who care for our veterans and wounded warriors—they haven't had a pay raise in more than two years. I know I'm not alone in wanting the best doctors and nurses to care for our veterans.

They are the foreign service officers who represent our government at embassies in Libya, Israel, Russia and beyond. The FSO's who worked side-by-side with slain Information Management Office Sean Smith in Benghazi haven't had a pay raise in more than two years.

They are the FDA inspectors who trace E. coli outbreaks to ensure that our food is safe to eat. They are the NIH researchers working to find a cure for breast cancer, and prostate cancer, and Alzheimer's and Autism.

They are the defense civilian riggers and machinists and refuelers and engineers repairing sophisticated electronic weaponry systems at Army depots and Air Force bases and shipyards who support our military personnel;

They are the firefighters you call when a lighting strike sets a national forest on fire and homes and business are in danger. And they are the park service rangers who ensure that your constituents can safely hike and camp in our national parks and tour our battlefields.

They are the scientists working at the DOE labs. They are the meteorologist at weather service storm centers tracking hurricanes, tornadoes, tsunamis and blizzards. They are the NASA astronauts, engineers and scientists.

Over the last Congress, unlike other groups, federal employees contributed more than \$103 billion to deficit reduction—no other group was asked to sacrifice more. I know that these patriotic Americans are willing to do more, but they rightly expect all of us to fully join this effort. A vote for the bill next week isn't a vote just to cut a program, but it's a targeted vote to specifically freeze an individual's pay from a marginal increase—a personal affront to the employee and their entire family, including their spouses and children, and the retired parents who care about their children.

I get it—this vote polls well with certain groups. But we were elected to represent our constituents. Let's pass bills that actually reduce the drivers of our nation's debt and deficit. This is cheap grace. Vote no.

Please don't hesitate to contact me or Mira Lezell on my staff at 5-5136 if you have any questions.

Sincerely,

FRANK WOLF,
Member of Congress.

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Speaker, at this time it is my great pleasure to yield 2 minutes to a good friend here, Mr. WITTMAN.

Mr. WITTMAN. Mr. Speaker, today I rise in opposition to this bill. I'm proud to represent thousands of hardworking Federal civilian employees who selflessly serve this Nation on a daily basis. They fight crime for the FBI, root out terrorism with the CIA, and provide vital support to members of our military. They're scientists, air traffic controllers, and engineers, pursuing excellence each day to cure disease, protect our travelers, and shore up our infrastructure. They're doctors and nurses at VA hospitals, ensuring that our veterans get the highest caliber care in return for their service to this Nation. They're Border Patrol agents protecting our homeland from those who wish to do us harm. But above all, they are patriots, selfless, committed citizens who believe in serving their Nation.

This Congress charges these hardworking Americans with their duties, and this Congress asks them to perform these duties to the very best of their abilities. It is only appropriate then that their service be recognized and applauded rather than consistently used as a tool in the game of politics.

To be clear, I do not think that Members of Congress should receive a pay increase, and I have continually supported efforts to reduce our pay and cut our legislative budgets. But this bill is not about Members of Congress, it is about our Federal civilian workforce, which has already been under a pay freeze for the last 2 years. This legislation would continue that pay freeze throughout the end of this year.

For these dedicated citizens, life is about public service and commitment—commitment to the people of this Nation and to the ideals and dreams set forth by our Founding Fathers.

So today, I ask my colleagues: Do you want an efficient, responsible, and safe United States of America? Do you plan to ask any less of our Federal workforce?

It seems to me that we are only asking them to do more for this Nation with less without standing by them in these challenging times. We must stop continually targeting our Federal employees, and I urge a "no" vote on H.R. 273.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, would you be kind enough to tell both of us how much time remains.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Florida has 13 minutes. The gentleman from Georgia has 16½ minutes.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I'm very pleased at this time to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. BERA), a new, very thoughtful Member of the House of Representatives.

Mr. BERA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to speak against the closed rule. Yesterday I introduced an amendment that would have separated the pay raise for Members of Congress from the remainder of Federal employees. If

that amendment had passed, only Members of Congress would be affected by this bill.

Unfortunately, the Rules Committee reported a closed rule and will not allow an up-or-down vote on any amendments. They would not allow us to vote up or down on this. Failure to allow an up-or-down vote does not allow Congress to take a clean vote on a cost-of-living adjustment for Federal employees.

Congress needs to start working together in a bipartisan manner and start addressing issues like sequestration and the budget. We need to start making strategic budget decisions, not across-the-board cuts. That is not how you make decisions. We need to eliminate and reduce those programs that are no longer effective and begin to bring our budget under control. And if we cannot act responsibly and find a way to achieve this balance, then we don't deserve a pay raise as Members of Congress.

□ 1430

This amendment, the amendment I proposed, would have reiterated that.

Not allowing a clean vote is just wrong. We should not balance the Federal budget on the backs of our Federal employees. My amendment would have allowed us to take that vote.

Sacramento County, my home county, has over 26,000 Federal employees. These are hardworking citizens in the Defense Department. Many of them are veterans who have served our country admirably, and there are other dedicated public servants keeping our country safe. We should not ask them to make the sacrifice without asking ourselves to make that sacrifice first.

Now is the time we've got to set aside this partisanship and start working together to serve our country. However, achieving fiscal balance on the backs of our hardworking Federal employees is not a solution.

I urge my colleagues to vote against this rule. Protect our hardworking and responsible Federal employees, and work in a bipartisan manner to pass a responsible budget.

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 2 minutes. And I want to say of my friend from California, he gave a very thoughtful presentation in the Rules Committee last night. And as my colleague from Florida suggested, I am a big fan of open rules. It's early in the process. It's always harder to go through regular order until the committees have spun up.

But I would just say to my freshman friend from California that even if we had made an open rule controlling for this bill, the gentleman's amendment still would not have been made in order. It would have been ruled by the Parliamentarian as out of order, as being nongermane to the underlying bill.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Will my colleague yield?

Mr. WOODALL. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. But we have the power in the Rules Committee to waive that germaneness, and we could have done that and allowed Mr. BERA's measure to go forward. I thank my colleague for yielding.

Mr. WOODALL. I appreciate my friend's comment. He's absolutely right.

So my advice to my new freshman colleague from California would be, in this case, it's not an open rule that he's after; it's his colleagues on the Rules Committee working their Rules Committee magic to waive the rules. It would have actually taken a waiver of the House rules to allow the gentleman's amendment to come.

But he made a very passionate case last night, Mr. Speaker, and I know his heart is in this issue.

Mr. Speaker, I want to be clear about what this bill is and what this bill isn't. And what it isn't is a pay freeze for Federal employees, and, in fact, what has been the law of the land for the last 2 years has not been a pay freeze.

All of the increases that come with longevity have been taking place. All of the increases that come with promotions have been taking place. All of the increases that come with meritorious pay and bonuses and all of those activities have still been going on.

What this is, however, is a 9-month suspension of the automatic, across-the-board .5 percent increase that the President directed by executive order in December. That is all this bill is, and that's all this bill will be under this rule.

With that, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I'm very pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PASCRELL), my good friend, the former mayor of his city.

Mr. PASCRELL. Mr. Speaker, we need a balanced approach to reducing our deficit which makes responsible cuts while also raising revenue. This bill is not the way to do it.

I have great respect for the gentleman's intellect, but this is one of the dumbest bills I've ever seen come to this floor.

Let's take a look at it, Mr. Speaker. I rise in strong opposition to this rule and the underlying bill.

As part of the fiscal cliff deal, we promised Federal employees that they would see their first pay raise in over 2 years on March 27. This is a modest pay adjustment, half a percent. When you say \$10 billion, you're talking about \$1 billion a year.

Now, a little more than a month before the increase takes effect, the bill before us today would break that promise. Do you think, America, that this is going to solve the fiscal problems that the Congress and President created?

My home State of New Jersey suffered devastating damage from Sandy this past fall, as did a few other States.

Employees from FEMA, the Army Corps of Engineers, HUD, and many other agencies were on the ground immediately.

How dare you ask this pejorative question about, well, what if we took the dollar from the clerk and then provided it to our Armed Forces?

What kind of negotiation is that?

What kind of bartering are we doing?

And we're doing the same thing with our own staffs, the very people that are sitting alongside us and behind us, which is not germane to this legislation, but we're doing the same thing. They haven't had a raise in 2 years.

Oh, wonderful, we're saving the country because we're doing that. These are human beings too. They're not chattel. They're not numbers.

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

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. I yield the gentleman an additional 1 minute.

Mr. PASCRELL. They're not stick figures. They walk the streets, navigating through flooding, debris, downed power lines, these Army Corps, these FEMA folks, in order to assess damages and reach out to the victims. They're not nameless. They're not faceless bureaucrats. These are heroes who continue to contribute each and every day to our ongoing rebuilding.

And darn it, we allowed this to happen 5 or 6 years ago when we laid off thousands and thousands of police officers and firefighters and teachers and we called it saving the country.

Federal workers are also law enforcement officers and firefighters who put their lives on the line for us every day. They work for the Defense Department. They protect us in our times of need, and we need to be there for them.

They've done and continue to do their part. I am tired of us using Federal, State, local, county employees as the scapegoats for our ineptness. Maybe it's the politically correct thing to do to capitulate and join the forces and cut everybody. That's what we should do? I don't think so.

I will debate you anytime on the Federal workers.

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 3 minutes to say to the gentleman—he heard it from the gentleman from Virginia on my side of the aisle—the respect for Federal employees and the job that they do is not a question that's being debated here today.

The admiration that I have for the folks at the CDC, in my neck of the woods, the support that, led by the Speaker of the House from my State, Speaker Gingrich, to double the NIH budget, and then double it again. The kind of work that goes on here is undisputed.

But I want to show you, Mr. Speaker, what my constituents also see in their tough times, because it's not just the clerk at the VA that hasn't gotten a raise in 2 years.

I was talking with a friend of mine who's a clerk at a furniture store, sin-

gle mom, child, son, 6 years old, hasn't gotten a raise in 2 years, makes \$11 an hour.

Average median Federal wage, \$74,000.

What I show you here is a chart from the CBO, the same organization that sites the job loss figures that you've quoted here earlier, that compares the work of folks with high school degrees, with a little bit of college, with college, in the private sector, the salaries and the benefits in the private sector with that of the public sector.

Now, I say to the gentleman, in no way, Mr. Speaker, do I want to minimize the tremendous responsibility placed on our Federal civilian workers. Again, I have chosen a career of public service, as have they, and I admire them for it. I know it's at great sacrifice to themselves and their families.

Mr. PASCRELL. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOODALL. After this one sentence, and that is, in this tough time, until we can get our handle on the debt and the deficit, my constituents continue to look at how their tax dollars appear to be paying salaries and benefits higher to Federal employees than what my folks are getting back home.

I hope the CBO will produce a different report that shows a different result; but until it does, I wish my friends wouldn't categorize what's going on here as some sort of hateful act, disrespectful act towards Federal employees and could recognize it as a balancing of salaries and benefits that our own Congressional Budget Office has suggested is actually an inequity that exists today.

With that, I would be happy to yield to my friend, the gentleman from New Jersey.

□ 1440

Mr. PASCRELL. I wouldn't use the two words that you used. I would use the word "demeaning." We have demeaned our staff, which is not included in this, I understand that. But you want to know something? Those unemployment figures for the last 6 years would be so different if we hadn't laid off those very same Federal employees whom you are now deciding to take a half a percent away from them at this particular time. And for some crazy idea that you'll give the money to the agency to do with it what it wishes, I don't think you meant that, really. I don't think you meant that at all.

Mr. WOODALL. I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased at this time to yield 2 minutes to my friend, the distinguished gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE).

(Ms. JACKSON LEE asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. JACKSON LEE. I thank my dear friend from Florida for the leadership on the issue, the number of Members who have already spoken, and my good

friend on the Rules Committee who is the manager of this particular bill and, in essence, bringing this bill to the floor of the House, and that is what you hear the discourse about. Many times this discourse, this debate becomes confusing because we are trying to compare apples and oranges. And so let me first own up to the fact that a congressional pay freeze is already in place. Our salaries have been frozen. When it expires, we'll rise to the occasion and freeze it again. We're elected by the people, and those decisions can be made on behalf of the people.

We're not talking about congressional salaries today. They're in place. They exist. What we're talking about is the ICE officer that I'm meeting with in the Rayburn Room who works every day to protect this country and has seen that, because of the \$103 billion that Federal employees have already given to reduce the deficit, necessities of work are being challenged. Customs and Border Protection, DEA officers, FBI, Health and Human Services, Centers for Disease Control physicians, research at NIH and those scientists, all of those persons are working for the greater good—those who had to address the West Nile virus, FEMA employees who are right now on the ground with Hurricane Sandy. I have no question that there are private sector employees that are addressing this question, but they've gotten a 4.7 percent raise.

Let me tell you what the issue is. Let's stop fooling around and address the question of sequester. Protect those who need a social safety net and Social Security and Medicare. Realize that if you dice and cut and slash under the sequester, that will be the issue. None of these amendments were allowed in.

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

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. I yield the gentlewoman 1 additional minute.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. I thank the gentleman.

Last night at the Rules Committee, there were amendments to bring forward the right way of addressing the question, and they indicated that was not germane. I know these words are confusing, but that could have been a waiver. We all know what that means. It doesn't match, it doesn't fit, but we waive you in. That could have been debated on the floor of the House.

My amendment said that we should take a pause. I simply said this bill shouldn't be brought up. I struck the entire language of the bill so that we could get to the point of providing a debate on the sequester to make sure that the American people's voices are heard. They don't want an across-the-board cut when you begin to cut the resources that they need. But we can do better.

And let me just say to you, in Texas, there are 251,000 Federal employees; California, over 400,000. These are not folks inside the beltway. They're the ones that are in the Nation's national

forests, on the border, in hospitals, dealing with drug cartels.

I can assure you, Mr. Speaker, that this is not what we should be doing today. This is unfair to our Federal workers, and I won't stand for it.

Vote against the rule and the bill.

Mr. Speaker, I rise to explain my amendment #5 to H.R. 273, "to eliminate the 2013 statutory pay adjustment for federal employees and to reject this frontal assault on federal employees."

My amendment would have struck the entire text of this bill. Why? Because the premise underlying the bill, to freeze federal salaries, is flawed.

And let me be clear: this bill does not add a dime to deficit reduction efforts. Yet my friends on the other side insist on this game of charades, pretending to be concerned with deficit reduction, but the folly of it all is that it's only a not-so-well-disguised game of political one-up man ship.

If you are really looking to cut government spending you should have made the Amendment submitted by my colleague, Mr. VAN HOLLEN of Maryland in-order. Mr. VAN HOLLEN's amendment was not perfect as it cut subsidies for large oil companies, among other things; but it represents a balanced approach to deficit reduction.

And as we look for ways to address our fiscal issues we cannot continue to use the salaries and retirement options of federal employees as our Congressional Savings and Loans.

Federal employees have contributed more than their fair share to addressing this problem. We need creative and long term solutions with a heavy emphasis on job growth.

H.R. 273 continues to freeze the salaries of federal employees who are vital to implementing the very laws and regulations that are generated by Congress and federal agencies.

As the Ranking Member on Homeland Security Committee, Subcommittee on Border and Maritime Security, I can attest that it is in our national security interest to have the ability to recruit and retain the best and the brightest employees to keep our borders safe from harm.

As a Representative from Texas, I can further attest that is again in our nation's best interest to have qualified high skilled professionals reviewing drilling applications for off shore well sites.

Federal employees help to ensure that the air we breathe, the airways that we travel upon, and the food we eat are safe.

Most Americans encounter their first federal employee when they meet their postal carrier. Men and women who faithfully deliver the mail: rain or shine.

After 911 with our need to improve airline security, we turned to federal employees . . . the very employees who are amongst the first to react when there is an attack on our soil.

Federal employees operate in every state cross our nation with only 15% of all federal employees working in Washington D.C., continuing to freeze their compensation is not a long term solution to our fiscal problems.

Our long term fiscal problems will not be solved by cutting Social Security, Medicaid, or Medicare.

Our problems will not be solved by freezing the pay and benefits of federal employees.

Our problems will not be solved on the backs of seniors, low and middle income

Americans, or the disabled. Our problems can be solved by putting forth legislation that will put hardworking Americans back to work, advance training for high skilled and high wage jobs. By putting forth legislation that inspires innovation, and through addressing the long term needs of all Americans rather than a few.

Most federal employees are not living the lifestyles of the rich and famous. The majority of Federal employees are middle class Americans. Over 60 percent of all federal employees make less than \$75,000 a year.

According to the Federal Salary Council (FSC) annual report federal employees are paid 34.6 percent less in salary than their private-sector counterparts.

There are those who have cited a study by the Congressional Budget Office which found that federal workers on average earned slightly more than private-sector workers; however, that study did not take into account the level of job responsibility, specialized training, or length of tenure of each employee. Which we all know should be taken into account.

There are those who claim that the federal government is too large. In reality, the federal government is smaller today that it was in 1968.

The IRS has 20,000 fewer employees than they did in 1995, yet are required to process 236 million more complicated tax returns.

The Department of Health and Human Services, Centers for Medicare and Medicaid has 7 percent fewer employees serving 64 percent more enrollees.

Most growth in the number of federal workers has been in Homeland Security and Defense as a result of 9/11.

From 2001 to 2010, employment in non-security federal agencies as a percent of population actually fell by 4 percent.

Even though overall there are less federal government employees serving each American today than there were 30 years ago. They have still contributed \$103 billion worth of budget savings since the beginning of 2011.

\$60 billion from a federal pay freeze in 2011 and 2012.

\$15 billion from increased retirement contributions for newly-hired federal employees. As a result new hires will not receive 2.3% less compensation than their federal counterparts.

\$28 billion from a pay increase of .5 percent which is well below the Cost of Living Adjustment of 1.7 percent.

Additional funds will also be generated as a result of a mandatory reduction in the Department of Defense civilian work force.

Federal Employees have given enough.

They have not seen a cost of living adjustment in going on 3 years. There appears to be a growing attitude that this freeze should go on indefinitely.

The freeze was originally enacted to cover only 2011 and 2012; however, it was extended through late March as part of a temporary budget measure. Again, this was supposed to be a temporary solution not a permanent cure.

We must do more to recruit and retain the best and brightest.

We must do more to inspire innovation and job growth.

We must do more to protect middle income Americans, like federal employees.

The way to address our long-term fiscal problems is not be using federal employees as a Congressional Savings and Loans.

Again, it is not through cuts to Social Security, Medicaid, and Medicare. It is by advancing creative long-term solutions that encourages jobs growth and innovation that will allow us to fix our current fiscal issues.

FAST FACTS

H.R. 273, freezes a 0.5% statutory pay adjustment slated to go into effect in March. It also extends the Congressional pay freeze through the end of the year.

My amendment nullifies the entire bill.

According to the Office of Management and Budget the federal workforce is virtually as small today as it has ever been in the modern era.

In 1953, the federal government employed one worker for every 78 residents. In 2009, one worker was employed for every 147 residents.

In the IRS today, there are 20,000 fewer employees than there were in 1995, processing 236 million more complicated tax returns. And, in the Department of Health and Human Services Medicare and Medicaid staff, there are 7 percent fewer employees serving 64 percent more enrollees.

Most growth in the number of federal workers has been in Homeland Security and Defense as a result of 9/11. From 2001 to 2010, employment in non-security federal agencies as a percent of population actually fell by 4 percent.

Only 15 percent of federal employees work in the Washington, DC, metro area. Continuing to freeze the pay of federal employees so they are not in keeping with the cost of living will have Cutting federal a negative impact on the economy of every state.

Currently there are 281,571 federal employees working in my home state of Texas. In California, there are over 350,000 federal employees. There are hundreds of thousands of hardworking Americans who are going to be impacted by this continued pay freeze across the U.S.

Over 93 percent of federal employee jobs are non-clerical positions.

The federal workforce is a highly-educated and skilled workforce, including doctors, attorneys, scientists, IT specialists, CPAs, engineers, and other highly trained experts in virtually every discipline.

Nearly 50 percent of federal employees have a bachelor's or higher degree.

About 21 percent of federal employees have professional degree or doctorate versus compared to only 9 percent in the private sector.

The federal workforce is the most highly-educated in the nation, with professionals in virtually every discipline.

If we want to continue to recruit and retain the best and the brightest in the federal government we can not continue to use their wages and benefits as a Congressional Savings and Loans. Provide services that are vital to our daily lives.

I do not believe that Americans wish to sacrifice vital services that impact the health, safety and well-being of their families because the federal government failed to invest in its most important asset . . . human capital.

The federal workforce has declined, on a per-capita basis, from one employee for every 78 U.S. residents in 1953 to one employee for every 147 residents in 2009.

About 85 percent of federal employees work in other cities and towns across the nation.

Federal employees have contributed \$60 billion over 10 years toward deficit reduction

through a two-year pay freeze, and another \$15 billion in pension contribution increases.

Federal workforce cuts will hurt American families through fewer food inspections, decreased monitoring of air and water, and fewer people protecting consumers in the financial markets, just to name a few.

Continuing attempts to freeze federal employee pay, cut retirement benefits, and reduce the federal workforce will more than likely result in a workforce that is not as productive, not as efficient, and not as competent.

Because these types of measures make it even more difficult to attract and retain highly skilled and qualified federal employees. We must consider the long-term impact of short-sighted decision making.

Mr. WOODALL. I yield myself 2 minutes.

I just want to read from the Simpson-Bowles Commission report. And I want to read from it not because I support everything the Simpson-Bowles Commission had to say. I want to read from it not because it's a bill that has passed here on the floor of the House—it's been introduced but it hasn't passed—but I want to read from it because it was put together by the President to be a thoughtful, nonpartisan, deliberative body that would try to find those things in the Federal Government that should change to right the fiscal ship that is the United States of America. And this is what that group, appointed by President Obama, Republicans and Democrats, a thoughtful deliberative body, had to say:

Out of duty and patriotism, hardworking Federal employees provide a great service to this country. But in a time of budget shortfalls, all levels of government must trim back. In the recent recession, millions of private sector and State and municipal employees have had their wages frozen or cut back, and millions more lost their jobs altogether. In contrast, Federal workers' wages increase annually due to automatic formulas in law, providing them with cost-of-living adjustments totaling more than 5 percent in the last 2 years. This proposal would institute a 3-year government-wide freeze on Federal pay at every government agency, including the Department of Defense civilian workforce. This proposal will save \$20.4 billion in 2015.

In 3 years, the President, to his credit, implemented the first 2 years of this proposal. Perhaps there was consultation with someone in this body. It wasn't with me. I serve on the Oversight and Government Reform Committee. The President, by executive order in December, decided he was not going to extend it a third year and was instead going to give a half percent pay raise.

These are issues that can absolutely be debated, Mr. Speaker.

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

Mr. WOODALL. I yield myself an additional 30 seconds.

This isn't a Republican idea; it's not a Democrat idea; it's not something that was created in the minds of folks who hate Federal employees and the Federal Government. It's an idea that came directly from the commission appointed by President Barack Obama to

solve exactly the kind of fiscal problems that we are facing today.

Like it, don't like it, but don't say it's something that it's not, Mr. Speaker. This is an idea from the President's fiscal commission, and we're bringing it to the floor today.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I would alert my colleague from Georgia that I have no further requests for time, and I'm prepared to close.

Mr. WOODALL. I also have no further requests for time and am prepared to close.

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

I really like and have great affection for my friend from Georgia, and I understand exactly what he just did with reference to the President's commission as appointed by Senator Simpson and Erskine Bowles, but the fount of wisdom with reference to what is required in order for this Nation to right its ship doesn't emanate from just any one commission. And while this particular proposal may be listed as an idea from the Simpson-Bowles Commission, I would urge my friend from Georgia to read the whole thing, which does contemplate shared sacrifice. And that's what I tried to get across to my colleagues here in this institution.

As a person that lived as a child during the Second World War, I saw what sacrifice meant, and I saw the people that did the sacrificing. And they did it together, differently than us today. And that's why I think it's wrong to cherry-pick and then use a sledgehammer against Federal employees for something that is not likely to become the law of the land. It's a waste of time.

The only good thing that I have to say about the bill before us today is that it has zero chance of becoming law. I anxiously wait for my friends on the other side, particularly the leadership, to actually start considering legislation that will help, not hurt, the American people.

□ 1450

Mr. Speaker, if we defeat the previous question, I will offer an amendment which would allow the House to vote on replacing the entire sequester for 2013 with savings from specific policies that reflect a balanced approach to reducing our national debt.

There are only 6 legislative days left until the sequester hits. Now is the time to act. Smart government is not about sequesters; it's about solutions. And it's time to work together for the American people.

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote "no" and defeat the previous question.

I urge a "no" vote on the rule, and I yield back the balance of my time with the final thought that we don't have that much time to waste, and we are wasting the American people's time.

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume to say the gentleman believes we're wasting the American people's time. An equally precious commodity is the American people's money.

I talked earlier about the \$10,000 per American inhabitant. A lot of folks do their numbers by American tax-paying families, Mr. Speaker. A lot of folks do their numbers by per adult or per children. I didn't want to game the system like that.

The chart I have right now, Mr. Speaker, \$52,381. If you take today's \$16.5 trillion debt that America has and divide it by every single human being that the Census Department tells us is in America in January 2013, you will find that we have borrowed and spent \$52,381 for every human being in America.

I don't minimize the burden that will be on a family of four in my district when they don't receive that half a percent pay bump that the President tried to do by executive order that we're rescinding here today. I don't minimize that at all. But it is minimal compared to the \$52,000 for each member of that family of four. That half a percent pay raise is minimal compared to the \$208,000 that that family owes as its share of the Federal debt.

The gentleman from Florida, Mr. Speaker, made a very passionate presentation last night, and I believe he is absolutely right. He referenced himself and our ranking member as the only two folks in that committee who know anything about sacrifice. I always go through my grandparents' stuff. I was one of those kids who loved being in the attic. You always find neat stuff in the attic and the basement. I have all the ration stamps, Mr. Speaker—sugar, rubber. I don't know what that's like. I don't know what that's like for a Nation to come together with such a sense of purpose that they say we're going to police ourselves and our own family. We're going to have the posters up on the wall that say "loose lips sink ships," and don't waste because we need it for the war effort, and we're going to come together and make that happen.

In fact, the last time, Mr. Speaker, this country had the kind of debt as a percentage of the size of its economy that it has today was when we were coming out of World War II. In that time, when we were rationing rubber and sugar, when we no longer minted our currency with copper because we didn't have enough to go around—or nickel—we were using steel to put the coins together at that time. In that time of crisis, Mr. Speaker, when we

thought the freedom of the world was on the line, we borrowed the largest amount of money ever borrowed in the history of this country to win World War II.

As we stand here today, we have borrowed trillions more in actual dollars, but that same gargantuan number of 100 percent of our economy. And for what? What does that leave us when the next crisis comes—and I promise you it will. The next crisis will come, and the tools that we have to address it will have been eroded by the policies of today.

I take no pleasure in being down here today managing the rule that will extend into year 3 a Federal employee pay freeze. I told folks in my constituency, Mr. Speaker, I said I want to come back home and I want to tell you how much I've been doing good work for you in Washington and doggone it I deserve a pay raise. I want us all to be so successful that we can go back home and tell folks we deserve it. But with \$16.4 trillion in debt, 4 years of no budgets at all coming out of this town, trillion-dollar annual deficits, we don't.

If you think the pain of a 3-year pay freeze is bad, Mr. Speaker, Google Greece, Bing Greece, do your Yahoo search on Greece—not half a percent freezes, but double-digit cuts to Federal benefits; double-digit cuts to pensions that seniors are relying on; double-digit cuts to salaries; layoffs, double-digit percentages. It doesn't get better on its own, Mr. Speaker. We have to do it.

My friend from Florida is so right, Mr. Speaker: we have to come together to solve the bigger problems. This is not the bigger problem. At best, this is a symptom of a problem. At worst, it's just something we're trying to do to manage through.

In this body, Mr. Speaker, and the Senate, the President, we put six of our best minds from the House, three Democrats and three Republicans, six of our best minds from the Senate, three Democrats and three Republicans, and we locked them in a room for about 3 months and said do anything, do anything you want to with the Federal budget. Dream your biggest dreams. Come up with your best ideas. Get outside the box. And we're going to close the door so you can have that conversation with the utmost candor, Republicans and Democrats alike, House Members and Senate Members alike.

After 3 months, Mr. Speaker, having looked at literally hundreds of trillions of dollars of Federal spending going out for decades, they found that they could agree on not even one dollar, not one dollar in changes.

Mr. Speaker, as you well know, and as the freshman Members of this body are going to learn, we only control one-third of the budget here, just one-third of the budget, that discretionary spending, one-third of the budget. That's where the Federal employee sal-

aries are, one-third of the budget. So everything we do to try to get a handle on \$52,000 in debt per man, woman and child in America, everything we do to try to get our fiscal ship sailing straight once again is coming from that one-third.

Because to get to the real drivers of the debt, Mr. Speaker, to get to the real drivers, we've got to get into the two-thirds, the two-thirds that can only get to the table when the House and the Senate and the President all agree.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. I know you're on a roll, but will my friend yield for just 5 seconds?

Mr. WOODALL. As highly unorthodox as that is, my great respect for my friend requires that I do.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. I thank you so very much.

I just want to say America ain't Greece; it ain't going to be Greece.

Mr. WOODALL. Reclaiming my time, Mr. Speaker—and again, pleasure to yield—I say to my friend, I fear it's thinking like that that's going to take us exactly there.

□ 1500

Mr. Speaker, again, I take no pleasure in this freeze today. I believe in shared sacrifice across this country to solve our problems. The only thing that would be permissible in this legislation is to ensure that Members of Congress and fellow employees are both frozen together, as is ensured in this legislation.

I urge my colleagues to support this rule, bring this bill to the floor, support this underlying resolution, and remember that until \$52,381 per man, woman and child in this country reads "zero," we're going to have these discussions again and again and again.

The President, Mr. Speaker, I'm told is planning to produce a budget. It's not going to be this month. It may come next month. Do you know that in the 2 years I've been here as a Member of Congress, the President's budgets never, ever, ever pay down one penny of this debt? We're complicit in this, Mr. Speaker; and, together, we can get ourselves out of it.

The material previously referred to by Mr. HASTINGS of Florida is as follows:

AN AMENDMENT TO H. RES. 66 OFFERED BY
MR. HASTINGS OF FLORIDA

(1) At the end of the resolution, add the following:

SEC. 6. Notwithstanding any other provision of this resolution, following debate on H.R. 273 it shall be in order to 1 consider the amendment received for printing in the Congressional Record pursuant to clause 8 of rule XVIII and numbered 1, if offered by Representative Van Hollen of Maryland or a designee. That amendment shall be in order without intervention of any point of order, shall be considered as read, shall be separately debatable for one hour equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, and shall not be subject to a demand for a division of the question.

(2) On page 2, line 5, insert "with or without instructions" after "recommit".

THE VOTE ON THE PREVIOUS QUESTION: WHAT IT REALLY MEANS

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

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

The Republican majority may say "the vote on the previous question is simply a vote on whether to proceed to an immediate vote on adopting the resolution . . . [and] has no substantive legislative or policy implications whatsoever." But that is not what they have always said. Listen to the Republican Leadership Manual on the Legislative Process in the United States House of Representatives, (6th edition, page 135). Here's how the Republicans describe the previous question vote in their own manual: "Although it is generally not possible to amend the rule because the majority Member controlling the time will not yield for the purpose of offering an amendment, the same result may be achieved by voting down the previous question on the rule . . . When the motion for the previous question is defeated, control of the time passes to the Member who led the opposition to ordering the previous question. That Member, because he then controls the time, may offer an amendment to the rule, or yield for the purpose of amendment."

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

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

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SIMPSON). The question is on ordering the previous question.

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

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 229, nays 194, not voting 8, as follows:

[Roll No. 41]

YEAS—229

Aderholt	Graves (GA)	Perry
Alexander	Graves (MO)	Petri
Amash	Griffin (AR)	Pittenger
Amodei	Griffith (VA)	Pitts
Bachmann	Grimm	Poe (TX)
Bachus	Guthrie	Pompeo
Barletta	Hall	Posey
Barr	Hanna	Price (GA)
Barton	Harper	Radel
Benishek	Harris	Reed
Bentivolio	Hartzler	Reichert
Bilirakis	Hastings (WA)	Renacci
Bishop (UT)	Heck (NV)	Ribble
Black	Hensarling	Rice (SC)
Blackburn	Herrera Beutler	Rigell
Bonner	Holding	Roby
Boustany	Hudson	Roe (TN)
Brady (TX)	Huelskamp	Rogers (AL)
Bridenstine	Huizenga (MI)	Rogers (KY)
Brooks (AL)	Hultgren	Rogers (MI)
Brooks (IN)	Hunter	Rohrabacher
Broun (GA)	Hurt	Rokita
Buchanan	Issa	Rooney
Bucshon	Jenkins	Ros-Lehtinen
Burgess	Johnson (OH)	Roskam
Calvert	Johnson, Sam	Ross
Camp	Jones	Rothfus
Campbell	Jordan	Royce
Cantor	Joyce	Runyan
Capito	Kelly	Ryan (WI)
Carter	King (IA)	Salmon
Cassidy	King (NY)	Scalise
Chabot	Kingston	Schock
Chaffetz	Kinzinger (IL)	Schweikert
Coble	Kline	Scott, Austin
Coffman	Labrador	Sensenbrenner
Cole	LaMalfa	Sessions
Collins (GA)	Lamborn	Shimkus
Collins (NY)	Lance	Shuster
Conaway	Lankford	Simpson
Cook	Latham	Smith (NE)
Cotton	Latta	Smith (NJ)
Cramer	LoBiondo	Smith (TX)
Crawford	Long	Southerland
Crenshaw	Lucas	Stewart
Cuellar	Luetkemeyer	Stivers
Daines	Lummis	Stockman
Davis, Rodney	Marchant	Stutzman
Denham	Marino	Terry
Dent	Massie	Thompson (PA)
DeSantis	Matheson	Thornberry
DesJarlais	McCarthy (CA)	Tiberi
Duffy	McCaul	Tipton
Duncan (SC)	McClintock	Turner
Duncan (TN)	McHenry	Upton
Ellmers	McKinley	Valadao
Farenthold	McMorris	Wagner
Fincher	Rodgers	Walberg
Fitzpatrick	Meadows	Walden
Fleischmann	Meehan	Walorski
Fleming	Messer	Weber (TX)
Flores	Mica	Webster (FL)
Forbes	Miller (FL)	Westmup
Fortenberry	Miller (MI)	Westmoreland
Fox	Miller, Gary	Whitfield
Franks (AZ)	Mullin	Williams
Frelinghuysen	Mulvaney	Wilson (SC)
Gardner	Murphy (PA)	Wittman
Garrett	Neugebauer	Wolf
Gerlach	Noem	Womack
Gibbs	Nugent	Woodall
Gibson	Nunes	Yoder
Gingrey (GA)	Nunnelee	Yoho
Gohmert	Olson	Young (AK)
Goodlatte	Palazzo	Young (FL)
Gosar	Paulsen	Young (IN)
Granger	Pearce	

Andrews	Green, Gene	Owens
Barber	Gutierrez	Pallone
Barrow (GA)	Hahn	Pascarell
Bass	Hanabusa	Pastor (AZ)
Beatty	Hastings (FL)	Payne
Becerra	Heck (WA)	Pelosi
Bera (CA)	Higgins	Perlmutter
Bishop (GA)	Himes	Peters (CA)
Bishop (NY)	Hinojosa	Peters (MI)
Blumenauer	Holt	Peterson
Bonamici	Honda	Pingree (ME)
Brady (PA)	Horsford	Pocan
Bralley (IA)	Hoyer	Polis
Brown (FL)	Huffman	Price (NC)
Brownley (CA)	Israel	Quigley
Bustos	Jackson Lee	Rahall
Butterfield	Jeffries	Rangel
Capps	Johnson, E. B.	Richmond
Capuano	Kaptur	Roybal-Allard
Cárdenas	Keating	Ruiz
Carney	Kennedy	Ruppersberger
Carson (IN)	Kildee	Rush
Cartwright	Kilmer	Ryan (OH)
Castor (FL)	Kind	Sánchez, Linda
Castro (TX)	Kirkpatrick	T.
Chu	Kuster	Sanchez, Loretta
Cicilline	Langevin	Sarbanes
Clarke	Larsen (WA)	Schakowsky
Clay	Larson (CT)	Schiff
Cleaver	Lee (CA)	Schneider
Clyburn	Levin	Schrader
Cohen	Lewis	Schwartz
Connolly	Lipinski	Scott (VA)
Conyers	Loeb sack	Scott, David
Cooper	Lofgren	Serrano
Costa	Lowenthal	Sewell (AL)
Courtney	Lowey	Shea-Porter
Crowley	Lujan Grisham	Sherman
Cummings	(NM)	Sinema
Davis (CA)	Luján, Ben Ray	Sires
Davis, Danny	(NM)	Slaughter
DeFazio	Lynch	Smith (WA)
DeGette	Maffei	Speier
Delaney	Maloney,	Swalwell (CA)
DeLauro	Carolyn	Takano
DelBene	Maloney, Sean	Thompson (CA)
Deutch	Markey	Thompson (MS)
Dingell	Matsui	Tierney
Doggett	McCarthy (NY)	Titus
Doyle	McColum	Tonko
Duckworth	McDermott	Tsongas
Edwards	McGovern	Van Hollen
Ellison	McIntyre	Vargas
Engel	McNerney	Veasey
Enyart	Meeks	Vela
Eshoo	Meng	Michaud
Esty	Miller, George	Velázquez
Fattah	Moore	Visclosky
Foster	Moran	Walz
Frankel (FL)	Murphy (FL)	Wasserman
Fudge	Nadler	Schultz
Gabbard	Napolitano	Waters
Gallego	Neal	Watt
Garamendi	Negrete McLeod	Waxman
Garcia	Nolan	Welch
Grayson	O'Rourke	Wilson (FL)
Green, Al		

NOT VOTING—8

Culberson	Gowdy	McKeon
Diaz-Balart	Grijalva	Yarmuth
Farr	Johnson (GA)	

□ 1522

Messrs. BERA of California, ISRAEL, PETERS of California, Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico, Messrs. MURPHY of Florida, CASTRO of Texas, PETERS of Michigan, COSTA, Ms. ESHOO, and Mr. GALLEGRO changed their vote from "yea" to "nay."

Messrs. SHUSTER, WOLF, HUELSKAMP, FLEMING, CALVERT, HUNTER, YODER, and JONES changed their vote from "nay" to "yea."

So the previous question was ordered.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the resolution.

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

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 227, nays 192, not voting 12, as follows:

[Roll No. 42]

YEAS—227

Aderholt	Granger	Pearce
Alexander	Graves (GA)	Perry
Amash	Graves (MO)	Peterson
Amodei	Griffin (AR)	Petri
Bachmann	Griffith (VA)	Pittenger
Bachus	Grimm	Pitts
Barletta	Guthrie	Poe (TX)
Barr	Hall	Pompeo
Barton	Hanna	Posey
Benishek	Harper	Price (GA)
Bentivolio	Harris	Radel
Bilirakis	Hartzler	Reed
Black	Hastings (WA)	Reichert
Blackburn	Heck (NV)	Renacci
Bonner	Hensarling	Ribble
Boustany	Herrera Beutler	Rice (SC)
Brady (TX)	Holding	Rigell
Bridenstine	Hudson	Roby
Brooks (AL)	Huelskamp	Roe (TN)
Brooks (IN)	Huizenga (MI)	Rogers (AL)
Broun (GA)	Hultgren	Rogers (KY)
Buchanan	Hunter	Rogers (MI)
Bucshon	Hurt	Rohrabacher
Burgess	Issa	Rokita
Calvert	Jenkins	Rooney
Camp	Johnson (OH)	Ros-Lehtinen
Campbell	Johnson, Sam	Roskam
Cantor	Jones	Ross
Capito	Jordan	Rothfus
Carter	Joyce	Royce
Cassidy	Kelly	Runyan
Chabot	King (NY)	Ryan (WI)
Chaffetz	Kingston	Salmon
Coble	Kinzinger (IL)	Scalise
Coffman	Kline	Schock
Cole	Labrador	Schweikert
Collins (GA)	LaMalfa	Scott, Austin
Collins (NY)	Lamborn	Sensenbrenner
Conaway	Lance	Sessions
Cook	Lankford	Shimkus
Cotton	Latham	Shuster
Cramer	Latta	Simpson
Crawford	LoBiondo	Smith (NE)
Crenshaw	Long	Smith (NJ)
Daines	Lucas	Smith (TX)
Davis, Rodney	Luetkemeyer	Southerland
Denham	Lummis	Stewart
Dent	Marchant	Stivers
DeSantis	Marino	Stockman
DesJarlais	Massie	Stutzman
Diaz-Balart	McCarthy (CA)	Thompson (PA)
Duffy	McCaul	Thornberry
Duncan (SC)	McClintock	Tiberi
Duncan (TN)	McHenry	Tipton
Ellmers	McKeon	Turner
Eshoo	McKinley	Upton
Farenthold	McMorris	Valadao
Fincher	Rodgers	Wagner
Fitzpatrick	Meadows	Walberg
Fleischmann	Meehan	Walden
Fleming	Messer	Walorski
Flores	Mica	Weber (TX)
Forbes	Miller (FL)	Webster (FL)
Fortenberry	Miller (MI)	Wenstrup
Foxx	Miller, Gary	Westmoreland
Franks (AZ)	Mullin	Whitfield
Frelinghuysen	Mulvaney	Williams
Gardner	Murphy (PA)	Wilson (SC)
Garrett	Neugebauer	Wittman
Gibbs	Noem	Womack
Gibson	Nugent	Woodall
Gingrey (GA)	Nunes	Yoder
Gohmert	Nunnelee	Yoho
Goodlatte	Olson	Young (AK)
Gosar	Palazzo	Young (FL)
Gowdy	Paulsen	Young (IN)

NAYS—192

Andrews	Barrow (GA)	Beatty
Barber	Bas	Becerra

Bera (CA)	Heck (WA)	Pascarell
Bishop (GA)	Higgins	Pastor (AZ)
Bishop (NY)	Himes	Payne
Blumenauer	Hinojosa	Pelosi
Bonamici	Holt	Perlmutter
Brady (PA)	Honda	Peters (CA)
Braley (IA)	Horsford	Peters (MI)
Brown (FL)	Hoyer	Pingree (ME)
Brownley (CA)	Huffman	Pocan
Bustos	Israel	Polis
Butterfield	Jackson Lee	Price (NC)
Capps	Jeffries	Quigley
Capuano	Johnson, E. B.	Rahall
Cárdenas	Kaptur	Rangel
Carney	Keating	Richmond
Carson (IN)	Kennedy	Roybal-Allard
Cartwright	Kildee	Ruiz
Castor (FL)	Kilmer	Ruppersberger
Castro (TX)	Kind	Rush
Chu	Kirkpatrick	Ryan (OH)
Cicilline	Kuster	Sánchez, Linda
Clarke	Langevin	T.
Clay	Larsen (WA)	Sanchez, Loretta
Cleaver	Larson (CT)	Sarbanes
Clyburn	Lee (CA)	Schakowsky
Cohen	Levin	Schiff
Connolly	Lewis	Schneider
Conyers	Lipinski	Schrader
Cooper	Loebbeck	Schwartz
Costa	Lofgren	Scott (VA)
Courtney	Lowenthal	Scott, David
Crowley	Lowe	Serrano
Cuellar	Lujan Grisham	Sewell (AL)
Cummings	(NM)	Shea-Porter
Davis (CA)	Luján, Ben Ray	Sherman
Davis, Danny	(NM)	Sinema
DeFazio	Maffei	Sires
DeGette	Maloney,	Slaughter
Delaney	Carolyn	Smith (WA)
DeLauro	Maloney, Sean	Speier
DelBene	Markey	Swalwell (CA)
Deutch	Matheson	Takano
Dingell	Matsui	Thompson (CA)
Doggett	McCarthy (NY)	Thompson (MS)
Doyle	McCollum	Tierney
Duckworth	McDermott	Titus
Edwards	McGovern	Tonko
Ellison	McIntyre	Tsongas
Engel	McNerney	Van Hollen
Enyart	Meeks	Vargas
Esty	Meng	Veasey
Fattah	Michaud	Vela
Foster	Miller, George	Velázquez
Frankel (FL)	Moore	Visclosky
Fudge	Moran	Walz
Gabbard	Murphy (FL)	Wasserman
Gallego	Nadler	Schultz
Garamendi	Napolitano	Waters
Grayson	Neal	Watt
Green, Al	Negrete McLeod	Waxman
Green, Gene	Nolan	Welch
Gutierrez	O'Rourke	Wilson (FL)
Hahn	Owens	Wolf
Hanabusa	Pallone	

NOT VOTING—12

Bishop (UT)	Gerlach	King (IA)
Culberson	Grijalva	Lynch
Farr	Hastings (FL)	Terry
García	Johnson (GA)	Yarmuth

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). There are 2 minutes remaining.

□ 1529

Mr. RYAN of Ohio changed his vote from “yea” to “nay.”

So the resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated against:

Mr. GARCIA. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 42, had I been present, I would have voted “nay.”

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, had I been present on Thursday, February 14, 2013, I would have voted “no” on the motion on ordering the previous question on the rule

and “no” on H. Res. 66, the rule providing for consideration of H.R. 273.

APPOINTMENT OF MEMBERS TO JOINT ECONOMIC COMMITTEE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair announces the Speaker’s appointment, pursuant to 15 U.S.C. 1024(a), and the order of the House of January 3, 2013, of the following Members on the part of the House to the Joint Economic Committee:

Mr. CAMPBELL, California
 Mr. DUFFY, Wisconsin
 Mr. AMASH, Michigan
 Mr. PAULSEN, Minnesota
 Mr. HANNA, New York
 Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ, California
 Mr. CUMMINGS, Maryland
 Mr. DELANEY, Maryland

NATIONAL RECREATIONAL THERAPY MONTH

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

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, in February we celebrate National Recreational Therapy Month. Leading a healthy life means not only the absence of illness, but a level of physical, cognitive, emotional, social, and leisure well-being, which is the underlying focus of the recreational therapy profession.

Recreational therapists are caring professionals who touch the lives of individuals facing life-changing disease and disability all across the Nation. These professionals help individuals navigate these challenges, achieve healthy outcomes and, ultimately, an overall better quality of life.

Having worked in this profession for 28 years, I witnessed firsthand how the services of this profession made significant differences in the lives of so many. These services are provided by professionals nationally certified by the National Council for Therapeutic Recreation Certification as certified therapeutic recreation specialists.

Recreational therapy ultimately aims to improve an individual’s functioning and keeps them active, healthy, and as independent as possible.

Mr. Speaker, I congratulate the caring professionals of the therapeutic recreation profession during the month of February for the services they provide each and every day.

PROTECT VOTING RIGHTS OF ALL AMERICANS

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

Ms. LEE of California. Mr. Speaker, the upcoming Shelby County, Alabama v. Holder Supreme Court case presents a direct threat to section 5 of the Voting Rights Act of 1965, which is the

most effective civil rights legislation ever enacted by Congress.

The Voting Rights Act of 1965 was passed just 1 year after I graduated from high school. Growing up in El Paso, Texas, I vividly remember the days of Jim Crow, segregation, and the poll tax. Should the Supreme Court rule against the Justice Department and overturn this important legislation, minority communities will lose many of their voting protections.

Later this month, I intend to join my colleagues in the Congressional Black Caucus to listen to the oral arguments for this case at the Supreme Court. Many of us were part of the 390–33 majority, along with 98 Senators, who voted to reauthorize the Voting Right Act in 2006. We agreed there is still a compelling need to protect and preserve the voting rights of all Americans. After all, it is this right that lies at the very heart of our democracy that must not be eroded.

AMERICAN HEART MONTH

(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, February marks National Heart Month, which reminds all Americans to take control of their cardiovascular health. Each year, 700,000 Americans suffer a heart attack, and approximately 600,000 die from causes related to heart disease. Nearly everyone knows a family member, a colleague, or a friend who has experienced the devastating effects of this disease firsthand.

While heart disease is currently the leading cause of death among men and women, we can all take steps to prevent this disease and promote overall heart health.

One example of community action is the great work of the Plymouth Rotary Club and Allina hospitals and clinics in Minnesota. They've teamed up together to start a new project called Heart Safe Plymouth, a plan that promotes education and training on the emergency treatment of sudden cardiac arrest.

I encourage all Americans to follow their example of involvement and action. Let's use American Heart Month as an opportunity to learn more about heart disease and prevention so that we can all live longer and healthier lives.

IMPACTS OF SEQUESTER

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

Mr. PETERS of California. The impacts of sequester will be felt in every district and State. San Diego is home to major research universities and technology firms. Last year, firms working on everything from improving cancer diagnostics to protecting our computer security received more than \$130 million from the National Science

Foundation and \$850 million from the National Institutes of Health. In all, San Diego received more than 1,760 grants to support America's innovators.

I recently received a letter from Arisan Therapeutics, a small biomedical group in my district. This small team of dedicated researchers has been working on vaccines against the flu and dengue fever. If the sequester goes into effect, they will have to lay off their researchers and close. The sequester will not only hurt people, jobs, and families, but it will stop critical research in the biomedical sciences and stifle innovation in our labs and universities.

Congress must act now so America and San Diego do not fall behind our international competitors and so that we continue to be on the cutting edge of technology. We must keep investing in our future.

RECOGNIZING HONOR FLIGHT NORTHERN COLORADO

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

Mr. GARDNER. Madam Speaker, I rise on the occasion of Honor Flight Northern Colorado's ninth flight to Washington, D.C., bringing veterans of World War II, Korea, and Vietnam to see their memorials. On behalf of a grateful delegation, State, and country, I welcome these heroes.

The 122 veterans on this flight included 37 from World War II, 80 from the Korea conflict, four from the Vietnam war, and one from the war in Iraq. Eight of these veterans wear the Purple Heart.

The Honor Flight program was founded in 2005. It provides veterans with the opportunity to visit Washington, D.C., free of any cost to them or their families to see the memorials that were built in their honor. The program, originally intended to honor World War II veterans, has developed to include veterans from several major conflicts.

Today we honor those veterans as they make the journey to Washington to visit the memorials that serve as a symbol of a grateful Nation. Of course, no memorial, no statue can ever truly convey the sacrifices our veterans have made for our country. Much has been asked of these soldiers, sailors, airmen, marines, and Coast Guardsmen; and time and time again they have delivered.

The freedoms endowed upon us by our Creator, protected by our Constitution, and enjoyed by all Americans must never be taken for granted. Today, we honor those who have sacrificed to secure the blessings of liberty for generations of Americans. Please join me in thanking these patriots.

Madam Speaker, I rise on the occasion of Honor Flight Northern Colorado's ninth flight to Washington, DC bringing veterans of WWII,

Korea, and Vietnam to see their memorials. On behalf of a grateful delegation, State, and country, I welcome these heroes.

The 122 veterans on this flight include 37 from World War II, 80 from the Korea conflict, 4 from the Vietnam War, and one from the War in Iraq. Eight of these veterans wear the Purple Heart. The Honor Flight program was founded in 2005. It provides veterans with the opportunity to visit Washington, DC free of any cost to them or their families to see the memorials that were built in their honor. The program, originally intended to honor WWII veterans, has developed to include veterans from several major conflicts. Today we honor those veterans as they make the journey to Washington to visit the memorials that serve as symbols of a grateful Nation.

Of course no memorial, no statue can ever truly convey the sacrifices our veterans have made for our country. Much has been asked of these soldiers, sailors, airmen, Marines, and Coast Guardsmen, and time and time again, they have delivered. The freedoms endowed upon us by our Creator, protected by our Constitution, and enjoyed by all Americans must never be taken for granted. Today we honor those who have sacrificed to secure the blessings of liberty for generations of Americans.

Please join me in thanking Willard Bauer, Robert Bell, Edward Coleman, Floyd Ewing, Albert Fairweather, Marvin Fowler, Elwyn Frazier, Robert Fulton, William Garcia, Edward Glover, Herold Hettinger, Raymond Holiday, Buford Johnson, William Kammlade, Donald Lawless, Russell Maxwell, Dale Norwood, Philip Owen, Paul Painter, George Parker, Theodore Pratt, Kenneth Robb, Henry Redd, Harley Rouze, Harold Scatterday, Dean Severin, Leonie Shannon, Keith Simons, Jacob Stieb Jr., Howard Teague, Margaret Thompson, Charles Vogel, Thomas Weathers, Victor Weidmann, John Williams, Milo Whitcomb, Quentin Younglund, Bobby Andersen, Emmett Archuletta, Donald Armagost, Robert Ambrecht, Gary Beverlin, Stanley Black, Ronald Brasseur, Earl Buckendorf, Robert Buttner, Donald Campbell, Clarence Carnes, Jerald Clark, Robert Clayton, Keith Coates, Kenneth Comin, Victor Crenshaw, Dean Daggett, Lester Edgett, Arno Engele, Roy Erickson, William Erickson, Bernard Erthal, Donald Fenske, Donald Ficksencher, Russell Foster, Franklin Fronek, Porfelio Garbiso, Carl Goegelein, William Goble, Delbert Gorsline, George Gray, Kenneth Hoff, Robert Hull, Robert Jones Jr., George Knaub, Arthur Kober, John Leach, Roger London, Willard Loose, Joseph Lopez, Arthur Lukemire, Charles Mahoney, Eathon Marr, Vernon Marston, Robert Martin, George Maxey, Loren Maxey, Albert Melcher, Gordon Michel, Kenneth Miller, Raymond Miller, Stuart Miller, Ralph Nuss, James Othrow, Theodore Pearson, Robert Phillips, Franklin Pino, Julius Racette, Dean Rydholm, Delmar Scholfield, Carlos Scott, Stanley Shafer, Emil Shireman, Hubert Shumaker, Norris Slechta, Jack Snyder, John Stieb, Dale Stinton, Donald Svedman, James Theobald, Gem n Terrell, William Thill, Paul Van Driel, James Vincent, Paul Vohs, Leroy Waag, LaVerne Walls, Warren Ward, Duane West, David Young, Leonard Beutelspacher, John Gruver, Gaylord Mekeburg, Cloyd Rael, Marshall Spring, Charles Adams, and any participants whose names were not available at the time of this statement.

□ 1540

DOCTORS CAUCUS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MASSIE). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2013, the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. ROE) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. ROE of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, before starting this Special Order, I'd like to yield as much time as he may consume to my friend from Mississippi, STEVEN PALAZZO.

SEQUESTRATION EFFECTS

Mr. PALAZZO. I want to thank the good doctor from Tennessee for yielding me some time.

Mr. Speaker, in 2 weeks we face one of the most devastating cuts to our military that our country has ever seen, literally, a worst-case scenario for our men and women in uniform, all in just 2 weeks.

For a year and a half, several of my colleagues and I have been discussing with anyone who will listen the devastating impact of these automatic budget cuts, but still we have stalled and delayed till we are where no one in their right mind would want to be.

If these cuts are not stopped, not only will our military be hollowed out, but a number of other agencies will be severely impacted as well. Defense cuts are bad enough. Unfortunately, these cuts affect a lot more than just defense. These automatic cuts affect food inspections at the Department of Agriculture, FBI investigations, TSA screening at airports, and others. No agency is untouched.

One example in Mississippi alone is it is anticipated that these automatic budget cuts could cost as many as 845 jobs in the education sector alone. These are the people we task with educating our future generations and ensuring our country's success.

We're now hearing of furloughs across the government agencies. This would mean that families that are dependent on that paycheck to put food in their children's mouths and clothes on their backs will be forced to stay home as much as 1 day a week for up to 22 weeks.

This means millions of dollars in lost pay for dedicated public servants because Congress and this President cannot get their act together and do what is right for our country.

At this point, the House has passed two separate plans that were never even considered by the Senate. Ultimately, inaction by the President and Senate are allowing us to inch closer and closer to the disgusting reality of these cuts.

Even more disappointing than the Senate and the President's inaction is the ridiculous position of many that seem completely content to throw their hands up and say that we have done all we can do.

But I am perhaps the most disappointed in my colleagues that want these cuts to take place in the name of

spending cuts only. What good are spending cuts when you can't defend the Nation you are trying to save and destroying our economy in the process?

I am in favor of reducing our national debt and balancing our budget as much as anyone in this Congress, but I refuse to do it on the backs of our men and women in uniform and their families. I will not jeopardize their safety and security, yet some in this body want to do just that.

It is foolish—no, naive—to believe that allowing \$1 trillion in spending cuts to our national defense is responsible or sustainable. Many of my colleagues seem to have forgotten that these automatic cuts were intended to be the absolute worst thing we could do. It was designed to force bipartisan action on addressing our spending addiction in this Congress. It is the unintended consequences of an absolute failure by the supercommittee. So, instead of using a scalpel, we're using a meat-ax, and the impact of our failure to act will soon be all too apparent unless we avert this irresponsible action.

Despite repeated requests for over a year for more details on what effects these details will have, only now, 2 weeks before they are scheduled to take place, have we received any information from this administration.

The military services have let us know exactly what effect they think sequestration will have, and it is not a pretty sight. We are talking about one of the biggest drivers of small businesses, a major employer of our Nation's veterans, and a major economic driver in our economy. And some here are willing to see it slashed for no benefit whatsoever.

But civilians are not the only issue here. We are downsizing our force to deal with the cuts already in place—\$487 billion worth. We will have to cut further into our active duty if these cuts are not rolled back and replaced responsibly.

In my district, over 10,000 people walk through the gates of Ingalls Shipbuilding in Mississippi every day. If just one ship contract is cancelled as a result of sequestration, we are talking about thousands of people being immediately unemployed and layoffs at small businesses in over 49 States. These are some of the most patriotic and hardest working people I have ever met in my life. They have dedicated their lives to building the greatest naval ships the world has ever seen.

So this week, I spoke with our most senior military leaders, and they told us very directly, if you want our military to continue doing what it's doing today, then we can't give you another dollar.

There are similar stories across the Nation at plants building the largest planes to the smallest component parts. These are the stories of real people who go to work every day to make America a better place. These skills are not easily relearned. Once they go away they are gone forever, and I will

not stand by and allow inaction by my colleagues to kill American jobs.

I ask my colleagues: Is this what you want? Do you honestly believe this is for the best?

I beg anyone to explain to me how we're a better country if these cuts take place.

Mr. Speaker, I implore our leaders, the Senate, and the President to act. The future safety and security of our Nation is at stake.

Mr. ROE of Tennessee. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Speaker, we're going to take the next hour or so, the Doctors Caucus, Dr. GINGREY, myself, Dr. HARRIS, and we're going to speak about the Affordable Care Act, how we got where we are, the plan to save Medicare, and other health care issues.

I came to this Congress after a 31-year medical practice in Johnson City, Tennessee, just a doctor out each day in east Tennessee taking care of patients; and I made a decision that I didn't like the direction that the country was headed in health care, and I wanted to run for Congress to be here for that reason.

Well, it turned out that two Congresses ago we did have a debate on the health care issue. We have nine physicians in our health care caucus, and not one of us was consulted about that health care bill. Not one of us was brought in the loop and said, What do you think?

Well, we had an extensive debate, I will admit, in the House. This bill was passed on a pure party-line vote in November of 2009; and on Christmas Eve, the Senate passed a bill that had not been vetted, had not been heard in the House, was not debated in the House, a completely different bill. But because of the rules in the Senate, it never got heard here and was not debated fully in the Senate.

That bill was passed, it will soon be, 4 years ago—3 years ago, I mean. We thought that we'd have an opportunity after the Supreme Court looked at this—those challenges were brought to overturn this bill—and we're going to spend the next hour explaining why we don't think it was the right prescription for the health care of the citizens of this country.

I bring an extensive knowledge about a health care reform bill we did in our State of Tennessee. The biggest problem with the health care in this country is not the quality of care. Certainly, we can always do better, and physicians want to do better and have new techniques and new innovative medicines that we use. But the biggest problem with health care in America is the cost of that care. I got to see it every day in my practice, where going to the hospital could bankrupt families if they didn't have proper insurance, it was more expensive to come in, and so the number one driver was cost.

□ 1550

Number two, there's no question we had a group of people who worked

every single day of their lives and could not afford health insurance. It was not affordable for them. I would see it in my community where you would have, let's say, a carpenter who would work and during the winter they didn't get to work too much. They would work and maybe make \$20,000 or \$25,000 a year. Their wife may work at a local diner, maybe, and make \$20,000 or \$25,000. Together, where we live, they could make \$40,000 or \$50,000, maybe, in combined income and they could live okay. But they could not afford a thousand dollars a month for health insurance coverage. It was just out of their reach. And thirdly, we had a liability crisis in this country.

So what did the Affordable Care Act actually do? Well, it did increase access. But it increased access mainly, the best I can tell, through a massive expansion of a failed system called Medicaid. The Medicaid system right now in this country is broken and needs to be reformed. We did not reform it with this bill. So that's one thing it did.

Two, it did not touch liability. And we can go into that a little bit later. But the liability crisis still exists. My State of Tennessee has done something, as has the States of Texas and California. Other States have been successful in liability reform. And that has helped. But the President was here Tuesday night. We were all sitting in this Chamber. And amazingly, in the seat right below you here on the dais, the President said with a straight face that his bill, his Affordable Care Act, so-called ObamaCare, had lowered costs. I was astonished by that because it clearly has not done that at all. And let me just go through a few things.

I serve as the chairman of the Health, Employment, Labor and Pension Subcommittee in the Education and Workforce Committee. So if you have a private health insurance plan, that issue, that plan will come through my subcommittee. Let me just go over a couple of things that we found. We've had numerous hearings over the past 3 years about this. And this is recent data right here. President Obama's health care law will push about 7 million people out of their job-based insurance coverage, nearly twice the current estimate. That was just in the last week or two, that estimate, according to guess who? The Congressional Budget Office. Not PHIL ROE and not some Congressman. But the CBO believes that. So twice what they thought it would do.

Spending on health care is up. And we estimate it's as much as \$4,500 per family since this bill has come into play. That is not pushing the cost of health care down. So we see that. And one of the things that this bill did, I think which was good and bad, Mr. Speaker, is we allowed millions of young people under the age of 26 to be on their parents' health care plan. That sounded like a good idea. And if you have a mom and dad that paid for

that, it probably is a good idea if they pay for. I know one of the great points of my life were when my three children got out on their own and paid their own health insurance. That was the biggest raise I probably ever got, them getting out of college and paying their own health insurance.

But what happened was, the way the bill was written, actuaries can no longer charge the actual cost of that care. Let me give you an example. If a person my age is out buying an individual policy, it will cost about six times what a young person under 26 pays because actuarially I'm much more likely to need health insurance or need my health care plan. This bill only allows a 3-to-1. So that means a young person is going to pay two to three times, that person out there paying for that health insurance coverage, than they otherwise would have.

I've had a good friend of mine who's in the health insurance market at home, and for all three of my children I bought them individual plans, and I specifically remember exactly how much I wrote the check for. He said, Dr. ROE, I was having these plans for about \$100 a month, just a basic health care plan. Some less than that, depending on risk. Immediately after that bill passed, those rates tripled—they were \$280 a month. All of a sudden now, if you're an individual, that isn't affordable. Most people don't have an extra \$200 or \$300 right now in a tight economy to do that. So we've made it less affordable for a lot of young people. More accessible but less affordable.

I'd like to introduce my colleague and cochair of the Doctors Caucus and fellow OB/GYN physician from Georgia, my good friend, Dr. PHIL GINGREY.

Mr. GINGREY of Georgia. I thank the gentleman from Tennessee for yielding to me. He has already alluded to some of the things that I am going to say in my remarks but the most important thing that he stated: On Tuesday night, President Obama stood here in this Chamber and he gave his State of the Union address and said:

Patients enjoy stronger protections than ever before. Already, the Affordable Care Act is helping to slow the growth of health care costs.

Well, President Obama obviously didn't get the memo. We must not have read the same CBO report, Mr. Speaker. ObamaCare is not slowing the growth of health care costs. ObamaCare is driving up the costs, jeopardizing insurance coverage, and placing excessive burdens on small businesses, limiting their potential for growth.

In 2010, President Obama and the Democrats assured us that their health care law would lower costs, it would cover millions of uninsured Americans. Well, as Dr. ROE said, fast forward 3 years and we have seen nothing but broken promises and this enormous pricetag. Just last week, the CBO—the Congressional Budget Office—the unbiased scorekeeper that works for Con-

gress, reported that under ObamaCare—PPACA, health care costs will increase and 7 million Americans will lose their coverage. These are the facts, despite any State of the Union rhetoric.

Young Americans will also be severely impacted with an exorbitant rise in health insurance premiums due to a provision in ObamaCare. A lot of people are not aware of this, Mr. Speaker. This provision requires insurance companies to reduce their rates for seniors—a laudable goal. Premium costs for individuals under the age of 40, though, are going to significantly rise to even out that balance. By limiting these—we call them age ban discounts—that are called for in ObamaCare, a 3-to-1 ratio. So someone, let's say as an example, that is in their very early sixties and they're not eligible for Medicare at age 65, and they already possibly have multiple systems diseases, as we say in medical parlance, and are on many prescription drugs, expensive drugs—they're a much greater risk in regard to an insurance premium coverage of busting the ceiling on that every year. But under ObamaCare it says their premiums cannot be more than three times the premium of someone who is 28 years old, 10 feet tall, and bulletproof.

As a result, these are some of the problems that that creates within these exchanges. It will absolutely discourage the younger people from buying insurance. They'll pay the fine. They will not pay those higher premiums so that they stay within that 3-to-1 ratio. It will likely force young healthy individuals out of the insurance market. That's some of those 7 million we're talking about that are going to lose their insurance because of this.

Let me just give a real specific, and then I'll yield back to the gentleman so he can yield time to our other colleagues. For a 27-year-old earning \$33,500 a year, premiums are expected to jump from \$2,400 a year to almost \$3,200 a year. This is an outrageous increase in costs that young people can't afford. If they get a job in this current climate where we've had 7.6 percent or higher unemployment—the entire time that President Obama has been in office—they're not going to be able to afford these premiums. And they clearly are not going to pay for them. ObamaCare is negatively impacting the insurance market on two fronts: it forces rising premium costs on the young, and it increases the total uninsured population, as I stated earlier.

So at this point I'll yield back to the gentleman from Tennessee and I hope to remain with my colleagues for the remainder of the hour as we continue this colloquy.

Mr. ROE of Tennessee. I thank the gentleman.

I'd now like to yield time to my good friend, Dr. ANDY HARRIS from Maryland. ANDY is an OB anesthesiologist. And I say this to my good friend: I

spent a good bit of my adult life waiting for anesthesia to put my patients to sleep so I could operate. So I now yield to Dr. HARRIS.

□ 1600

Mr. HARRIS. I want to thank the gentleman from Tennessee and the gentleman from Georgia.

Following up on what the gentleman from Georgia said, Mr. Speaker, the President stood there and told America that health care costs have gone down. Now, I don't know if the President has been in a pharmacy lately or been to the doctor or bought a health care insurance policy lately, but the fact of the matter is the price has gone up—in some cases, dramatically—and it's going to go up more, especially for the young, who actually are the highest percent of the uninsured of any age group.

Look, it's just the facts. Folks, when they're 18, 19, 20, 25, they don't think anything is ever going to happen to them, so they don't buy a policy. And the policies now, I sat down with someone whose daughter was insured, and she had one of the HSA accounts, those health savings accounts, and \$2,500 goes into the health savings account. The first \$2,500 she would pay, and above that, the insurance would kick in. It was an affordable policy. It used to be less than \$100 a month. Imagine that, \$100 a month, guaranteeing that young person, God forbid they get into a bad accident, God forbid they develop a tumor at an early age, they have coverage for the really expensive things that you may need. That was affordable. I think most people would say \$80 a month is affordable.

That policy went up to \$110, and this time the renewal was 22 percent more than that. And it's going to get worse because the President now, in the Affordable Care Act—ObamaCare, as he prefers it to be called—actually reduces the amount that those health savings accounts can hold. It's now limited to \$2,500. You can't get your premium lower by saying, Okay, I'll take a little more risk, increase my health savings account. So those costs are going to skyrocket. And when they skyrocket, the gentleman from Georgia is absolutely correct, a young person is going to say, I'll pay the penalty.

So a young person who may have had insurance before because it was only \$80 a month—and it protected us from having to pay for those medical costs, God forbid that young person had a catastrophic illness or injury. That person is going to make what looks like a logical choice now and say, You know what; I'll pay the penalty and drop my insurance. It's going to have exactly the opposite effect of what was intended, and predictably so, when you force those premiums up.

Again, the President stood here and said that health care costs went down. I've got to tell you, I still have yet to run into someone at one of my town hall meetings that says, Good job,

ANDY; my health care costs or my insurance is going down. It's not, it's going up.

Let me address, because the gentleman from Tennessee touched on it, one of the problems that the President didn't consider—tort reform. You have three physicians here, two of whom spent their professional lives in the labor and delivery suite delivering babies, practicing obstetrics. I practiced obstetric anesthesiology, do those epidurals, those spinals, relieve women of their pain in childbirth.

Over my career, my generation—I finished my training in 1984, 28 years ago. At that time, to show you what the effect of not having tort reform is, the cesarean section rate for American women having a baby was 15 to 17 percent. One in six to one in seven women would have to have a cesarean section. Now, 28 years has passed. I don't know if the Speaker is aware, but the cesarean section rate is now 33, 35 percent, in some hospitals 40, up to as high as 70 percent in some hospitals. That's in one generation.

I will tell you, as a physician, not much has changed to patients in one generation. What has changed is that you don't find an obstetrician who's willing to take the risk of doing a delivery in a high-risk patient, a normal delivery, because of the medical malpractice exposure—not that they would commit it, but they would be charged with it, that a baby doesn't come out perfect, because that's the way the world is. Yet they would be charged, brought into a court of law, and lose millions of dollars in a settlement. So what do they do? They choose, when there is any question, to do a cesarean section, and who can blame them to do it.

Mr. Speaker, those women who are watching, they know exactly what I'm talking about, because they know if it was their daughter or granddaughter or a friend of theirs, they all know someone who has had a cesarean section. If the women who are in the audience now think back to one generation ago, it was much more rare. So what's happened? We haven't had tort reform.

But that's not all. By the way, the cost to the system is billions of dollars a year for those extra cesarean sections, billions of dollars direct cost to the health care system.

If that was all, we'd say maybe we can tolerate that, a doubling of the rate of cesarean sections, but that's not all. When those women go to see their obstetrician now, one generation ago when I started, when I had my first child, my wife went to an obstetrician. It was a solo practice. And that obstetrician apologized to my wife and said, You know what, I'm sorry, but every other weekend someone may have to cover my practice, so I may not be able to guarantee you that I'm there with you at your delivery.

Let's fast-forward one generation, 28 years. You can hardly find an obstetrician in solo practice anymore. They

simply cannot afford the medical malpractice premium. They may never have been sued in their life, and they may have to pay over \$100,000 a year just for the medical malpractice premium, never having been sued in their life. So what happens? They're all forced into large groups.

Now, that same conversation, if my daughter now goes in to see an obstetrician, that conversation would run like, You know, ma'am, you're going to have to see everyone in the group during your pregnancy, and we have seven or eight people in the group. So every time you're going to have to see someone else so that everyone gets to see you because we don't know who's going to be there the day you deliver.

Now, is that good care? Is that a good relationship that woman develops with her obstetrician when she doesn't even know who's going to be there to deliver her? In fact, she doesn't even know who might see her the next time she's in the office, one of the most important times in her life. We have completely changed the doctor-patient relationship because we don't have tort reform in this country.

If it was just the rate of cesarean section doubling or just the fact that you have to see seven or eight people and you don't really know who's going to deliver you on a given day, we might accept that, but it goes beyond that, Mr. Speaker. Because what's happened now, a good, highly trained obstetrician stops delivering babies in their forties or fifties because they have developed their practice, they have seen those patients. They just take care of their gynecology problems and they spend the last 20 years in their career not delivering a baby. Having delivered them for 20 years, gaining all that experience, the most experienced obstetricians don't deliver our babies anymore. And why don't they? Because if they stop delivering babies and promise their insurance company they will not deliver a baby, all of a sudden that \$100,000 premium becomes \$20,000. If you were in your forties and fifties and could afford to do that in your practice, you might say, You know what; it makes sense for me to stop doing this.

So when you add up all the things that have happened because the President, in his Affordable Care Act, refused to have real tort reform—and it's possible, because it happened in California. I mean, there are areas in the country that have it. But nationally, he refused to have it—and the gentleman from Georgia is very familiar with this because his bill deals with this. Because of that, we have a cesarean section rate that's twice as high as it ought to be, and some people will tell you it might be three or four times as high as it ought to be. We have women who never develop a close doctor-patient relationship with their obstetrician because you really can't. I mean, you're seeing a group of seven or eight purely because the malpractice premiums are now spread out. Frequently, somebody else even pays.

They may be part of a hospital group, for instance.

Finally, our most experienced physicians for women in a time—you know, you talk about taking care of children. You've got to start right at the beginning. You've got to have the most experienced person there. See, I've been at thousands of deliveries.

□ 1610

Ninety-nine percent of the time they go all right. But when they don't go all right, you want the most experienced person there. And, Mr. Speaker, our lack of tort reform means we no longer have it. We have entirely changed the way we deliver obstetric care. So if you even said, look, we're not even going to worry about costs, let's not talk about costs, let's talk about access to experienced, personalized care for our women having babies, it's virtually gone because the President and our counterparts across the Capitol in the Senate refuse to take up the issue of tort reform and restore some commonsense, good medical care to Americans.

Obstetrics is an example. We could go into neurosurgery and many other examples, and I'll leave it with that. We have so many opportunities to reduce the costs and improve the quality and access to medical care, and it was lacking in the State of the Union Address.

Mr. ROE of Tennessee. I thank the gentleman for his comments. I felt a little *deja vu* there, Dr. HARRIS, after walking out of the delivery room after about 5,000 deliveries for some of the very reasons that Dr. HARRIS brought up. I'd now like to yield to my friend from Georgia, Dr. GINGREY.

Mr. GINGREY of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Tennessee is generous with his time. I did want to follow on to what the gentleman doctor from Maryland is just talking about in regard to tort reform. Yes, he covered that very, very clearly and pretty completely.

But there are other things in this law, the so-called Affordable Care Act—well, Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act. And, yes, I think President Obama proudly likes to have it called *ObamaCare*. Maybe he hopes that one day that will be his legacy. There are provisions that, particularly in these exchanges that are being set up in all 50 States, the States that are doing it, the territories and the District of Columbia, that basically say what best practices are for the different physician specialties, including the specialty of obstetrics and gynecology which Dr. ROE and I practiced many years. But in these descriptions of what's the best practice for a general surgeon or an internist or a pediatrician, in some cases, they're not a carbon copy of what our specialty societies recommend. The American College of Obstetricians and Gynecologists, as an example, does a wonderful job of making sure that each one of their members gets a monthly bulletin and current updates on what the

best practices are for our specialty. It's based on science by the best and brightest. And, yet, this law may ask us to do something that goes against that.

I have introduced a bill, Mr. Speaker, to protect our physicians. If they are following the guidelines of their specialty, or, on the other hand, if they're following the guidelines of the government that some government bureaucrat says is the best standard of care, if they're doing that and they have a bad outcome, this provider shield would protect those physicians from liability. It's something that's desperately needed because of this law.

There is another bill that I have introduced called the SCOPE Act. SCOPE is an acronym for the Safeguarding Care of Patients Everywhere. What would prevent the Secretary, Ms. Sebelius, or whomever, from saying what qualifies a physician to be on a provider group in one of these exchanges? Is it what she says or what their specialty society says?

So, again, these are things that we're working on very hard to correct, I think, a very bad situation. We members of the Doctors Caucus, we on this side of the aisle will continue to fight for that. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. ROE of Tennessee. I thank the gentleman for yielding. Just to carry on with what Dr. GINGREY and Dr. HARRIS have brought up, let me share with you about affordability. When Dr. HARRIS was talking about young people, it's obvious that the President—I don't know who writes the check for health insurance in his home, but he hasn't looked at the check, whoever is writing it, if he hasn't figured out that costs have gone up.

Dr. HARRIS, I may be a little more than a generation past where you are, but when I left, when I quit operating and doing obstetrics, I had an 8 percent primary c-section rate. You've seen that. And why did that happen? When I came back from the Army to Memphis, I trained at the University of Tennessee in Memphis. I had 2 years of training, and then I had to go in the military for 2 years and came back and finished my training. All the malpractice carriers left the State of Tennessee. In 1975, they all left. So the doctors and the Tennessee Medical Association set up an organization called the State Volunteer Mutual Insurance Company. This insurance company was a mutual company, so money that we didn't pay in came back to us at the end of a year. It wasn't owned by some stock-traded company. Strictly, it was just to give us malpractice liability insurance coverage, which I've kept until this day.

In the entire time that that company has been in existence, over half the malpractice premium dollars have not gone to injured people. They've gone to lawyers, both plaintiff and defense lawyers. What a terrible system that is; to try to compensate someone who has actually been injured, we have no way to

do it. Less than 40 cents on the dollar that we paid in for 35 years has actually gone to people who have been hurt. That's a terrible system. We need a better system.

As Dr. HARRIS pointed out, when I started my practice, my malpractice premiums were \$3,000 a year. Five years ago, when I left, a young physician who replaced me was paying \$7,400. And guess what? The patients didn't get better quality and better access. They just got higher costs. So that's why we need to address that issue. I think you're spot on, Dr. HARRIS. I yield to the gentleman from Maryland.

Mr. HARRIS. I thank the gentleman from Tennessee for yielding. To follow up on his point, Mr. Speaker, I don't know if Americans realize, the gentleman is absolutely right. If you have a case litigated, a birth injury claim, and it goes to a jury and there's an award, let's say, of \$6 million—not an unusual award—40 percent of that award, \$2.4 million plus expenses, goes just to the attorney. Is that fair? You have an injured baby—and we're not going to decide what the injury is. But is it fair that when the court renders a decision that half the money doesn't go to take care of that baby? It doesn't seem fair.

I want to briefly go back to some of the issues in the Affordable Care Act. One that really struck me is the medical device tax. Now, I know the President likes taxes. There are 21 in the Affordable Care Act. He stood up there 2 days ago and talked about taxes, increasing taxes as a solution to our problems. But let me tell you what the problem with that medical device tax is. And I'm going to hearken back to my experience, again, over 28 years. I remember training in the early eighties. Some of the people watching, Mr. Speaker, might know if they had a kidney stone 30 years ago and had to have an operation for that kidney stone just how serious that was. And I remember, I did anesthesia for many of them. There were big incisions on your back, on your side, a week in the hospital, and you could get infections from it. It was a terrible experience if you needed an operation to remove a kidney stone.

So 2 years ago, I had the opportunity to work in one of the urology operating rooms. It was a kidney stone removal. And here I'm going, wow, I haven't seen one in a while. I'm going to give the anesthesia for it, I'm going to prepare for a big operation. The surgeon said, no, no, no, no. We're doing this with a laser. I said, a laser? That kidney stone is deep inside. It's inside your body. He said, no, you've got to see what we got.

They brought a laser machine in, and I apologize I didn't bring a sample of these catheters. It's a catheter, a wire that's about a yard long, and it's fiber optic. Oh, my gosh, it's thinner than the lead in a pencil, and it's flexible. They thread this up—and I won't go

through the exact anatomy—they thread it up to where that kidney stone is. They fire a laser through this, and they break the kidney stone up into tiny little pieces, or evaporate it, and it just comes out. There's no incision. These patients go home the same day.

□ 1620

Why? Because of medical innovation, because some company took a risk to develop that laser product. I tell you, it's not cheap. I'll also tell you it's a whole lot cheaper than several days in the hospital.

The President stood there and said, We don't want to pay by the hospital day; we want to pay by the quality. Let me tell you something: if I have a kidney stone, my hand is going up for that newest method because it's the quality method. What does the Affordable Care Act do? It taxes it. If that person had the old operation, there's no taxes involved; but if they have that new device, there's a tax on it.

I learned in the legislatures that there's a saying that if you want to discourage something, tax it. We have these arguments over tobacco. You want to discourage tobacco? Let's tax it. Most States have taxed it, the Federal Government taxed it, and sure enough we have less. I don't understand. Is that the same thinking we have about innovative medical devices? Are they all of the sudden not a good idea? That's exactly what this bill does, it taxes them.

One of two things is going to happen: either that tax is going to be passed on—because that's what businesses do: when you tax businesses, they pass them on—or we won't innovate as much. That would be a disaster because the key to improving our health care quality, going into the future, especially with American ingenuity and innovation and expertise, is innovating. We're taxing innovation. It makes no sense, Mr. Speaker.

I hope we move a bill through this Chamber to remove that taxation. It's a very bad idea for the quality of health care in the United States because some of these new products, whether it's for treating diabetes or whether it's for treating kidney stones, are amazing new technology.

Mr. ROE of Tennessee. I think we all could stand here for hours talking about—I certainly could—the innovative new devices that I've used through laparoscopy that have helped patients shorten their length of stay, shorten their pain. I hope we don't go into the Middle Ages of health care in technology because we could spend literally hours talking about what we've seen. We're the place in the world that people come for this.

Before I go back to costs, the estimates are that this device tax will cost 43,000 jobs. The fear is that we'll start producing these offshore and lose jobs in this country. That makes no sense whatsoever. Actually, it was Dr. Milton Friedman who said:

If you want more of something, subsidize it; if you want less, tax it.

That's a fairly simple concept.

Back to the initial problem we have in health care, which is cost. Let me just go over a couple of things, and not just behavioral things. In a recent Gallup survey, the top concern cited by small business owners was rising health care costs. Remember, the President stood right here—and I listened to the debate and so did Dr. GINGREY—for hours on end about how this was going to lower the average person's health care insurance premium by \$2,500 a year. Remember that? You remember that, Dr. GINGREY. I heard it over and over right in this well and right at this dais. Guess what? Exactly the opposite happened, which is exactly what we predicted would happen. It did not bend the cost curve down, and it's making it less successful and affordable for people.

Anyway, on with this Gallup survey. So three-fourths, 74 percent, of respondents reported that rising health care costs were hurting their businesses; and 61 percent of small business owners, who are not hiring, point to worries about potential costs of health care as a reason for why they're not hiring. That ought to be a clear signal to everyone here that we need to deal with costs.

What I should have stated at the outset of this hour is what we do not need to do. Health care decisions should be made between physicians, the family, and that patient. That's who should be making them. It should not be insurance companies and certainly not some bureaucrat here in Washington or some policy wonk up here that thinks they know what's best, as Dr. HARRIS just pointed out what is best for that patient. He saw and he knows what's best because that's what he's done for the last 30 years.

I think our cost issue is clearly what we're not dealing with with this care. Are there good things in this bill? Sure. There are things in here that I like in the Affordable Health Care Act, and we can talk about that.

Dr. GINGREY, I would like to yield to you at this point.

Mr. GINGREY of Georgia. Again, I thank the gentleman from Tennessee for yielding because I wanted to follow on in this line of discussion with regard to costs.

The way doctors were paid by Medicare in 1965 was, to my understanding—I think I'm correct on this—just like private insurance: an 80/20 indemnity kind of coverage, and the cost was accelerating.

Then in 1998, I believe, the Balanced Budget Act of 1997 put in this formula to control Medicare spending, particularly the spending that goes to the health care providers, which by the way is only about 12 percent of total Medicare spending.

In any regard, that seemed to be the greatest concern, controlling how much the doctors were getting paid. So

they put in this formula that's called SGR, sustainable growth rate, based on some calculus. But it was flawed. It was flawed badly. And for the last, I would say, 10 years, when you calculate that formula for the expenditures for doctor fees for the previous year, the formula would call for a cut of 1 percent, 2 percent, 4 percent. Over those 10 years, it's up to 26.5 percent. Well, thank goodness Congress, we Members of Congress on both sides of the aisle, have the ability to mitigate that; and we have done that because we know the formula is flawed and it needs to be repealed and replaced. Yet we have not been able to do that.

I'll tell you this, though: in this House of Representatives, in this 113th Congress, with Republican control under Speaker BOEHNER and Leader CANTOR and committee chairmen like FRED UPTON in Energy and Commerce and DAVE CAMP on Ways and Means, we are going to fix that flawed formula once and for all. We're not going to keep putting Band-Aids on it, mitigating a little bit at a time, and kicking the can down the road. That is our pledge to the American people.

I hope our colleagues in the other Chamber, controlled by the Democratic Party, will go along with us on this because what we realize is that all of the doctors in the House and in the Senate, they understand that if you enact those cuts that will come due again at the end of this year, almost a 30 percent cut in what you reimburse for Medicare providers, then there will be no doctors. People will have a Medicare card, but they will not be able to find a physician to take care of them.

This ObamaCare bill did nothing except, in fact, enact a provision, which I know my colleague from Tennessee wants to talk about, that makes it worse, that doubles down on it. We need to repeal SGR and figure out a better way to reimburse, to pay physicians based on quality of care, rather than volume. I think that's a good idea. But there's a provision in ObamaCare that could trump all of that and make all of our efforts in that direction go for naught.

So I want to end here so the gentleman from Tennessee can explain what I'm talking about because he has the repeal bill for that.

Mr. ROE of Tennessee. I thank the gentleman.

I do want to say to the American people that 47 million people, including Dr. GINGREY and I, are on Medicare.

We made a solemn promise to our seniors in 1965. When that program came out, it was a \$3 billion program. Why was it put in place? Because many people retired from their business at that point in time, they no longer worked, and they had no access to care. Again, lack of access to affordable health insurance.

It was a \$3 billion program. There was no Congressional Budget Office at that time, but the estimators here in Washington said we believe in 25 years

this will be a \$12 billion program and maybe even balloon to \$15 billion. The actual number in 1990 was \$110 billion. Today, in 2013, it's going to be over \$550 billion.

Now, we've made a solemn promise to people who paid premiums—2.9 percent of their income, basically. The employer pays 1.45, and they pay 1.45. Of all the income you make, all of your paycheck goes to that.

□ 1630

One of the things that we've discovered and found out is that we pay in, as I have—as the average person does—about \$117,000 or \$118,000 over a lifetime, a family does, but they get out over \$300,000 in services. So we know we can't pay \$100,000 in and get three times that much service out. What are the reasons? It's the same issue with Social Security. We have fewer and fewer people paying in and people living longer and longer and longer. By the way, each day in this country, over 10,000 baby boomers hit age 65. That's 3.5 million people a year who are getting to be about 65 years of age.

You have to laugh at the lingo up here, when "savings" means that you take money out of something and when an "investment" means you spend it into something. So you have to learn the language up here to understand what people are talking about.

About \$700 billion was taken out of the Medicare program—savings—and we've got 3.5 million more people being added every year. Well, you do the math. How they were going to control this cost was with a little plan called the Independent Payment Advisory Board. What that is is a board of 15 unelected bureaucrats who are appointed by the President and confirmed by the Senate. Here is a little tricky part of the legislation. The President is supposed to be appointing these people this year. If they are not appointed to that board, one person—one—the Director of HHS, Kathleen Sebelius, has the power to enact all this. We have given that bureaucratic power to one person if those members and that board are not confirmed. Most people don't know that.

I've heard all the pros about how wonderful this is. I go back to my scholarly journals, and I want to refer people to the New England Journal of Medicine. An attorney in the New England Journal of Medicine, Timothy Stoltzfus, wrote an article in June of 2011, not pro or con, but just about the Independent Payment Advisory Board.

In addition, my friend Dr. GINGREY just said—and he is absolutely correct—that Congress changed this payment to doctors, the so-called SGR—the sustainable growth rate—so that patients would maintain their access to their doctors. We've had a retrospective look at the last 25 years. Let's say we fix SGR, like we're talking about, so that patients maintain their access. In a retrospective look in his report, the CMS actuary questioned—this is

not me saying this—whether this goal is achievable to maintain these cuts, noting that the IPAB-targeted growth rates would have been met in only 4 of the last 25 years and would have approximated the sustainable growth rate, meaning that a cut would happen. We have almost no power to change this.

Now, here is what I found interesting. In the bill, it's absolutely correct that you can't ration care, that you can't do any of those things. That's maybe true, but if patients don't have access to their doctors, you, in effect, have rationed care. It's that simple.

This is what Peter Orszag said, the former Office of Management and Budget Director here in the Obama White House:

The IPAB is the single biggest yielding of power to an independent entity since the creation of the Federal Reserve.

That is an astonishing statement when you hear it. That's one of the reasons I'm so passionate about maintaining the decision-making power with patients and with their families and their doctors and not with some bureaucratic board up here and also, certainly, not with the insurance companies. I agree with that.

Another comment that I've seen made:

The Independent Payment Advisory Board puts important health care payment and policy decisions in the hands of an independent body that has far too little accountability.

That's one of the things. You may like it or not, but we in Congress have been able to change these things, and it would require 60 votes in the Senate to do it. Quite frankly, with my good friends on the other side of the building here, you couldn't get 60 Senators hardly to agree whether the Sun came up in the east, so the benchmark is very, very high.

Mr. Speaker, how much time do I have remaining?

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MULLIN). The gentleman has 8 minutes remaining.

Mr. ROE of Tennessee. I want to finish by spending the last little bit of time on Medicare. It is such an important part of our health care system. I want to strengthen this program—and I certainly know the folks on my side of the aisle and, I think, on the other side of the aisle want to—for future generations. We've made a promise to our citizens in this country that when they are at retirement age they'll have at least an affordable health insurance product available to them.

Let me tell you, the funny thing I found out about myself when I turned 65 was, the day before, I had a health insurance plan. It had a prescription drug benefit plan; it had a hospitalization part; it had a part that paid for my physician services. The day I turned 65, I got a part A, a part B, a part C, and a part D I could have. Well, nothing happened except I got 1 day older. Why, when a person turns 65,

wouldn't you just have a health insurance plan that offered you those various options in your plan? You should be allowed to pick what's in your best interest and need.

Remember, in the Affordable Care Act, the Federal Government now decides what's an essential benefits package. You don't make that decision with your family and your doctor. A Federal bureaucrat makes that decision—what you must buy, a good or a service that you must purchase.

Some of the facts I've mentioned already about Medicare, and one of the things that we have to do, I think, in Medicare—and I know my colleagues will confirm this—is that, currently, one in 10 physicians is not accepting new Medicare patients. In some areas, it may be as many as three in 10 primary care or as many as half won't. We have a huge shortage of primary care physicians in this country. We know that the hospital insurance trust fund is insolvent. It may run out of money as soon as 2016.

I yield to my colleague, Dr. HARRIS.

Mr. HARRIS. I thank the gentleman from Tennessee for yielding.

The gentleman is absolutely correct. We made a promise to our seniors. To the people who've worked all their lives, we made a promise that we're going to take care of you, but we have to be honest with how long we can do that. What are we going to do for my children? for people who are in their twenties or thirties? How are we going to preserve that system and preserve their ability to choose their physicians and allow their physicians to choose what's best for them? Because that's really what's critical, that we preserve that in the system.

The gentleman is right. For the seniors who are watching this afternoon, they know that, in many parts of this country, if their primary care providers, their internists, their family doctors retire or move to other States, it's going to be hard to find someone, not because doctors don't want to take care of Medicare patients. We all do—we've taken care of thousands of them in our lives, in our professional careers—but the fact of the matter is that, every year, the government threatens to cut the reimbursement, the payment for services, by 25 percent, and it hasn't had an increase for inflation in 10 years.

This kind of uncertainty means that we may end up looking like the other program the Federal Government runs, Medicaid, where the statistics are dire and where fewer than one-half of specialists can afford to see a Medicaid patient because the government simply has decided we're just not going to pay. It's where fewer than half of the primary care providers don't see Medicaid patients because the government has said we just can't pay, and we're not going to. It's where hospitals now are wondering how they're going to staff and how they're going to keep up with the best medical equipment and the

best medical delivery because they're afraid the government is not going to pay. Who can blame them? Every year, the government threatens to cut the pay to our seniors' doctors 25 percent, and, every year, the government threatens to cut the pay to our hospitals that are taking care of our seniors. Every year, this goes on. It has to stop.

I hope the Speaker and the gentleman from Tennessee will agree that we have to address this seriously, honestly, with a view to two things: preserving the benefit for people who are in retirement and keeping the system going for every American. An American born today, February 14—a child born today—should have a system that he knows is going to be there, not bankrupt, but a system that's there when he reaches those golden years, and we can do it if we all work together.

I was hoping I'd hear more from the President. I didn't. The President is still not willing to come and talk about preserving Medicare, because, Mr. Speaker, you know that the trustees have said it goes bankrupt in 10 years. The current system will not be there for everyone retiring. The 10,000 people retiring today, February 14, enter Medicare. That system will not be there in 10 years. It will be bankrupt. So the current system doesn't even protect our current seniors, much less a baby born today.

□ 1640

We have to deal with it. Mr. Speaker, I urge the President to step up to the plate, be serious. Our colleagues on the other side of the Capitol, step up to the plate. This program is too important to let go bankrupt within 10 years.

Mr. ROE of Tennessee. I thank the gentleman. He is absolutely spot on. One of the reasons that he ran for Congress and I ran for Congress is to preserve this great program for our seniors out there, and I am absolutely committed to do it.

Let me give a couple of facts before we end up. The actuary of the Medicare program—this is not me, this is the Medicare actuary—said that congressional action will be required to ensure that our seniors have continued access to care. In May 2012, he said it is reasonable to expect that Congress would find it necessary to legislatively override or otherwise modify the reductions in the future to ensure that Medicare beneficiaries continue to have access to Medicare services.

This is not some right-wing Republican, this is the Medicare actuary, and we're not even talking about it. We have heard nothing from the President about how we preserve this great program other than we just keep doing what we're doing. That's not an honest, fair assessment of where we stand today. The sooner we deal with it, the more likely we are to come to a less painful solution to this.

I do want to finish by saying that I appreciate the hour you've shown us,

Mr. Speaker. We will continue this very, very important discussion on Medicare in the future, and I yield back the balance of my time.

PROGRESSIVE CAUCUS MESSAGE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2013, the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. ELLISON) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Mr. ELLISON. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, my name is Congressman KEITH ELLISON, and I would like to open up by talking about the progressive message. The progressive message is the message articulated by the Progressive Caucus, and the Progressive Caucus is that organization within this body, within this Congress, that is here to unapologetically say that all Americans should have the right to go to the doctor and get basic health care in this richest country in the history of the world. All Americans should have civil and equal rights and be treated fairly based on whatever color, whatever their sexual preference might be, whatever nation they might be from.

We're the ones who say let's have comprehensive immigration reform with a path towards citizenship, and let's absolutely pass the DREAM Act. The Progressive Caucus is that caucus that boldly and unapologetically says Social Security, Medicare, and Medicaid are great programs; and we need to protect them not only for today's seniors but for tomorrow's seniors, too.

I would like to start out, Mr. Speaker, by talking a little bit, as I talk about the progressive message, starting out with just a few observations about the State of the Union speech. I personally thought the State of the Union speech was awesome. I thought President Obama was great, and I was really proud of President Obama as he delivered that State of the Union speech in this very Chamber.

This Chamber was full of dignitaries from all over the world—ambassadors, Senators, the United States Supreme Court. And in front of them, in front of the American people, President Obama specifically identified 24 Americans who joined Members of Congress as their guests. And these folks who President Obama identified were victims of gun violence. I was so proud to see President Obama specifically give these folks encouragement to keep on speaking out, continue to tell their story so that we can arrive at a place where the U.S. Congress will be on their side to bring forth sensible, sane gun violence prevention.

You know, President Obama's wife, our First Lady, Michelle Obama, had seated next to her her own guest, parents of young Hadiya Pendleton whose life was taken away from her. She was shot down in Chicago. But only a few weeks before, she had been performing for her country at the President's inauguration.

And so whether it was ordinary Members of Congress who just brought different people, or it was the President or the First Lady, the people who can speak most eloquently about the need for sane, sensible gun violence reform were here, Mr. Speaker. They were here and were present in this gallery so they could be a witness and a presence on the need.

And what did President Obama say? He said give us a vote. He said give us a vote. Now, I say to the Republican House majority: Why are you afraid of a vote? Let's have a vote. Let's count who is for sane, sensible gun violence prevention and who is not; who is for closing loopholes that allow people to escape background checks; and who's for filling up background checks and making sure that anybody who gets a firearm, an instrument that is dangerous by any account, at least we know that this person is sane and legally qualified to have one. Let's see. Let's have a vote. I don't think that anyone should be afraid of the vote, because if you are proud to say, no, we don't want any background checks, then stand up and say that. Be on Mr. LaPierre's side of the NRA. But if you believe we need to make sure that guns stay out of the wrong hands, that's a vote that the American people should have, and I was so proud that the President made that clear.

I personally think that the President was right in saying give us a vote when it comes to things like high-capacity magazines. You know, these high-capacity magazines, designed for the military, don't have any place on our streets. And the people who want to stand up and defend them, let them defend them. Let them defend them right here on the floor if they have the audacity to do so. And let us talk about millions of Americans, over the course of years, who have been tragically injured and hurt with bad gun policy.

Let us talk about the victims in Aurora who were shot by somebody with a high-capacity clip. Let us talk about people who were victims in Milwaukee. Let us give the message about the folks who were shot down in Tucson by somebody with a high-capacity clip.

The fact is that the President said give us a vote, and I agree 100 percent. We need a vote on these sane, sensible gun reforms.

I'm going to leave this topic now, Mr. Speaker; but I do want to just make mention of my own guest. My own guest was a young man named Sami Rahamin. Sami, 17 years old, a brilliant young man, but really just a regular teenager, he happened to be on a bus going to Madison, Wisconsin, when he saw a message come across his phone which said there was a shooting in what he knew was his neighborhood.

He texted back to his father and said: Dad, be careful because there's supposedly a shooting in the neighborhood. But the text never came back because one of the victims of that shooting was Sami's dad.

Ruvin Rahamin was an immigrant to the United States. He came to the United States in search of the American Dream, but he died the American nightmare because a person who is mentally unsound, mentally unstable, easy access to the most dangerous weapons came to a work site and shot down five people, including Ruvin who was an awesome guy, a wonderful constituent of mine. He's missed. But because of his son carrying on the legacy, he will never be forgotten because Sami is telling the story about how much we need sane, sensible gun prevention measures.

So enough about the gun issue. The State of the Union speech was awesome for another reason, which I definitely want to make note of, and that is the fact that he went right to the very heart of what I believe is the defining issue of our time, and that is income and wealth equality in our country. Our country, this is the land of opportunity. And we know that some people are rich and some people are middle class and some people are poor. We believe we're a country that can provide a ladder up for anybody who wants to work hard. And for those people who are too sick to work or too aged to work or too young to work, we believe in the social safety net to take care of them.

□ 1650

We believe in income and economic mobility in America. And yet the President put his finger right on it when he talked about how we've seen people making \$14,000 a year working full time; but because they are paid so little, they are still in poverty.

I was so proud the President made this point. It's a point that needs to be made. There are people working in restaurants, people who are cleaning up, people in our hospitals, people who are doing the really tough jobs. I'm talking about the jobs where you've got to take a shower after you get off work, not take a shower going to work, you've got to take one when you're done with your day's work because you've been working hard, you've been building things, you've been maybe cleaning up things, you've been lifting people, you've been doing the hard work. And many of these folks are scraping by on really low wages. The President clearly has a heart for these folks and wants to see them come up. And I was glad the President was able to do that.

Mr. Speaker, you should know that over the past 30 years income for the average American has stayed flat, while the richest 1 percent of Americans have seen their income more than triple. This has not happened by accident. It has been a set of policies put in place through the Tax Code, through trade policy, through the loss of manufacturing, and a number of things.

There's been a number of policies that have gotten us to this place, but there's been one philosophy, and the

philosophy is simply this: if we give a lot of money to the richest Americans, maybe they will take their excess wealth and put that into plant and equipment and hire people.

This is known as supply-side economics. We don't want to have any regulations on them. They can do what they want with the water, they can do what they want with the meat, they can do what they want with the air. No regulations or against regulations. We don't want to tax them. They don't have to pay for our roads, our bridges, our schools; they don't have to do anything like that. They get to keep all this money. And it's all under the assumption that they will take this money that they amass and put it into plant and equipment and hire people.

Well, this philosophy has proven to have failed; this philosophy has caused income inequality in America. And the President correctly said that we have got to do something to create more economic viability for the poor and middle class in America. I was so happy to see him do it.

Mr. Speaker, you should know, the President didn't say this, but it's absolutely true, that the wealth of the richest 1 percent is over 225 times larger than the average household, higher than it has ever been, higher than it has ever been.

Mr. Speaker, we look back at the Gilded Age and we think, oh, boy, wasn't income inequality bad way back then. Well, it's worse now. We've got to do something about it, and our President knows that. I am very pleased to see that. And the President, while he gave a message of economic hope and understanding to the working and middle classes of our country, the politician who gave the alternative, Mr. MARCO RUBIO, when he wasn't getting glasses of water in the middle of his speech, he just really articulated the same old thing: money for the rich, less for everybody else.

Mr. Speaker, we cannot continue to give tax breaks to millionaires and billionaires while cutting investments that the middle class relies on, while cutting programs that help local governments keep on police, keep on teachers, keep on people who fix our roads and firefighters. We cannot cut the Federal workforce, as is about to happen—I'll talk about sequester in a little while—and we cannot make these economic decisions and hope to have a strong economy.

We've got to invest in our roads, our bridges, our grids, our electrical power grids in transit to move people around quickly. We've got to make these investments. We've got to invest in research; we've got to invest in our schools. This is what's going to make America a strong country. This is what's going to put more people to work. More people paying taxes means we're going to have more taxes, and that will help us lower the deficit.

The Republicans have it all wrong. They think that by slashing the Fed-

eral Government, then that's going to make our economy better. All it's going to do is create a situation where you've got more people out of work, fewer people paying taxes, fewer people putting in tax revenue, and then the deficit will go up.

I'm going to talk about the sequester in a moment; but I just want to say, as I highlight a few things about the State of the Union speech, how important I thought the President's remarks were.

Let me turn for a moment—another thing about the State of the Union speech—Mr. Speaker, on the issue of Social Security, Medicare and Medicaid. First of all, I want to encourage people to not refer to these programs as entitlements. I don't even like doing it myself right now.

What they really are is social insurance. You know how insurance works. You pay a premium and then when you need it, you can use it. Well, you get 6 percent taken out of your paycheck every week or two weeks or a month or however often you get paid. You're paying into Social Security, you're paying into Medicare, you're paying into Medicaid.

The bottom line is these social insurance programs are not some giveaway; they're not welfare. They are important social insurance programs to provide income security for people when they are aged, when they are too ill to work and disabled, or when their parents die and they need support. That's what these programs are about.

I'm glad that we are here to talk about how we preserve these programs. The President mentioned it. He said he wanted to strengthen Social Security, Medicare, and Medicaid for generations to come. I quite agree with this. He said:

But any reform should come through protecting these programs, not just cutting these programs to finance tax cuts for the wealthy.

I believe that we should not have any benefit cuts to these programs. We don't need to. There's plenty of places to cut, plenty of loopholes to close, and we can get money elsewhere. But I'm glad the President made mention of the program.

I also want to mention, Mr. Speaker, that one of the places we can find savings for social insurance programs is we need to allow Medicare part D to negotiate lower drug prices. Medicare part D is a prescription drug benefit that the Republicans negotiated and passed in 2003. This particular program put into law that there could be no negotiation of drug prices. This has made the program more expensive. About \$158 billion would be attainable as savings if we were allowed negotiation.

The President also said we're going to get out of Afghanistan. I think this is great. The President announced that we would bring 34,000 troops home from Afghanistan by this time next year. That's fantastic. My own son is a member of the U.S. Military. I'm very proud of that. I actually don't want to see

him deployed to Afghanistan. I want to see him in a place where he can defend this Nation, as he wants to do. I think that it's time for us to go home.

The President didn't say we're going to abandon Afghanistan. We will be there diplomatically, we will be there training their soldiers, but sovereignty means that you protect yourself. It's time for the Afghan people who want to be sovereign to take responsibility for their own security.

I want to turn now to the subject of immigration. I think right now, and I think the President made clear, that we may be at a point, and I pray that we are, where comprehensive immigration reform is within the reach of Congress to pass.

I'm proud to be joined by my good friend Congressman JARED POLIS of Colorado. This is an important issue to you, Congressman, and I want to yield to you to share your thoughts on immigration.

Mr. POLIS. I thank the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. Speaker, it's common sense to most Americans. We have upwards of 10, 12, 14 million people here illegally in this country. Many of them are members of our communities, many of their kids are Americans, go to school with their fellow Americans or on the football team or cheerleaders, are productive in every way. And yet every day our government through its current policies tears families apart; absolute heartbreaking tragedies where a mother is torn from her American daughter, placed in detention, frequently kicked out of this country at a cost to taxpayers of tens of thousands of dollars, all over a broken taillight.

□ 1700

Now it's important to educate people about the difference. We do have a group of people that are in detention that are called criminal aliens. These are people who are here illegally and committed crimes. It could be robbery. Maybe they're in a gang or dealing drugs. There's no disagreement among liberals and conservatives and people of all ilks that, of course, there needs to be detentions where appropriate and where there are criminal penalties in place and, of course, there should be expulsions from the country in that regard. In fact, many of us argue that by sweeping up many of the people whose only violation is a civil violation, who otherwise have been following our laws, in that sweep we are actually limiting our enforcement ability to go after real criminals who are causing harm in our community.

That happens in two ways. One, through the limited law enforcement resources. When we divert those resources to taking mothers away from daughters, fathers away from sons who are productive members of society, when we divert the resources to that, it means they're going off of some other beat. It means they're going off of keeping our streets safe. It means

they're going away from looking at white collar crime and other areas that need to be investigated in these fiscally restrained times with limited budgets.

The second reason is it builds an atmosphere of distrust in our immigrant communities. How much unreported crime occurs because, in many cases, the victims of those crimes could be spouses that are abused, it could be people that are robbed or ripped off by unscrupulous scam artists and are frequently afraid to report that crime because they are afraid that the very same agency that they're supposed to trust to report that crime to could in fact be in league with another government agency that wants to deport them. And that's the problem with 287(g) and some of the other information-sharing protocols.

For community policing to work, it's critical to have the trust and support of the community. And by the way, if these criminals go unprosecuted in our community and unpenalized for taking advantage of somebody, and that is not being reported, their next victim very well could be an American. Their next victim very well could be your family. It could be my family. And that's why we all have an interest in community policing, in law enforcement, as well as public health, to make sure that people are inoculated and treated early for diseases, regardless of their status.

Now the solution is not to have this large population here illegally. Whenever we're talking about this enforcement, it's tough. There's no right answer. The right answer is comprehensive immigration reform. Let's find a way where the people that we need here to have critical jobs in our economy, that have families, that are in our community, that have kids that are American and going to school and doing well every day, have a way and paperwork to show that they can be here.

Now that doesn't mean in comprehensive immigration reform that anybody gets citizenship. And I want to be clear about this, because frequently this false specter of somehow granting citizenship to 11 million people is raised. Comprehensive immigration reform in any version doesn't give citizenship to anybody. Not one person, not a thousand people, not a million people. Zero people. In fact, under all the versions that are being talked about of comprehensive immigration reform, anybody who's here illegally would have to get right with the law and would go to the back of the line with regard to applying for citizenship some day, if they're eligible. To be eligible, they'll have to follow the laws of our country for many years. They'll have to learn English. They'll have to take a test.

Yes, some day it's possible that some immigrants will become citizens. It's also possible and likely that many will choose never to. They might work here for a number of years and return to an-

other country. And that's fine. But it's critical that there is at least the ability to get right with the law. It's very frustrating when people say, Why don't they get in line today? Because it's a nonexistent line. Comprehensive immigration reform will create the line that people will then get into and create an immigration system that is in touch with reality in this country, in touch with a pro-growth agenda, in touch with an agenda that will make our country prosperous, that will conform our treatment of our neighbors to our values as Americans, the same values that extended a welcome to my ancestors and yours when they came to these shores and helped their, in my case, grandchildren and great grandchildren serve in this great body.

So, too, we need to assure that our values are represented in our immigration system. And whether one is on the left or the right, it is clear that today's disaster of an immigration system is not reflective of our value as Americans—our value as Americans not to tear families apart, our values as Americans to ensure that if you work hard and you play by the rules, you can get ahead in this country. You can succeed in this country. The value of encouraging civic participation is absolutely critical.

So this is a unique opportunity, a unique moment. It's a bipartisan approach, as it has to be. This is not a Democratic issue or a Republican issue. Immigration reform is an American issue, as it always has been a Nation of immigrants, a Nation of laws. And we can conform those two together so that we can fulfill our destiny in a way that honors the rule of law and honors the role of immigrants in creating our great country.

Mr. ELLISON. I do appreciate the gentleman from Colorado. Congressman POLIS, you have been on the mark on this thing ever since you stepped into this body, and there are literally I think millions of people who appreciate your advocacy. I just want to mention a few points and then, of course, invite you to dive back in.

The President does have a proposal on immigration reform. It's reasonable. It's a commonsense starting point. Republicans and Democrats need to find a way, as Congressman POLIS just said. But it is a clear path toward a legal status for thousands who are already in the U.S. working and paying taxes. It's a process for family reunification. It's a workable employment verification system with penalties for employers who knowingly hire people who are not in status. It is a reasonable enforcement.

But I just want to say this, and I want to invite Congressman POLIS to react. We've put about \$18 billion into border issues so far. One of the real things about comprehensive immigration reform is, we hear people talk about the border, the border, the border. Well, President Obama has done tons on the border—for some of us, too

much—but the border issue is not the problem. The real problem is the other part.

I yield to the gentleman from Colorado to see if you have any thoughts about this matter.

Mr. POLIS. Another thing that's important for Americans to understand about how 11 million people got here without paperwork and how this continues to occur is that more than half of the population that lives and works here illegally didn't sneak across a border. They came here legally. They came here as a tourist, they came with a visa. They stayed illegally and worked illegally. So, again, even if you had 100 percent security at the border—and, by the way, that's certainly a valid goal—but you're never going to have 100 percent. But even if you had 100 percent, you would still have a large flow of people to this country illegally because it's not that hard to get a tourism visa, to get a student visa, to get some other type of documentation for travel that allows you to be here for a month or 3 months and then to outstay that and work here illegally.

So no matter what you do on the border—and, by the way, I think absolutely as part of comprehensive immigration reform there will be more border security—but no matter what you do on the border, you don't address the issue without having a comprehensive approach that deals with those already here, that deals with the immigration laws going forward so we don't wind up in this same situation again in 10 or 20 years, to make sure that our immigration laws reflect the real needs of our country, the needs of the private sector, the needs of the workforce in terms of making sure we have enough people in the service industry. Whether it's to pick crops in the field, whether it's to staff our high-tech companies with programmers, we need to have an America-centric approach to immigration. And while border enforcement can certainly be a part of that, no matter how much you have, it doesn't even come close to addressing the issue of immigration in this country. And that's why, as the President indicated in his speech and in his call, as others from both sides of the aisle have indicated, it's critical for America to take on the issue of immigration reform and pass a comprehensive solution.

Mr. ELLISON. Thank you, Congressman. I'm going to wrap up in about 5 minutes or so. But I just want to hit a few things that need to be touched on. One is that the Progressive Caucus is very concerned about this looming sequestration. Now folks out there this evening, Mr. Speaker, might think, sequestration, what is that? Is that like when you go on jury duty or something? No. Sequestration is what we're calling some really dramatic cuts to Federal spending that are coming up in about 2 weeks.

□ 1710

And now you're thinking, How did we end up here? Here is what happened.

In August 2011, the Republicans had taken the majority in that session, the first session of the 112th Congress, in January, and they started out with an agenda to dramatically reduce the size of government. They started out with something called Cut, Cap and Balance, and they wanted to cut all kinds of programs. They never wanted to touch defense, but they wanted to cut the Federal Government. I'm talking about Head Start, Women Infants, and Children nutrition, programs that help support State and local governments, for police, fire, all kinds of stuff like that, they wanted to cut. And they wanted to cut big-time. They wanted to cut Social Security, Medicare, and Medicaid.

And so they came forward with this proposal. Now, they knew they couldn't get it past the Senate, but they said, Oh, the debt ceiling. The debt ceiling, we can use that as a lever to make the Democrats give us significant cuts to the Federal budget.

So what they did, in August 2011, they said that we're going to allow—we're not going to raise the debt ceiling. We're going to allow the Federal Government to default on previously acquired obligations of the United States—so not pay our bills that we already acquired and risk our triple A credit rating—if you do not impose dramatic cuts.

And so what the President did is said, Okay, we're going to give you some cuts up front and we'll set up something called the supercommittee. Three Democrats from the House, three Republicans from the House, three Republicans from the Senate, three Democrats from the Senate, we'll call that the supercommittee, and they are going to work out a compromise and give us an up-or-down vote on some more cuts. But if they don't, then we're going to have this thing called the sequester and there will be across-the-board cuts in a dramatic and really imposing way.

The sequester is what we're facing now because the supercommittee failed. Now, the supercommittee didn't just fail. What we didn't know is that when the Republicans, both House and Senate, appointed their members of the supercommittee, all of them had signed a promise to a man named Grover Norquist never to raise any taxes. And so what happened is that they got on this supercommittee and refused to negotiate. Democrats said, We'll do some cuts, but we need some revenue. We need to raise some taxes and close some loopholes.

Republicans said, No way, and Democrats said, Well, wait a minute. So you want it all cuts and no raising taxes. They said, That's right, we're not going to negotiate with you on this.

And so the supercommittee failed in its work. When it failed in its work, that meant that we were going to deal

with sequester, and that's where we are now.

Sequester is going to impose automatic, arbitrary cuts that could lay off, according to the Congressional Budget Office, up to about 750,000 people. There are going to be cuts in domestic spending and cuts to military spending. Some of us think that military cuts are warranted. Others of us are absolutely concerned about the people who are going to be affected by these domestic cuts.

Let me wrap up. I just want to say that I am concerned that several Republicans seem real cavalier about sequester, and you should look at the list. The Progressive Caucus' solution is to repeal sequester. What we would propose to do with our legislation is to say 50 percent cuts, 50 percent revenue. We already cut \$1.7 trillion in revenue, and then last New Year's Eve we got some money in the door through raising taxes and now we need to balance to 50-50. This is what we call the Balancing Act.

Our bill would bring it to balance by raising money through closing loopholes, carried interest, jets and yachts, stuff like that. Oh, yeah, you didn't know they could write off their jets and their yachts? Oh, yeah, they can. And then put about \$300 billion into jobs.

Let me wrap up by saying the Balancing Act, you can go online and look it up. It's a great program. We urge you to support it. In the last 1 second, if I may—I've promised my friend 20 minutes and I'm messing up right now.

On February 22, the Supreme Court will hear oral arguments in the Shelby County, Alabama v. Holder case. This threatens to take away serious voting rights. I'm going to be talking about this, because democracy must prevail. We have not reached the point where everybody has a fair vote in this country. I don't have the time to elaborate on it now, but please be aware that this Shelby County v. Holder is a critical issue. The Supreme Court is going to take it up on the 27th of February. We need to be aware of that if we want to believe that you ought to be able to cast a fair vote in America.

With that, I am going to yield to the gentleman from Colorado. Thank you very much, Congressman.

Mr. POLIS. I thank the gentleman from Minnesota.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Does the gentleman yield back his time?

Mr. POLIS. The gentleman from Minnesota yielded to me.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Colorado is recognized.

Mr. POLIS. I would like to ask the Speaker how much time remains.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Minnesota has 25 minutes remaining.

Mr. POLIS. And the gentleman has yielded his time.

Mr. ELLISON. With the understanding that the gentleman will get the balance of the time remaining of

my hour, then I will yield the floor back.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Does the gentleman yield back his time?

Mr. ELLISON. I have a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state his inquiry.

Mr. ELLISON. My inquiry is, if I yield back, does the gentleman from Colorado get the balance of the time I have remaining?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Colorado may serve as the designee of the minority leader for the remainder of the hour.

Mr. ELLISON. And further inquiry, are there 25 minutes left?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The minority hour has 24 minutes remaining.

Mr. ELLISON. In that case, I yield back the balance of my time.

IMMIGRATION REFORM

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2013, the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. POLIS) is recognized for 24 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of passing comprehensive immigration reform as soon as possible.

CINDY SLOSSON

I have a story to share from a resident in my district, Cindy Slosson from Fort Collins, Colorado. Cindy wrote me that her daughter fell in love with a young man from Mexico when they were in high school. They had a dream about their future lives together, and part of that dream was of course helping him become an American citizen so he could go to college, find a job and support their family that they hoped to build together. They persisted tirelessly for 10 years, through everything that the American bureaucracy and Immigration Services threw at them, and today, finally, he's a citizen of the United States. He's pursuing his degree in aviation mechanics and wants to continue to go to school for an engineering degree.

Part of their dream is now a reality and they keep on building upon this dream to be contributing community members and leaders among their friends and family. Cindy writes that, unfortunately, some young people don't have the kind of support and focus and, frankly, patience that her children had.

Cindy writes:

Let's make their path a bit more attainable. I believe most everyone truly wants to do their best, so let's give them a chance to be their best in this country.

□ 1720

As Cindy writes, there are so many people that are caught up in indefinite waiting periods just to be reunited with their own family, people who give up hope and move from their family and friends and everybody they know

simply because they can't get through the unrealistic length of time it takes to navigate our legal system.

As part of comprehensive immigration reform, we need to have a system that reflects our values as Americans and one that's realistic for families to go through.

MONICA OLGUIN

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to share a story from a constituent from my district, Monica Olguin from Boulder, Colorado. Now, her story is an interesting one because the U.S. came to her instead of her moving to the United States. Her family hails from the southwestern United States even before it was part of Mexico. Her family descended from Spanish colonial settlers in 1598 near Santa Fe, New Mexico. Over the following 300 years, they traveled north to Colorado to Conejos County, where the family has been for over 100 years.

Now, Monica writes:

Many of our best students today have been immigrant children.

Monica, herself, taught in our public schools for over 30 years.

Monica writes:

They enter our school system with great hopes and dreams and do not take education for granted. It isn't long, though, before they are able to express their fear of losing their place in this country, their fear of not belonging in their country of origin or their knowledge that there is no hope for success or dreams for their future in either their country of origin or in this country.

Monica shares the concerns of so many of us whose lives have touched those who live in this country every day in fear of the very government that should be there to protect them, in fear that it will detain them indefinitely, in fear that it will send them out of this country back to a country that they know no one in, that they might not have even been in since they were 3 years old or 8 years old or perhaps even to a country where the language that's spoken is not even a language that they're fluent in. That is the reality of our immigration system every day.

As Monica writes, it's critical that we replace our broken immigration system with one that works now. You're only a child once, and we need to make sure that our next generation of leaders has every opportunity to make our country greater.

PAUL EDWARD CONDON

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to share a story from a constituent of mine in Lafayette, Colorado, Paul Edward Condon. Like so many Coloradans, Paul feels that we need to replace our broken immigration system with one that works for our country and make sure that we have a way to make sure that the people already here can get right with the law.

Paul writes that on his father's side he is descended from people who his daughter, Katherine, likes to say qualify her to be a member of the Daughters of the American Revolution. On

his mother's side, he's descended from immigrants from Bohemia in the 1890s who homesteaded in Oregon. So, like many Americans, Paul is a child of both one side of the family with long roots in our country dating from before our country existed and another side of his family recent immigrants.

As Paul writes, perhaps with the full sense of understanding that comes from his personal story, Paul writes:

We are all sons and daughters of immigrants, including those descended from the peoples who were already here when my earliest immigrant ancestor arrived and descended from the people who also arrived unwillingly in this country. All immigrants, all mingled together. And, indeed, even Congresspersons are descended from immigrants. Congresspersons who wish to restrict immigration and reject immigrants are rejecting their own heritage. They should be ashamed.

I agree with Paul. We are all, in this country, descended from immigrants. And whether those immigrants arrived thousands of years ago, hundreds of years ago, decades ago, or last week, our future is intertwined with the very definition of America as an immigrant Nation, a Nation of laws, a Nation of immigrants.

Those two need to be reconciled. We need laws that reflect our values as Americans, our values as a Nation of immigrants; laws that are enforceable and in touch with reality rather than laws that tear families apart every day in this country and deny—deny people who have worked hard here and contributed to society the opportunity to fully partake in our great country and to someday become Americans themselves.

SEMAY DIBEKULU NELSON

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to share a story from a constituent in Colorado from the Second Congressional District, Semay Dibekulu Nelson, from Boulder, Colorado, who shared a story with me about immigration, that speaks to the need to reform our immigration system today to ensure that everybody gets a chance to succeed in this country.

Semay writes:

As a first generation immigrant American having received political asylum under life-threatening conditions, I feel the pain of undocumented immigrants and their fear of being deported. I am honored to have received your message, and I would like to reflect on this important topic. I'm aware there's no time to waste while millions are being underpaid for an honest day's work while living in fear of detention and deportation. I hope our government brings this agonizing issue to a positive resolution. The time is over in which we can afford to ignore an issue that has led to this humanitarian catastrophe.

I agree with Semay. Hers is a firsthand story of many legal immigrants like Semay who have firsthand knowledge of the process of leaving everything they know and coming to a new country without friends and without family. How difficult is that? Yet, today, our government is active tearing families apart, at taxpayer expense

taking mothers from daughters and placing them in detention at the cost to taxpayers of tens of thousands of dollars.

We need to replace our broken immigration system with one that works for our country and reflects our values as Americans, as even our newest Americans like Semay agree with.

JOHN HOFFMAN

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to share a story from John Hoffman in Boulder, Colorado. Like so many Coloradans and like so many Americans, John feels that we need to replace our broken immigration system with one that works and allows a way for the 11 million people who are here without status to get right with the law and fulfill their destiny.

John writes:

My great-great German grandparents settled in Germantown in Louisville, Kentucky. They were hardworking and industrious and eventually got into the vaunted "middle class." Let the Latinos do the same.

IZABELLA PESZEK

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to share a story from Izabella Peszek from Lafayette, Colorado. Izabella wrote me to share her immigration story and her passion for making sure that we replace our broken immigration system with one that works and reflects our values as Americans.

Izabella and her husband were recruited to join a graduate program in math at the University of Maryland in 1989. When they decided to go for it, they thought they would return to their home country, Poland. That was their plan when they got their degrees. But fate decided otherwise. When they graduated, Robert in 2 years and Izabella in 2½, the country that they knew in their childhood was gone, and they were being offered some very tempting positions in the United States. Robert went to CMU for a postdoc, and Izabella joined the pharma industry.

Eventually, they got green cards and became citizens of the United States and of our great State of Colorado, which is now their home, where both of them are respected in their fields and are happy doing what they do best.

Now Izabella and Robert can't imagine living anywhere else. And they work hard to make their new home in the United States even better, just as so many other immigrant families contribute to this country, are an asset to this country, are an asset to America, are part of America, and are as American as anybody else, which is why we need an immigration system that reflects our values and our priorities as Americans and ensures that others have the ability to give back to this great country just as Izabella and Robert have and continue to do every day.

JANICE GREEN

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to share a story from Janice Green from Westminster, Colorado, about why we need to fix our broken immigration system to help reunite families.

Janice writes:

My family has been in the United States for many generations, but my daughter-in-law is prevented from joining my daughter here because of the Defense of Marriage Act. They were legally married in Portugal, and my daughter may have to leave the United States to be with her spouse.

□ 1730

Under current immigration law today, same-sex couples are not accepted under immigration law, even though there are a number of States where same-sex couples have the same marriage rights as opposite-sex couples. Because of the Defense of Marriage Act, federally that marriage is not counted for purposes of immigration.

Janice's daughter might be driven from the country she loves and can contribute so much to because there's no viable path for her family to stay together. That's why I support JERRY NADLER's United American Families Act, and we need to work hard to make sure that as we replace our broken immigration system with one that works, it's fair to all Americans and treats all Americans fairly and reflects our value as Americans of keeping families like Janice's daughter and daughter-in-law together.

JEAN HODGES

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to share a story from Jean Hodges of Boulder, Colorado, about why we need to improve our immigration system.

Jean writes that both sides of her family immigrated in the 1800s from Ireland, Scotland, and Wales. They began life in Virginia and moved to Ohio around the Civil War. So Jean doesn't share the immediacy of immigrant parentage that many others do, but Jean does write that she understands the privilege of being a U.S. citizen and all that provides: for all of us to find a path to equality and whatever our pursuit of happiness may be.

Jean, like so many Coloradans and so many Americans says, "I wish that for all immigrants."

Jean understands the reasons that her forebearers might have left everything and everyone they knew to come to this country.

I know Jean. And the way that she has given back to our community as a school teacher, as a leader for equality, her work to support parents of LGBT kids, has been of tremendous value to our country, like the tremendous value that today's immigrants will provide through their public service, their community involvement, through their efforts as teachers, as firefighters, as policemen, as lawyers, as doctors, as successful business people who will lead our country to a more prosperous and bright future.

DAN MCLELLAN

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to share a story from Dan McLellan of Boulder, Colorado, about why we need to fix our broken immigration system and replace it with one that reflects our values as Americans.

Dan is a fourth-generation Coloradan. In fact, on his father's side, he has ties all the way back to the Mayflower. On his mother's side, the family came from Ireland, Italy, Germany, and Scotland. Like many Americans of mixed blood, he remembers memorizing when he was in fifth grade his ancestry. He would quickly list it off: English, Irish, German, Italian, and Scottish.

But recently, Dan fell in love with a Canadian. It was love at first sight, and last March they got married in New York. The plan was that Dan and his spouse were going to spend their lives together. But you know what? Right now they don't know where because Dan's spouse is another man. Unlike if Dan's spouse was a woman, Dan doesn't have the same kind of right to allow his husband, Michael, to be a legal resident of our country. Dan writes that he's forced to have to choose between the country he loves, the country his ancestors worked hard to get to, and being united with his own family and his husband.

Dan calls upon us in Congress—and I pass this challenge to our colleagues—to pass a comprehensive immigration reform package that treats families fairly, that treats families equally, that ensures that families are united. That's why I'm a proud sponsor of JERRY NADLER's United American Families Act, and I call upon this body to include respect for marriage as an important bed-stone principle of comprehensive immigration reform.

SALLY MILLER

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to share the story of Sally Miller from Broomfield, Colorado, and her strong support for fixing our broken immigration system. Sally is a social worker, and her story is about several pieces of her own personal experience working with people in the Denver metro area.

Sally has worked with immigrants who came to our country 20 years ago. They raised their families, they hoped for a better life, their kids are U.S. citizens, have succeeded in school, and are giving back. But Sally writes that the parents of one of their families are constantly in fear that the father may be caught on the way to or from his cleaning job and sent back to a country that he left, torn apart from his family at taxpayer expense.

One of their three children graduated from high school just this past June and is working and taking college classes. The other kids are 16 and 14. Sally writes that her friend and his wife hope to stay in the Denver area until all three of their kids graduate from high school, but every day the kids come home from school, they live in constant fear that our government sees their parents and sends them back to another country.

Sally writes:

The parents are good decent people, loving parents, and have always felt their sacrifices for their children's sake have been worth the price.

There are so many families that risk being torn apart because our immigration system is completely out of touch with our values as Americans. Rather than reuniting families, it tears families apart; rather than encouraging people to follow the law, it rewards unscrupulous business people who hire people under the table and encourages the violation of the law and identity theft.

We need to replace our immigration system with one that works for our country, allow people who've been here and are hardworking and contribute to our country to get right with the law, and, yes, some day enjoy the same benefits of citizenship that Sally herself enjoys.

I call upon my colleagues to pass comprehensive immigration reform now.

ANN HARROUN

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to share the story of Ann Harroun from Loveland, Colorado, who wrote to me with regard to her support for comprehensive immigration reform and her own family's story.

Ann writes that her relatives first came to Canada from France and England; the French in the 1700s and the English a little later. Ann's great-great grandmother was becalmed in the middle of the Atlantic Ocean for a time, and both sides of her family were farmers in Quebec before wandering into northern New Hampshire in the 1920s.

Ann writes, "Were they legal? Who knows?" She further writes that the French had large families and soon outgrew their farms. They moved on from New Hampshire. Her mother moved from New Hampshire to Maine in 1942 after the death of her father, and she worked for Maine Blue Cross for 30 years.

Ann moved to California after high school and saw an opportunity to attend college, married, had children, joined the League of Women Voters, finally graduated in 1980, and promptly won an election to the Vermont house. Ann was the first in her family to attend college, vote, own a house, and hold public office.

There are so many today that would be the first to go to college, that would be the first to vote, that would be the first to own a house, that would be the first to hold public office, that would be the first to be captains of industry, that would be the first to have advanced degrees if only we can find a way where they have the ability to get right with the law and get paperwork that allows them to pursue the great opportunities that this country offers.

As Ann says, "Were they illegal? Who knows?" Were they illegal? Who cares? When my family came here in 1906, they got off the boat and registered. There was no quota or process or thing they had to deal with on the legal front. They just showed up here. You know what? They were welcomed. And you know what? Their grandson on one side and great-grandson on the other is

now a United States Congress person, just as Ann was the first in her family after they wandered down from Canada to New Hampshire. Ann has given so much for her country, just as so many of today's immigrants will if we only give them today's opportunity.

DARYL SHUTE

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to share the story of Daryl Shute from Littleton, Colorado. Daryl writes with regard to the critical need to replace our broken immigration system with one that works.

Daryl's grandfather, Joseph Giangreco, emigrated from Sicily to the United States to join his mother, who was already living in Buffalo, New York, in the mid-nineteen teens. Daryl writes that Italians were the unwanted immigrants of that day. Daryl writes that he returned to Canada, walked across the border, and rejoined his mother after he was deported from New York.

He was caught and given a choice to fight for the Allies in Europe to earn his citizenship. He accepted that. And Daryl's grandfather, Joseph, went to war for the American Dream. Unfortunately, he received injuries during that war that affected him the rest of his life. Even so, he was hardworking and worked hard from the back of a horse-drawn cart to support his family for many years.

□ 1740

Even to this day, immigrants give so much of themselves through their hard work, their toil, their sweat and tears, which all of us as Americans prosper from and benefit from. We need to find a way, just as Joseph's grandfather did, so that people can get right with the law.

What is being discussed and what needs to be discussed is not an amnesty any more than if you get a speeding ticket and you enter a plea bargain it's an amnesty. It's essentially a plea bargain. Yes, you violated the law. Let's figure out how you get right with the law: register, pay a fine, get your working permit. It's not realistic in any way, shape or form to try to round up large numbers of people who are giving so much to our country every day and who, in many cases, have American children. That's why we need to pass immigration reform and replace our broken immigration system with one that reflects our values as Americans.

MARTHA DENNEY

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to share a story from Martha Denney in Fort Collins, Colorado. It's her own personal story and the story of her family's immigration and why we need to replace our broken immigration system with one that works and pass comprehensive immigration reform now.

Martha's grandmother's family members were immigrants from Montbeliard, France, but they were actually Swiss Mennonites. They were driven from Switzerland as followers of

the Mennonite faith. They followed the teachings that defied the teachings of the Catholic Church, and they were discriminated against. Many Swiss farmers became valued and trusted workers on estates in France, where they went to escape persecution. When they were able to emigrate to the U.S. in the late 1800s, they came to Wayland, Iowa, which was a small Mennonite community.

Martha has worked for more than 30 years in the area of international exchange at a large American university, Colorado State University, in Fort Collins. She has worked with issues of visas and student visas and the immigration of students. She has observations about the process that she has tried to share over the years with Representatives of our United States Government, but she believes that, up until now, they weren't in a position to hear them because they weren't focusing on immigration reform.

I call upon this body to focus on immigration reform, to heed the stories of those like Martha's and of the many others who interact every day—whether it's as an employer or an educator or a social worker—with those who are here in this country and are working hard to make our country greater but who lack the paperwork that verifies their own existence, who lack the paperwork that allows them to exist under the rule of law in this country.

We need to replace our broken immigration system with one that reflects our American values, with one that allows people to step out of the darkness and into the light, to get right with the law, to be able to fully pursue their destinies as future Americans. We are a Nation of immigrants, and we all benefit from the tremendous benefits that immigrants give to this country every day.

I hope that now is the time that Representatives of our United States Government in this House of Representatives will be in a position to hear and will be in a position to focus on immigration reform in order to make our country stronger, to make our country safer, to make our country more prosperous.

Mr. Speaker, I call upon my colleagues to support comprehensive immigration reform and to pass it now. We must replace our broken immigration system with one that works for our country and our values.

I yield back the balance of my time.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for today.

Mr. CULBERSON (at the request of Mr. CANTOR) for today on account of illness.

ADJOURNMENT

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

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 44 minutes p.m.), the House adjourned until tomorrow, Friday, February 15, 2013, 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:

286. A letter from the Attorney, Legal Division, Bureau of Consumer Financial Protection, transmitting the Bureau's final rule — Electronic Fund Transfers (Regulation E) Temporary Delay of Effective Date [Docket No.: CFPB-2012-0050] (RIN: 3170-AA33) received January 30, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Financial Services.

287. A letter from the Attorney, Legal Division, Bureau of Consumer Financial Protection, transmitting the Bureau's final rule — High-Cost Mortgage and Homeownership Counseling Amendments to the Truth in Lending Act (Regulation Z) and Homeownership Counseling Amendments to the Real Estate Settlement Procedures Act (Regulation X) [Docket No.: CFPB-2012-0029] (RIN: 3170-AA12) received February 1, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Financial Services.

288. A letter from the General Counsel, National Credit Union Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Definition of Troubled Condition (RIN: 3133-AD97) received January 29, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Financial Services.

289. A letter from the General Counsel, National Credit Union Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Alternatives to the Use of Credit Ratings (RIN: 3133-AD86) received January 29, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Financial Services.

290. A letter from the Secretary, Securities and Exchange Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule — Extension of Exemptions for Security-Based Swaps [Release Nos.: 33-9383; 34-68753; 39-2489; File No. S7-26-11] (RIN: 3235-AL17) received January 30, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Financial Services.

291. A letter from the Director, Office of Congressional Affairs, Nuclear Regulatory Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule — Assessing the Radiological Consequences of Accidental Releases of Radioactive Materials from Liquid Waste Tanks in Ground and Surface Waters for Combined License Applications [DC/COL-ISG-014] received January 30, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

292. A letter from the Director, Office of Congressional Affairs, Nuclear Regulatory Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule — Assessing the Radiological Consequences of Accidental Releases of Radioactive Materials from Liquid Waste Tanks for Combined License Applications [DC/COL-ISG-013] received January 30, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

293. A letter from the Senior Procurement Executive, Deputy Chief Acquisition Officer, General Services Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Federal Acquisition Regulation; Unallowability of Costs Associated with Foreign Contractor Excise Tax [FAC 2005-65; FAR Case 2011-011; Item IV; Docket 2011-0011, Sequence 1] (RIN: 9000-AM13) received January 31, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

294. A letter from the Senior Procurement Executive, Deputy Chief Acquisition Officer, General Services Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Federal Acquisition Regulation; Unallowability of Costs Associated with Foreign Contractor Excise Tax [FAC 2005-65; FAR Case 2011-011; Item IV; Docket 2011-0011, Sequence 1] (RIN: 9000-AM13) received January 31, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

295. A letter from the Senior Procurement Executive, Deputy Chief Acquisition Officer, General Services Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Federal Acquisition Regulation; Technical Amendments [FAC 2005-65; Item V; Docket 2013-0080, Sequence 1] received January 31, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

296. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; Bone Island Triathlon, Atlantic Ocean; Key West, FL [Docket No.: USCG-2012-0956] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received February 6, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

297. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zones; New Year's Eve Fireworks Displays within the Captain of the Port Miami Zone, FL [Docket Number: USCG-2012-1041] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received February 6, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

298. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Drawbridge Operation Regulation; Apalachicola River, FL [Docket No.: USCG-2012-0470] (RIN: 1625-AA09) received February 6, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

299. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Special Local Regulations; 2013 Orange Bowl Paddle Championship, Biscayne Bay, Miami, FL [Docket Number: USCG-2012-1020] (RIN: 1625-AA08) received February 6, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

300. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Security Zone; On the Waters in Kailua Bay, Oahu, HI [Docket Number: USCG-2012-1038] (RIN: 1625-AA87) received February 6, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions of the following titles were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mr. SMITH of Washington (for himself, Ms. HANABUSA, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mr. LANGEVIN, Mr. CASTRO of Texas, Mr. COURTNEY, Mr. GARAMENDI, Mr. ANDREWS, Mr. PETERS of California, Ms. KUSTER, Mr. O'ROURKE, Ms. SHEA-PORTER, Ms. SPEIER, Ms. TSONGAS, Mr. LARSEN of Washington, Ms. BROWNLEY of California, Mr. TAKANO, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Ms. LEE of California, Mr. RUSH, Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York, Mr. HECK of Washington, Mr. CONNOLLY, Ms. MOORE,

Mr. HUFFMAN, Mr. MORAN, Ms. CHU, Mr. POCAN, Mr. CAPUANO, Mr. HONDA, Mr. FARR, Mr. ISRAEL, Mr. BISHOP of New York, Ms. GABBARD, Ms. NORTON, Mr. McDERMOTT, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Mr. McGOVERN, Mr. DEUTCH, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Mrs. DAVIS of California, and Mrs. CAPPS):

H.R. 683. A bill to amend titles 10, 32, 37, and 38 of the United States Code, to add a definition of spouse for purposes of military personnel policies and military and veteran benefits that recognizes new State definitions of spouse; to the Committee on Armed Services, and in addition to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. WOMACK (for himself, Ms. SPEIER, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. WELCH, Mrs. NOEM, Mr. GRIFFIN of Arkansas, Mr. POE of Texas, Mr. COHEN, Ms. CHU, Mr. AMODEI, Mr. DEUTCH, Mr. DIAZ-BALART, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mr. ROSS, Ms. DELBENE, Mr. SCHOCK, Ms. LINDA T. SANCHEZ of California, Mrs. ELLMERS, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Mr. BARLETTA, Mr. LANGEVIN, Mr. CRENSHAW, Mr. CRAWFORD, Mr. DENT, Ms. PINGREE of Maine, Mr. YOUNG of Indiana, Ms. SCHWARTZ, Mr. GRIMM, Mr. ELLISON, Mr. GIBSON, Ms. TSONGAS, Mr. CONAWAY, Mr. STIVERS, Ms. NORTON, Mr. CAPUANO, Ms. MCCOLLUM, and Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia):

H.R. 684. A bill to restore States' sovereign rights to enforce State and local sales and use tax laws, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas (for himself and Mr. HECK of Washington):

H.R. 685. A bill to award a Congressional Gold Medal to the American Fighter Aces, collectively, in recognition of their heroic military service and defense of our country's freedom throughout the history of aviation warfare; to the Committee on Financial Services, and in addition to the Committee on House Administration, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mrs. NOEM (for herself, Mr. WALZ, Mr. FORTENBERRY, Mr. PETERSON, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. WITTMAN, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, and Mr. LATTA):

H.R. 686. A bill to amend the Federal Crop Insurance Act to modify the ineligibility requirements for producers that produce an annual crop on native sod, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. GOSAR (for himself, Mrs. KIRKPATRICK, Mr. SALMON, Mr. SCHWEIKERT, and Mr. FRANKS of Arizona):

H.R. 687. A bill to facilitate the efficient extraction of mineral resources in southeast Arizona by authorizing and directing an exchange of Federal and non-Federal land, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. ROYCE (for himself, Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Ms. BONAMICI, Mr. CALVERT, Mr. CHABOT, Mr. CICILLINE, Mr. COBLE, Mr. CONNOLLY, Mr. COOK, Ms. HAHN, Mr. HECK of Nevada, Mr. HUFFMAN, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mr. JONES, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Mr. LEWIS, Mr. McCLINTOCK, Mr. MEKKS, Mr. MICHAUD, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Ms. NORTON, Mr. PETERS of Michigan, Ms.

PINGREE of Maine, Mr. POE of Texas, Mr. POSEY, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. SCHRADER, Mr. SHERMAN, Mr. STIVERS, Mr. THOMPSON of California, Mr. UPTON, Ms. WATERS, Mr. YARMUTH, Mr. BISHOP of New York, and Mr. YOUNG of Alaska):

H.R. 688. A bill to amend the Federal Credit Union Act to provide certain credit unions with the authority to make additional member business loans, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. BLUMENAUER (for himself, Mr. ROHRABACHER, Mr. POLIS, Ms. LEE of California, Mr. MORAN, Mr. COHEN, Mr. FARR, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. NADLER, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. HONDA, and Mr. HUFFMAN):

H.R. 689. A bill to provide for the rescheduling of marijuana and for the medical use of marijuana in accordance with the laws of the various States; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on the Judiciary, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. LATHAM (for himself and Mr. WALZ):

H.R. 690. A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to modify the per-fiscal year calculation of days of certain active duty or active service used to reduce the minimum age at which a member of a reserve component of the uniformed services may retire for non-regular service; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California (for himself, Mr. BARROW of Georgia, and Mr. COURTNEY):

H.R. 691. A bill to require the Secretary of Labor to issue an interim occupational safety and health standard regarding worker exposure to combustible dust, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. BARLETTA:

H.R. 692. A bill to provide protection for certain Federal employees with respect to implementation of the June 15, 2012, memorandum from Janet Napolitano, Secretary of Homeland Security, regarding the exercise of prosecutorial discretion with respect to individuals who came to the United States as children; to the Committee on Homeland Security.

By Mr. PITTS (for himself, Mr. DANNY

K. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. GOODLATTE, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. CHABOT, Mr. BUCSHON, Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania, Mr. MARINO, Mr. SHUSTER, Mr. FLEISCHMANN, Mr. HANNA, Mr. MORAN, Mr. PETRI, Mr. RUSH, Mr. BARLETTA, Mr. MEEHAN, Mr. FITZPATRICK, Ms. SPEIER, Mr. DENT, Mrs. BLACK, Mr. WOMACK, Mr. KELLY, Mr. QUIGLEY, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. LATTA, Mr. MASSIE, Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Mr. PASCRELL, Mr. PERRY, Ms. SHEA-PORTER, Mr. ROTHFUS, Mr. RENACCI, Mr. GERLACH, Mr. LANCE, Mr. LIPINSKI, and Mr. HARRIS):

H.R. 693. A bill to reform the Federal sugar program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Ms. SCHAKOWSKY:

H.R. 694. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to prevent the avoidance by corporations of tax on foreign income; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DENHAM (for himself, Mr. SCHWEIKERT, Mr. WESTMORELAND, Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee, Mr. HANNA, Mr. MCHENRY, Mr. MICA, Mr. NUNES, Mr. HUNTER, and Mr. REED):

H.R. 695. A bill to decrease the deficit by realigning, consolidating, selling, disposing, and improving the efficiency of Federal buildings and other civilian real property, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, and in addition to the Committees on Oversight and Government Reform, and Rules, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. HORSFORD (for himself, Mr. AMODEI, and Mr. HECK of Nevada):

H.R. 696. A bill to designate the Wovoka Wilderness and provide for certain land conveyances in Lyon County, Nevada, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. HECK of Nevada (for himself, Mr. AMODEI, Mr. HORSFORD, and Ms. TITUS):

H.R. 697. A bill to provide for the conveyance of certain Federal land in Clark County, Nevada, for the environmental remediation and reclamation of the Three Kids Mine Project Site, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mrs. CAPPS:

H.R. 698. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to establish safeguards and standards of quality for research and transplantation of organs infected with human immunodeficiency virus (HIV); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on the Judiciary, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. VAN HOLLEN (for himself, Mr. HOYER, Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, Ms. DELAULO, Mr. POCAN, Ms. CASTOR of Florida, Mr. MORAN, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. HUFFMAN, and Mr. HOLT):

H.R. 699. A bill to amend the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 to repeal and replace the fiscal year 2013 sequestration; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committees on the Budget, and Agriculture, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California:

H.R. 700. A bill to direct the Secretary of Education to carry out the Advanced Research Projects Agency-Education to fund directed development projects to support targeted breakthroughs in teaching and learning; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. MCHENRY (for himself, Mr. SCHWEIKERT, Ms. ESHOO, Mr. GARRETT, and Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia):

H.R. 701. A bill to amend a provision of the Securities Act of 1933 directing the Securities and Exchange Commission to add a particular class of securities to those exempted under such Act to provide a deadline for such action; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. BRALEY of Iowa:

H.R. 702. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to direct the Secretary of Health and Human Services to establish a Frontline Providers Loan Repayment Program; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. CARNEY (for himself and Mr. MEEHAN):

H.R. 703. A bill to establish the First State National Historical Park in the State of Delaware, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. CARTER (for himself, Mr. WOLF, and Mr. BURGESS):

H.R. 704. A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to extend whistleblower protections to a member of the Armed Forces who alerts Department of Defense investigation or law enforcement organizations, a person or organization in the member's chain of command, and certain other persons or entities about the potentially dangerous ideologically based threats or actions of another member against United States interests or security; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. CARTER (for himself, Mr. MCCAUL, Mr. WOLF, Mr. BURGESS, and Mr. FLORES):

H.R. 705. A bill to ensure that the victims and victims' families of the November 5, 2009, attack at Fort Hood, Texas, receive the same treatment and benefits as those Americans who have been killed or wounded in a combat zone overseas and their families; to the Committee on Armed Services, and in addition to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. CICILLINE (for himself, Mr. LANGEVIN, Mr. MCGOVERN, and Mr. NEAL):

H.R. 706. A bill to establish the Blackstone River Valley National Historical Park, to dedicate the Park to John H. Chafee, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. CRAWFORD (for himself and Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia):

H.R. 707. A bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act to simplify and rename the H-2C worker program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary, and in addition to the Committees on Education and the Workforce, and Energy and Commerce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. DOYLE (for himself, Mr. YODER, and Ms. LOGGREN):

H.R. 708. A bill to provide for Federal agencies to develop public access policies relating to research conducted by employees of that agency or from funds administered by that agency; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. ELLISON (for himself, Mr. PAULSEN, Mr. WALZ, and Mr. NOLAN):

H.R. 709. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Army to take actions to manage the threat of Asian carp traveling up the Mississippi River in the State of Minnesota, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, and in addition to the Committee on Natural Resources, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. FARR (for himself, Mr. ROHRABACHER, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. COHEN, Mr. GRIJALVA, Ms. LEE of California, Mr. MORAN, Ms. PINGREE of Maine, Mr. POLIS, and Mr. WAXMAN):

H.R. 710. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to provide an affirmative defense for the medical use of marijuana in accordance with the laws of the various States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Ms. FOXX (for herself, Mr. WESTMORELAND, Mr. CHAFFETZ, and Mr. PITTS):

H.R. 711. A bill to amend titles 23 and 49, United States Code, to repeal wage requirements applicable to laborers and mechanics

employed on Federal-aid highway and public transportation construction projects; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, and in addition to the Committee on Education and the Workforce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN (for himself, Mr. FITZPATRICK, Mr. GERLACH, Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. GARRETT, Mr. LANCE, and Mr. DENT):

H.R. 712. A bill to extend the authorization of the Highlands Conservation Act through fiscal year 2024; to the Committee on Natural Resources, and in addition to the Committee on Agriculture, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. GERLACH (for himself and Mr. BECERRA):

H.R. 713. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to repeal the Medicare outpatient rehabilitation therapy caps; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. GRIMM (for himself, Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California, Mr. NUNES, Mr. CONNOLLY, Mr. YODER, Mr. POLIS, and Mr. CHABOT):

H.R. 714. A bill to jump-start economic recovery through the formation and growth of new businesses, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary, and in addition to the Committees on Ways and Means, Science, Space, and Technology, Appropriations, and Energy and Commerce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. HASTINGS of Florida (for himself, Mr. CLAY, Ms. HAHN, Ms. LEE of California, Ms. FUDGE, Ms. CLARKE, Mr. MCGOVERN, and Mr. WATT):

H.R. 715. A bill to posthumously award a Congressional Gold Medal to Lena Horne in recognition of her achievements and contributions to American culture and the civil rights movement; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Ms. HERRERA BEUTLER:

H.R. 716. A bill to direct the Secretary of the Interior to convey certain Federal land to the city of Vancouver, Washington, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. HONDA (for himself, Mr. GUTIERREZ, Ms. PELOSI, Mr. BECERRA, Mr. CONYERS, Ms. LOFGREN, Ms. CHU, Mr. NADLER, Ms. LEE of California, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. ELLISON, Mr. POLIS, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Ms. BORDALLO, Mr. ISRAEL, Ms. CLARKE, Mr. RANGEL, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Mr. HOLT, Mr. FARR, Mr. AL GREEN of Texas, Mr. RUSH, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Mr. SIRES, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. MORAN, Ms. ESHOO, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. FALCOMA VAEGA, Mr. DEUTCH, Mrs. CAPPAS, Mr. QUIGLEY, Ms. GABBARD, Mr. POCAN, Ms. PINGREE of Maine, Ms. SINEMA, Mr. CAPUANO, Mr. TAKANO, Ms. MENG, Mr. TONKO, Mr. SABLON, Ms. CASTOR of Florida, Ms. SPEIER, Mr. CICILLINE, Mr. CÁRDENAS,

Mr. CONNOLLY, Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York, Ms. MOORE, Mr. WELCH, Mr. PIERLUISI, Mr. VARGAS, Mr. LANGEVIN, Ms. TSONGAS, Mrs. DAVIS of California, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. VEASEY, Mr. SWALWELL of California, and Mr. SERRANO):

H.R. 717. A bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act to promote family unity, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HULTGREN (for himself and Mr. LIPINSKI):

H.R. 718. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Health and Human Services, acting through the Administrator of the Health Resources and Services Administration, to award grants on a competitive basis to public and private entities to provide qualified sexual risk avoidance education to youth and their parents; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. KING of New York (for himself, Mr. SHERMAN, Ms. BONAMICI, Mr. BISHOP of New York, Mr. HANNA, Mr. JONES, Mr. LOEBSACK, Mr. MEEKS, Mr. MICHAUD, Ms. NORTON, Ms. PINGREE of Maine, Mr. POLIS, Mr. POSEY, Ms. WATERS, and Mr. BLUMENAUER):

H.R. 719. A bill to clarify the National Credit Union Administration authority to improve credit union safety and soundness; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. KING of New York (for himself, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. CAPUANO, Mr. CICILLINE, Mr. DEUTCH, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. FARR, Mr. GRIMM, Mr. HIMES, Mr. HOLT, Mr. ISRAEL, Mr. MORAN, Ms. NORTON, Mr. PIERLUISI, Mr. QUIGLEY, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. WAXMAN, and Mr. MCGOVERN):

H.R. 720. A bill to increase public safety by permitting the Attorney General to deny the transfer of a firearm or the issuance of firearms or explosives licenses to a known or suspected dangerous terrorist; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Ms. JENKINS (for herself, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois, and Mr. LIPINSKI):

H.R. 721. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to extend and modify the railroad track maintenance credit; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KING of New York (for himself, Mr. BISHOP of New York, Mr. MORAN, Mr. FARR, and Mr. RANGEL):

H.R. 722. A bill to combat illegal gun trafficking, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LANGEVIN (for himself, Mr. COURTNEY, and Mr. CICILLINE):

H.R. 723. A bill to amend the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act to designate a segment of the Beaver, Chipuxet, Queen, Wood, and Pawcatuck Rivers in the States of Connecticut and Rhode Island for study for potential addition to the National Wild and Scenic Rivers System, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. LATTI (for himself and Mr. PETERS of Michigan):

H.R. 724. A bill to amend the Clean Air Act to remove the requirement for dealer certification of new light-duty motor vehicles; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Ms. LEE of California (for herself, Ms. MOORE, Ms. PINGREE of Maine, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mrs. DAVIS of California, Mr. CLAY, Ms. NORTON, Ms. DEGETTE, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. MORAN, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mr. GRIJALVA, Ms. BONAMICI, Ms. CLARKE, Ms. SPEIER, Mr. DEUTCH, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Ms. LOFGREN, Mr. LEWIS, Ms. CHU, Mr. RANGEL, Ms. MCCOLLUM,

Mr. HONDA, Mr. NADLER, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. HOLT, Ms. WATERS, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. LARSEN of Washington, Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, and Mr. SIRES):

H.R. 725. A bill to provide for the reduction of unintended pregnancy and sexually transmitted infections, including HIV, and the promotion of healthy relationships, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Education and the Workforce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. BEN RAY LUJÁN of New Mexico (for himself, Ms. HANABUSA, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mr. MORAN, Mrs. NEGRETE MCLEOD, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Ms. MCCOLLUM, and Mr. PEARCE):

H.R. 726. A bill to amend the Native American Programs Act of 1974 to reauthorize a provision to ensure the survival and continuing vitality of Native American languages; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. BEN RAY LUJÁN of New Mexico:

H.R. 727. A bill to extend Forest Service and the Bureau of Land Management stewardship end result contracting authority, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources, and in addition to the Committee on Agriculture, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York (for herself, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Mr. CONYERS, Ms. MOORE, Mr. CICILLINE, Ms. LEE of California, Ms. PINGREE of Maine, Ms. HAHN, Mr. FARR, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. NADLER, Mr. ELLISON, Ms. DEGETTE, Mr. MORAN, Mr. HOLT, and Mr. PETERS of California):

H.R. 728. A bill to establish certain duties for pharmacies to ensure provision of Food and Drug Administration-approved contraception, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. MCDERMOTT (for himself and Mr. HIGGINS):

H.R. 729. A bill to amend the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 to exempt the National Institutes of Health from sequestration under section 251A for fiscal year 2013, and to reduce the sequestration by the amount of the exemption; to the Committee on the Budget.

By Mr. MULVANEY (for himself, Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina, Mr. GUTHRIE, Mr. FINCHER, Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. HANNA, Mr. KING of Iowa, Mr. ROONEY, Mr. DEFAZIO, Mr. HASTINGS of Washington, Mr. CAMPBELL, and Mr. HUIZENGA of Michigan):

H.R. 730. A bill to define urban rodent control for purposes of clarifying the control of nuisance mammals and birds carried out by the Wildlife Services program of the Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service and by the private sector, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. RADEL (for himself, Ms. FRANKEL of Florida, Mr. WEBER of Texas, Mr. COTTON, and Mr. MESSER):

H.R. 731. A bill to amend the Foreign Relations Authorization Act, Fiscal Years 1990 and 1991 to allow the Department of State to use a best-value contracting method in awarding local guard or protective service contracts in high risk areas abroad under the diplomatic security program; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN (for herself, Mrs. BLACK, Mr. BOUSTANY, Mr.

BRADY of Texas, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Mr. JONES, Mr. DESJARLAIS, Mr. CRENSHAW, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. MARCHANT, Mr. KING of Iowa, Mr. GRIFFITH of Virginia, Mr. NEUGEBAUER, Mr. CHABOT, Mr. COLE, Mr. HALL, Mr. GARRETT, Mr. MICA, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. FINCHER, Mr. POMPEO, Mr. WITTMAN, Mr. POE of Texas, Mr. DIAZ-BALART, Mr. GRIFFIN of Arkansas, Mr. STIVERS, Mr. CARTER, Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois, Mrs. HARTZLER, Mr. NUNNELEE, Mr. WALBERG, Mr. RIBBLE, Mr. MULVANEY, Mr. LAMBORN, Mr. BENISHEK, Mr. FLEMING, Mr. CALVERT, Mr. KELLY, Mr. PALAZZO, Mr. WENSTRUP, Mr. HULTGREN, Mr. JORDAN, Mr. PEARCE, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Mr. GUTHRIE, Mr. WESTMORELAND, Mr. MCCLINTOCK, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. HUELSKAMP, Mr. CONAWAY, Mr. TERRY, Mr. MILLER of Florida, Mr. SHUSTER, Mr. BILLIRAKIS, Mr. TIBERI, Mr. HUIZENGA of Michigan, Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky, Mr. LATTA, Mr. KING of New York, Mr. OLSON, Mr. GRAVES of Missouri, Mr. HENSARLING, Mr. RAHALL, Mr. TURNER, Mrs. BACHMANN, Mr. ALEXANDER, Mr. MURPHY of Pennsylvania, Mr. MULLIN, and Mr. SCALISE):

H.R. 732. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to prohibit taking minors across State lines in circumvention of laws requiring the involvement of parents in abortion decisions; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RUNYAN (for himself and Mr. WALZ):

H.R. 733. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to provide certain employees of Members of Congress and certain employees of State or local governmental agencies with access to case-tracking information of the Department of Veterans Affairs; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. STIVERS (for himself and Mr. PETERS of Michigan):

H.R. 734. A bill to create jobs and promote fair trade by increasing duties on certain foreign goods imported into the United States; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi:

H.R. 735. A bill to enhance homeland security, including domestic preparedness and collective response to terrorism, by improving the Federal Protective Service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, and in addition to the Committee on Homeland Security, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. WELCH (for himself, Mr. COSTA, Mr. CICILLINE, Mr. SIREN, Ms. SCHA-KOWSKY, Mrs. DAVIS of California, Mr. ELLISON, and Ms. BONAMICI):

H.R. 736. A bill to provide for the expansion of affordable refinancing of mortgages held by the Federal National Mortgage Association and the Federal Home Loan Mortgage Corporation; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Ms. WILSON of Florida (for herself and Ms. BROWN of Florida):

H.R. 737. A bill to establish a national catastrophic risk consortium to ensure the availability and affordability of homeowners' insurance coverage for catastrophic events; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. WILSON of South Carolina:

H.R. 738. A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to eliminate the requirement that certain former members of the reserve components of the Armed Forces be at least

60 years of age in order to be eligible to receive health care benefits; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. WITTMAN:

H.R. 739. A bill to require the Office of Management and Budget to prepare a cross-cut budget for restoration activities in the Chesapeake Bay watershed, to require the Environmental Protection Agency to develop and implement an adaptive management plan, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources, and in addition to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. YOUNG of Alaska (for himself, Ms. HANABUSA, Mr. PIERLUISI, Ms. BORDALLO, and Mr. SABLAN):

H.R. 740. A bill to provide for the settlement of certain claims under the Alaska Native Claims Settlement Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. NOLAN (for himself and Mr. POCAN):

H.J. Res. 29. A joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States providing that the rights extended by the Constitution are the rights of natural persons only; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PRICE of Georgia:

H.J. Res. 30. A joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States to limit the number of years Representatives and Senators may serve; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SCHIFF (for himself, Mr. CAPUANO, Mr. CICILLINE, Mr. FARR, Mr. GARAMENDI, Mr. HIMES, Ms. LEE of California, Mr. MICHAUD, Mr. MORAN, Ms. NORTON, Mr. WELCH, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. RUPPERSBERGER, Ms. MCCOLLUM, and Mr. RANGEL):

H.J. Res. 31. A joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relating to the authority of Congress and the States to regulate contributions and expenditures in political campaigns and to enact public financing systems for such campaigns; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PAYNE (for himself, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. MEEKS, Mr. RANGEL, Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, Ms. NORTON, Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. MORAN, Mr. DENT, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mrs. BEATTY, Ms. LEE of California, Mr. CONNOLLY, Ms. BORDALLO, Ms. MOORE, Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, Mr. HOLT, Mr. FITZPATRICK, Mr. ANDREWS, Mr. COBLE, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. PASCRELL, Mr. KING of New York, Mr. SIREN, Mr. COOPER, Mr. RUNYAN, Mrs. NEGRETE MCLEOD, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. LEVIN, Mr. LOBIONDO, Mr. LANCE, Mr. LEWIS, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Mr. FARR, Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania, Mr. DOYLE, Mr. GARRETT, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. RUSH, Ms. FUDGE, Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. TAKANO, Mr. JEFFRIES, Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Ms. CLARKE, Mr. AL GREEN of Texas, Mr. ELLISON, Ms. SEWELL of Alabama, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Ms. WATERS, Ms. EDWARDS, Mr. RICHMOND, Mr. CLEAVER, Mr. CLYBURN, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Ms. BROWN of Florida, Mr. VEASEY, and Mr. HORSFORD):

H. Res. 69. A resolution supporting the designation of March 2013, as National Colorectal Cancer Awareness Month; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. HUELSKAMP:

H. Res. 70. A resolution recognizing the 150th anniversary of Kansas State University; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. LOEBSACK (for himself, Mr. JORDAN, Mr. WALZ, Mr. BRALEY of Iowa, Mr. KING of Iowa, and Mr. LATHAM):

H. Res. 71. A resolution opposing the International Olympic Committee's decision to eliminate wrestling from the Summer Olympic Games beginning in 2020; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

CONSTITUTIONAL AUTHORITY STATEMENT

Pursuant to clause 7 of rule XII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the following statements are submitted regarding the specific powers granted to Congress in the Constitution to enact the accompanying bill or joint resolution.

[Omitted from the Record of February 13, 2013]

By Mr. LOBIONDO:

H.R. 625.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 18 of The Constitution of the United States of America

By Mr. SMITH of Washington:

H.R. 683.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The constitutional authority on which this bill rests is the power of Congress "to make Rules for the Government and Regulation of the land and naval Forces" as enumerated in Article I, section 8 of the United States Constitution and in pursuit of the Equal Protection Clause found in section 1 of the Fourteenth Amendment.

By Mr. WOMACK:

H.R. 684.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Commerce Clause of the United States Constitution, Article I, Section 8, Clause 3.

By Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas:

H.R. 685.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8 of the Constitution.

By Mrs. NOEM:

H.R. 686.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3, the Commerce Clause.

By Mr. GOSAR:

H.R. 687.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article IV of the Constitution provides the authority of Congress over federal property as a general matter. Article IV, §3 refers to the managerial authority over property owned by the Federal Government, and provides in relevant part:

The Congress shall have Power to dispose of and make all needful Rules and Regulations respecting the Territory or other Property belonging to the United States; . . .

By virtue of this enumerated power, Congress has governing authority over the lands, territories, or other property of the United States—and with this authority Congress is vested with the power accredited to all owners in fee, the power to sell, lease, dispose,

exchange, transfer, trade, mine, or simply preserve land. The appropriate acreage to be held under Federal dominance is not the subject of this bill. Turning to the power of Article IV, §3, the Supreme Court has described this enumerated grant as one "without limitation" *Kleppe v. New Mexico*, 426 U.S. 529, 542-543 (1976) ("And while the furthest reaches of the power granted by the Property Clause have not yet been definitively resolved, we have repeatedly observed that [t]he power over the public land thus entrusted to Congress is without limitations." Citing *United States v. San Francisco*, 310 U.S. 29. The Court in *Kleppe* further explained that "In short, Congress exercises the powers both of a proprietor and of a legislature over the public domain." Id. Like any "proprietor" Congress has the power to sell or exchange federal property.

It is now generally accepted that the Federal Government may own and manage property in the manner and form mandated by Congress. *United States v. Gratiot*, 39 U.S. 526 (1840); *Camfield v. United States*, 167 U.S. 518 (1897). However, the wisdom of the Federal Government owning large tracts of land, particularly in the Western States, is subject to question on policy grounds, and some contend on Constitutional grounds based on the decision in *Pollard's Lessee v. Hagan*, 44 U.S. 212 (where the Court stated that "a proper examination of this subject will show that the United States never held any municipal sovereignty, jurisdiction, or right of soil in and to the territory of which Alabama or any of the new States were formed, except for temporary purposes . . ."). Historically, the early federal government transferred ownership of federal property to either private ownership or to state ownership in order to pay off the then crushing Revolutionary War debts and to assist with the development of infrastructure. These are still acceptable goals for federal property sale or transfer.

The land exchange here is one that comports with good policy and constitutional strictures since by exchanging the land set forth in this bill, a large commercial grade copper mine will be able to proceed with the attendant economic benefits with which such a proposition inures (assuming compliance with other requirements set forth in the bill), but the Federal Government also gains equally valuable land that has significance for other purposes.

Article 1, §8, Cl. 17 addresses property ceded by a state and conveys exclusive regulatory federal jurisdiction over these federal properties and enclaves. Section 8, Cl. 17 may also provide some guidance here to the extent it grants Congress the power to "exercise like Authority over all Places purchased by the Consent of the Legislature of the State in which the Same shall be, for the Erection of Forts, Magazines, Arsenals, dock-Yards and other needful Buildings." But it is Article IV that this bill is grounded upon.

By Mr. ROYCE:

H.R. 688.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Under Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 of the U.S. Constitution to regulate commerce.

By Mr. BLUMENAUER:

H.R. 689.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1 of the Constitution (relating to the general Welfare of the United States).

By Mr. LATHAM:

H.R. 690.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, section 8 of the United States Constitution (clauses 12, 13, 14, 16, and 18),

which grants Congress the power to raise and support an Army; to provide and maintain a Navy; to make rules for the government and regulation of the land and naval forces; to provide for organizing, arming, and disciplining the militia; and to make all laws necessary and proper for carrying out the foregoing powers.

By Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California:

H.R. 691.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clause 3 & 18 of Section 8, Article I, of the U.S. Constitution

By Mr. BARLETTA:

H.R. 692.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Congress has the power to enact this legislation, the Protecting Department of Homeland Security Personnel Act of 2013, pursuant to the following:

This bill makes changes to existing law relating to "Article 1 Section 8 of the U.S. Constitution Clause 18."

By Mr. PITTS:

H.R. 693.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3: The Congress shall have Power to regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian tribes.

By Ms. SCHAKOWSKY:

H.R. 694.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1

By Mr. DENHAM:

H.R. 695

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution, specifically Clause 1 (relating to providing for the common defense and general welfare of the United States) and Clause 18 (relating to the power to make all laws necessary and proper for carrying out the powers vested in Congress).

By Mr. HORSFORD:

H.R. 696.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1 Section 8

By Mr. HECK of Nevada:

H.R. 697.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 1

By Mrs. CAPPS:

H.R. 698.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. VAN HOLLEN:

H.R. 699.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 1; Article 1 Section 8, Clause 18; and Article 1, Section 9, Clause 7 of the U.S. Constitution.

By Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California:

H.R. 700.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8

By Mr. McHENRY:

H.R. 701.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article One, Section Eight.

By Mr. BRALEY of Iowa:

H.R. 702.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article I, Section 8, Clause 18 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. CARNEY:

H.R. 703.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clause 1 of Section 8 of Article I of the Constitution;

Clause 18 of Section 8 of Article I of the Constitution; and

Clause 2 of Section 3 of Article IV of the Constitution.

By Mr. CARTER:

H.R. 704.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The constitutional authority of Congress to enact this legislation is provided by Article I, section 8 of the United States Constitution clause 14, which grants Congress the power to make Rules for the Government and Regulation of the land and naval Forces.

By Mr. CARTER:

H.R. 705.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The constitutional authority of Congress to enact this legislation is provided by Article I, section 8 of the United States Constitution clause 14, which grants Congress the power to make Rules for the Government and Regulation of the land and naval Forces.

By Mr. CICILLINE:

H.R. 706

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1 Section 8

By Mr. CRAWFORD:

H.R. 707.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clause 3 of Section 8 of Article 1 of the United States Constitution.

The Congress shall have the Power . . . To establish an uniform Rule of Naturalization

By Mr. DOYLE:

H.R. 708.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 6—Clause 2

All Debts contracted and Engagements entered into, before the Adoption of this Constitution, shall be as valid against the United States under this Constitution, as under the Confederation.

This Constitution, and the Laws of the United States which shall be made in Pursuance thereof; and all Treaties made, or which shall be made, under the Authority of the United States, shall be the supreme Law of the Land; and the Judges in every State shall be bound thereby, any Thing in the Constitution or Laws of any State to the Contrary notwithstanding.

The Senators and Representatives before mentioned, and the Members of the several State Legislatures, and all executive and judicial Officers, both of the United States and of the several States, shall be bound by Oath or Affirmation, to support this Constitution; but no religious Test shall ever be required as a Qualification to any Office or public Trust under the United States.

By Mr. ELLISON:

H.R. 709.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Art. I, Sec. 8, Clauses 3 and 18.

By Mr. FARR:

H.R. 710.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Sec. 8 ["to regulate commerce"], and Amendment IV ["to be secure . . . against unreasonable searches and seizures"], and

Amendment VI [“the accused shall . . . have compulsory process for obtaining witnesses in his favor . . .”].

By Ms. FOX:

H.R. 711.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Because the legislation would change the formula for government contracts on federal-aid highway and public construction transportation projects, it is authorized under clause 1 of section 8 of article 1 of the Constitution which states “[t]he Congress shall have Power to lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts and Excises, to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defence and general Welfare of the United States; but all Duties, Imposts and Excises shall be uniform throughout the United States.”

By Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN:

H.R. 712.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution

By Mr. GERLACH:

H.R. 713.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The Congress enacts this bill pursuant to Clause 1 of Section 8 of Article I of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. GRIMM:

H.R. 714.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 4
The Congress shall have Power *** To establish a uniform Rule of Naturalization, and uniform Laws on the subject of Bankruptcies throughout the United States.

By Mr. HASTINGS of Florida:

H.R. 715.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Section 8 of Article 1 of the Constitution

By Ms. HERRERA BEUTLER:

H.R. 716.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article IV, Section 3, Clause 2
The Congress shall have Power to dispose of and make all needful Rules and Regulations respecting the Territory or other Property belonging to the United States; and nothing in this Constitution shall be so construed as to Prejudice any Claims of the United States, or of any particular State.

By Mr. HONDA:

H.R. 717.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

section 8 of article I of the Constitution.

By Mr. HULTGREN:

H.R. 718.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clause 3 of Section 8, Article 1 of the Constitution—Congress shall have the power to regulate commerce. . .among the several states. . .

By Mr. KING of New York:

H.R. 719.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3

The Congress shall have Power to regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes.

By Mr. KING of New York:

H.R. 720.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 6

The Congress shall have Power . . . To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the fore-

going Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.

By Ms. JENKINS:

H.R. 721.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8:

The Congress shall have Power To lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts and Excises, to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defense and general Welfare of the United States; but all Duties, Imposts and Excises shall be uniform throughout the United States.

By Mr. KING of New York:

H.R. 722.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 6

The Congress shall have Power . . . To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.

By Mr. LANGEVIN:

H.R. 723.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, section 8, Clause 1 and Article IV, section 3 of the Constitution of the United States grant Congress the authority to enact this bill.

By Mr. LATTA:

H.R. 724.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, cl. 3

The Congress shall have the power . . . to regulate commerce with foreign nations, and among the states, and with Indian Tribes;

By Ms. LEE of California:

H.R. 725.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article I of the United States Constitution and its subsequent amendments, and further clarified and interpreted by the Supreme Court of the United States.

By Mr. BEN RAY LUJÁN of New Mexico:

H.R. 726.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8

By Mr. BEN RAY LUJÁN of New Mexico:

H.R. 727.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8

By Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York:

H.R. 728.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clause 3 of Section 8 of Article I of the Constitution.

By Mr. MCDERMOTT:

H.R. 729.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, clause 1

By Mr. MULVANEY:

H.R. 730.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 14. “To make Rules for the Government and Regulation of the land and naval Forces.”

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18. “To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing

Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.”

This bill provides rules for the Government, specifically, for the Wildlife Services program of the Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service. This law is necessary and proper for carrying out the power to make rules for the proper operation of a division of the government of the United States.

By Mr. RADEL:

H.R. 731.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This law is enacted pursuant to the following provisions of the United States Constitution:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 3; Article 1, Section 8, Clause 14; Article 1, Section 8, Clause 18;

By Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN:

H.R. 732.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. RUNYAN:

H.R. 733.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Title I, Section 8

By Mr. STIVERS:

H.R. 734.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Congress’ power to regulate Commerce with foreign Nations under Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 of the U.S. Constitution.

By Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi:

H.R. 735.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The U.S. Constitution, including Article 1, Section 8.

By Mr. WELCH:

H.R. 736.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 18: The Congress shall have Power To . . . make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.

By Ms. WILSON of Florida:

H.R. 737.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1 The Congress shall have Power to lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts and Excises, to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defense and general Welfare of the United States; but all Duties, Imposts and Excises shall be uniform throughout the United States.

By Mr. WILSON of South Carolina:

H.R. 738.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8

By Mr. WITTMAN:

H.R. 739.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 of the Constitution of the United States grants Congress the authority to enact this bill.

By Mr. YOUNG of Alaska:

H.R. 740.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article IV, Section 3, Clause 2 and Article 1, Section 8, Clause 3.

By Mr. NOLAN:

H.J. Res. 29.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The Constitutional Authority to Amend the Constitution is found in Article 5 of the Constitution.

By Mr. PRICE of Georgia:

H.J. Res. 30.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article V whereby the U.S. Constitution may be altered.

By Mr. SCHIFF:

H.J. Res. 31.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to Article V of the United States Constitution.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 24: Mr. YOUNG of Indiana, Mr. MILLER of Florida, Mr. MICA, Mr. ADERHOLT, Mr. STUTZMAN, Mr. CRAWFORD, Mr. CASSIDY, Mr. BOUSTANY, and Mr. FLEISCHMANN.

H.R. 50: Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Mr. MICHAUD, Mr. TAKANO, and Mr. THOMPSON of California.

H.R. 104: Mr. MESSER and Mr. COTTON.

H.R. 111: Mr. PETERS of California, Mr. RUSH, and Mr. MCNERNEY.

H.R. 124: Mr. BILIRAKIS, Ms. DEGETTE, Mr. LOBIONDO and Mr. MICHAUD.

H.R. 148: Mr. JEFFRIES and Mr. FARR.

H.R. 164: Mr. GERLACH, Mr. MCNERNEY, Mr. ROE of Tennessee and Mr. WHITFIELD.

H.R. 165: Mr. JONES.

H.R. 182: Mr. TIERNEY, Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, and Mr. HOLT.

H.R. 183: Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Mr. KING of New York, and Mr. BISHOP of New York.

H.R. 203: Mr. GARDNER.

H.R. 217: Mr. ROTHFUS.

H.R. 220: Mr. UPTON.

H.R. 236: Mr. QUIGLEY.

H.R. 239: Mr. BARLETTA and Mr. MULVANEY.

H.R. 241: Mr. WHITFIELD.

H.R. 247: Mr. STIVERS and Mr. FINCHER.

H.R. 268: Mr. DOGGETT.

H.R. 273: Mr. MCHENRY and Mr. PERRY.

H.R. 274: Mr. HOLT, Mr. COURTNEY, Mr. PERLMUTTER, Ms. FRANKEL of Florida, Mr. MORAN, Ms. JENKINS, and Mr. CLAY.

H.R. 280: Mr. SARBANES.

H.R. 281: Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania.

H.R. 301: Mr. SENSENBRENNER.

H.R. 303: Mr. ROSS, Mr. BACHUS, and Mr. LOBIONDO.

H.R. 318: Mr. ROYCE.

H.R. 321: Ms. ESHOO and Ms. GABBARD.

H.R. 324: Mr. MCINTYRE and Mr. CASSIDY.

H.R. 335: Mr. WALDEN, Mr. RICE of South Carolina, Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, and Mr. GIBBS.

H.R. 352: Mr. DESANTIS, Mr. SCHWEIKERT, Mr. BENTIVOLIO, and Mr. LAMALFA.

H.R. 359: Mr. LOBIONDO.

H.R. 360: Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Mr. HOLT, Mr. LARSEN of Washington, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, Ms. CLARKE, Mr. CLEAVER, Mr. CLYBURN, Ms. EDWARDS, Mr. AL GREEN of Texas, Mr. HORSFORD, Mr. JEFFRIES, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Mr. VEASEY, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Ms. DEGETTE, Ms. FRANKEL of Florida, Ms. TITUS, Ms. BROWNLEY of California, Mr. HOYER, Ms. SINEMA, Mr. SCHNEIDER, Mr. MURPHY of Florida, Mr. MCNERNEY, Mr. DEUTCH, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. MATHESON, Mr. CROWLEY, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Mr. TONKO, and Mr. CONNOLLY.

H.R. 366: Mr. CARTWRIGHT, Ms. KUSTER, Mr. PAULSEN, and Mr. WALBERG.

H.R. 377: Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Mr. O'ROURKE, Mr. CROWLEY, Mr. GARCIA, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, and Mr. VARGAS.

H.R. 416: Mr. ROKITA and Mr. WEBER of Texas.

H.R. 419: Mr. MCCAUL and Mr. JONES.

H.R. 447: Mr. ROKITA, Mrs. NOEM, Mr. KLINE, Mr. SENSENBRENNER, and Mr. SCALISE.

H.R. 454: Mr. PITTS and Mr. CARTWRIGHT.

H.R. 492: Mr. MESSER, Mr. JONES, Mr. SCHWEIKERT, Mr. BENTIVOLIO, Mr. BENISHEK, Mr. DESANTIS, and Mr. LAMALFA.

H.R. 493: Mr. MILLER of Florida, Mr. POE of Texas, Mr. HALL, and Mr. LIPINSKI.

H.R. 497: Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana, Mr. FITZPATRICK and Mr. MATHESON.

H.R. 503: Mr. BUTTERFIELD and Mr. ROKITA.

H.R. 517: Mr. RANGEL, Mr. POCAN, Mr. MORAN, and Mr. TAKANO.

H.R. 530: Mr. FITZPATRICK.

H.R. 540: Ms. ZOE LOFGREN.

H.R. 557: Mr. GRIFFIN of Arkansas.

H.R. 578: Mr. GRIFFIN of Arkansas, Mr. JORDAN, Mr. LAMALFA, Mr. BRADY of Texas, Mr. WALBERG, Mr. MEADOWS, and Mr. WILSON of South Carolina.

H.R. 580: Mr. GERLACH, Mr. BISHOP of Utah, and Mr. PEARCE.

H.R. 582: Mr. HALL, Mr. POSEY, and Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee.

H.R. 583: Mrs. DAVIS of California.

H.R. 584: Mr. LIPINSKI, Ms. ZOE LOFGREN, Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, and Mr. BLUMENAUER.

H.R. 588: Ms. GABBARD, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, and Mr. SCHIFF.

H.R. 597: Mrs. NAPOLITANO.

H.R. 612: Mr. MARINO.

H.R. 618: Mr. MCGOVERN.

H.R. 627: Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. TIBERI, Ms. BORDALLO, Mr. FARR, and Mr. LANCE.

H.R. 629: Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD.

H.R. 636: Mr. MCINTYRE, Mr. KILMER, Ms. DELBENE, Mr. MURPHY of Florida, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. PETERS of Michigan, Mr. O'ROURKE, Ms. TITUS, Mr. LANGEVIN, Mr. HUFFMAN, Mr. VARGAS, Mr. BARBER, Mr. LEVIN, Mr. WELCH, Mr. HECK of Washington, and Mr. LOWENTHAL.

H.R. 661: Mr. HOLT, Mr. GRIJALVA, and Mr. RUSH.

H.R. 673: Mr. HUIZENGA of Michigan, Mr. MESSER, Mr. WOLF, and Mr. REED.

H.R. 675: Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California.

H.R. 676: Mr. HOLT, Mr. LEWIS, and Mr. SCOTT of Virginia.

H.J. Res. 11: Mr. NUNNELEE.

H.J. Res. 25: Ms. GABBARD and Mrs. NAPOLITANO.

H.J. Res. 26: Mr. POSEY.

H. Con. Res. 3: Mr. BENISHEK.

H. Res. 11: Mr. COHEN, Mr. GRAYSON, Mr. HUFFMAN, and Mr. POCAN.

H. Res. 12: Mr. GRAYSON, Mr. HUFFMAN, and Mr. POCAN.

H. Res. 24: Mr. HARPER, Mr. CASSIDY, and Mrs. ROBY.

H. Res. 30: Ms. CLARKE, Mr. REED, Ms. ZOE LOFGREN, Ms. GABBARD, Mrs. LOWEY, Mr. LYNCH, Mr. THOMPSON of California, and Mr. POCAN.

H. Res. 36: Mr. JONES and Mr. SCALISE.

H. Res. 51: Mr. COURTNEY and Mr. TAKANO.

H. Res. 65: Mr. POE of Texas, Mr. CHABOT, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Mr. KINZINGER of Illinois, Mr. RADEL, Mr. ISRAEL, Mr. HOLDING, Mr. MESSER, Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina, Mr. PASCRELL, Mr. SHERMAN, Ms. ROSLEHTINEN, Mr. TURNER, Mr. KELLY, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. PERRY, Mr. COLLINS of Georgia, Mr. YOHO, and Mr. COOK.

AMENDMENTS

Under clause 8 of rule XVIII, proposed amendments were submitted as follows:

H.R. 273

OFFERED BY: MR. VAN HOLLEN

AMENDMENT No. 1: Page 2, after line 11, add the following:

SEC. 2. SHORT TITLE; TABLE OF CONTENTS.

(a) SHORT TITLE.—This Act (excluding section 1) may be cited as the "Balanced Approach to Deficit Reduction".

(b) TABLE OF CONTENTS.—

Sec. 2. Short title; table of contents.

TITLE I—BUDGET PROCESS AMENDMENTS TO REPLACE FISCAL YEAR 2013 SEQUESTRATION

Sec. 101. Repeal and replace the 2013 sequester.

Sec. 102. Protecting veterans programs from sequester.

TITLE II—AGRICULTURAL SAVINGS

Sec. 201. One-year extension of agricultural commodity programs, except direct payment programs.

TITLE III—OIL AND GAS SUBSIDIES

Sec. 301. Limitation on section 199 deduction attributable to oil, natural gas, or primary products thereof.

Sec. 302. Prohibition on using last-in, first-out accounting for major integrated oil companies.

Sec. 303. Modifications of foreign tax credit rules applicable to major integrated oil companies which are dual capacity taxpayers.

TITLE IV—THE BUFFETT RULE

Sec. 401. Fair share tax on high-income taxpayers.

TITLE V—SENSE OF THE HOUSE

Sec. 501. Sense of the House on the need for a fair, balanced and bipartisan approach to long-term deficit reduction.

TITLE I—BUDGET PROCESS AMENDMENTS TO REPLACE FISCAL YEAR 2013 SEQUESTRATION

SEC. 101. REPEAL AND REPLACE THE 2013 SEQUESTER.

(a) ELIMINATION OF THE FISCAL YEAR 2013 SEQUESTRATION FOR DISCRETIONARY SPENDING.—Section 251A(7)(A) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 is repealed.

(b) ELIMINATION OF THE FISCAL YEAR 2013 SEQUESTRATION FOR DIRECT SPENDING.—Any sequestration order issued by the President under the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 to carry out reductions to direct spending for fiscal year 2013 pursuant to section 251A of such Act shall have no force or effect.

(c) SAVINGS.—The savings set forth by the enactment of title II shall achieve the savings that would otherwise have occurred as a result of the sequestration under section 251A of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

SEC. 102. PROTECTING VETERANS PROGRAMS FROM SEQUESTER.

Section 256(e)(2)(E) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 is repealed.

TITLE II—AGRICULTURAL SAVINGS

SEC. 201. ONE-YEAR EXTENSION OF AGRICULTURAL COMMODITY PROGRAMS, EXCEPT DIRECT PAYMENT PROGRAMS.

(a) EXTENSION.—Except as provided in subsection (b) and notwithstanding any other provision of law, the authorities provided by each provision of title I of the Food, Conservation, and Energy Act of 2008 (Public Law 110-246; 122 Stat. 1651) and each amendment made by that title (and for mandatory programs at such funding levels), as in effect on September 30, 2013, shall continue, and the Secretary of Agriculture shall carry out the authorities, until September 30, 2014.

(b) TERMINATION OF DIRECT PAYMENT PROGRAMS.—

(1) COVERED COMMODITIES.—The extension provided by subsection (a) shall not apply with respect to the direct payment program under section 1103 of the Food, Conservation, and Energy Act of 2008 (7 U.S.C. 8713).

(2) PEANUTS.—The extension provided by subsection (a) shall not apply with respect to the direct payment program under section 1303 of the Food, Conservation, and Energy Act of 2008 (7 U.S.C. 7953).

(c) EFFECTIVE DATE.—This section shall take effect on the earlier of—

- (1) the date of the enactment of this Act; and
- (2) September 30, 2013.

TITLE III—OIL AND GAS SUBSIDIES

SEC. 301. LIMITATION ON SECTION 199 DEDUCTION ATTRIBUTABLE TO OIL, NATURAL GAS, OR PRIMARY PRODUCTS THEREOF.

(a) DENIAL OF DEDUCTION.—Paragraph (4) of section 199(c) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by adding at the end the following new subparagraph:

“(E) SPECIAL RULE FOR CERTAIN OIL AND GAS INCOME.—In the case of any taxpayer who is a major integrated oil company (as defined in section 167(h)(5)(B)) for the taxable year, the term ‘domestic production gross receipts’ shall not include gross receipts from the production, transportation, or distribution of oil, natural gas, or any primary product (within the meaning of subsection (d)(9)) thereof.”

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendment made by this section shall apply to taxable years ending after December 31, 2013.

SEC. 302. PROHIBITION ON USING LAST-IN, FIRST-OUT ACCOUNTING FOR MAJOR INTEGRATED OIL COMPANIES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 472 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

“(h) MAJOR INTEGRATED OIL COMPANIES.—Notwithstanding any other provision of this section, a major integrated oil company (as defined in section 167(h)(5)(B)) may not use the method provided in subsection (b) in inventorying of any goods.”

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE AND SPECIAL RULE.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The amendment made by subsection (a) shall apply to taxable years ending after December 31, 2013.

(2) CHANGE IN METHOD OF ACCOUNTING.—In the case of any taxpayer required by the amendment made by this section to change its method of accounting for its first taxable year ending after December 31, 2013—

(A) such change shall be treated as initiated by the taxpayer,

(B) such change shall be treated as made with the consent of the Secretary of the Treasury, and

(C) the net amount of the adjustments required to be taken into account by the taxpayer under section 481 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 shall be taken into account ratably over a period (not greater than 8 taxable years) beginning with such first taxable year.

SEC. 303. MODIFICATIONS OF FOREIGN TAX CREDIT RULES APPLICABLE TO MAJOR INTEGRATED OIL COMPANIES WHICH ARE DUAL CAPACITY TAXPAYERS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 901 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by redesignating subsection (n) as subsection (o) and by inserting after subsection (m) the following new subsection:

“(n) SPECIAL RULES RELATING TO MAJOR INTEGRATED OIL COMPANIES WHICH ARE DUAL CAPACITY TAXPAYERS.—

“(1) GENERAL RULE.—Notwithstanding any other provision of this chapter, any amount paid or accrued by a dual capacity taxpayer

which is a major integrated oil company (as defined in section 167(h)(5)(B)) to a foreign country or possession of the United States for any period shall not be considered a tax—

“(A) if, for such period, the foreign country or possession does not impose a generally applicable income tax, or

“(B) to the extent such amount exceeds the amount (determined in accordance with regulations) which—

“(i) is paid by such dual capacity taxpayer pursuant to the generally applicable income tax imposed by the country or possession, or

“(ii) would be paid if the generally applicable income tax imposed by the country or possession were applicable to such dual capacity taxpayer.

Nothing in this paragraph shall be construed to imply the proper treatment of any such amount not in excess of the amount determined under subparagraph (B).

“(2) DUAL CAPACITY TAXPAYER.—For purposes of this subsection, the term ‘dual capacity taxpayer’ means, with respect to any foreign country or possession of the United States, a person who—

“(A) is subject to a levy of such country or possession, and

“(B) receives (or will receive) directly or indirectly a specific economic benefit (as determined in accordance with regulations) from such country or possession.

“(3) GENERALLY APPLICABLE INCOME TAX.—For purposes of this subsection—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—The term ‘generally applicable income tax’ means an income tax (or a series of income taxes) which is generally imposed under the laws of a foreign country or possession on income derived from the conduct of a trade or business within such country or possession.

“(B) EXCEPTIONS.—Such term shall not include a tax unless it has substantial application, by its terms and in practice, to—

“(i) persons who are not dual capacity taxpayers, and

“(ii) persons who are citizens or residents of the foreign country or possession.”

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The amendments made by this section shall apply to taxes paid or accrued in taxable years beginning after the date of the enactment of this Act.

(2) CONTRARY TREATY OBLIGATIONS UPHeld.—The amendments made by this section shall not apply to the extent contrary to any treaty obligation of the United States.

TITLE IV—THE BUFFETT RULE

SEC. 401. FAIR SHARE TAX ON HIGH-INCOME TAXPAYERS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Subchapter A of chapter 1 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by adding at the end the following new part:

“PART VII—FAIR SHARE TAX ON HIGH-INCOME TAXPAYERS

“SEC. 59B. FAIR SHARE TAX.

“(a) GENERAL RULE.—

“(1) PHASE-IN OF TAX.—In the case of any high-income taxpayer, there is hereby imposed for a taxable year (in addition to any other tax imposed by this subtitle) a tax equal to the product of—

“(A) the amount determined under paragraph (2), and

“(B) a fraction (not to exceed 1)—

“(i) the numerator of which is the excess of—

“(I) the taxpayer’s adjusted gross income, over

“(II) the dollar amount in effect under subsection (c)(1), and

“(ii) the denominator of which is the dollar amount in effect under subsection (c)(1).

“(2) AMOUNT OF TAX.—The amount of tax determined under this paragraph is an amount equal to the excess (if any) of—

“(A) the tentative fair share tax for the taxable year, over

“(B) the excess of—

“(i) the sum of—

“(I) the regular tax liability (as defined in section 26(b)) for the taxable year,

“(II) the tax imposed by section 55 for the taxable year, plus

“(III) the payroll tax for the taxable year, over

“(ii) the credits allowable under part IV of subchapter A (other than sections 27(a), 31, and 34).

“(b) TENTATIVE FAIR SHARE TAX.—For purposes of this section—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—The tentative fair share tax for the taxable year is 30 percent of the excess of—

“(A) the adjusted gross income of the taxpayer, over

“(B) the modified charitable contribution deduction for the taxable year.

“(2) MODIFIED CHARITABLE CONTRIBUTION DEDUCTION.—For purposes of paragraph (1)—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—The modified charitable contribution deduction for any taxable year is an amount equal to the amount which bears the same ratio to the deduction allowable under section 170 (section 642(c) in the case of a trust or estate) for such taxable year as—

“(i) the amount of itemized deductions allowable under the regular tax (as defined in section 55) for such taxable year, determined after the application of section 68, bears to

“(ii) such amount, determined before the application of section 68.

“(B) TAXPAYER MUST ITEMIZE.—In the case of any individual who does not elect to itemize deductions for the taxable year, the modified charitable contribution deduction shall be zero.

“(c) HIGH-INCOME TAXPAYER.—For purposes of this section—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—The term ‘high-income taxpayer’ means, with respect to any taxable year, any taxpayer (other than a corporation) with an adjusted gross income for such taxable year in excess of \$1,000,000 (50 percent of such amount in the case of a married individual who files a separate return).

“(2) INFLATION ADJUSTMENT.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—In the case of a taxable year beginning after 2014, the \$1,000,000 amount under paragraph (1) shall be increased by an amount equal to—

“(i) such dollar amount, multiplied by

“(ii) the cost-of-living adjustment determined under section 1(f)(3) for the calendar year in which the taxable year begins, determined by substituting ‘calendar year 2013’ for ‘calendar year 1992’ in subparagraph (B) thereof.

“(B) ROUNDING.—If any amount as adjusted under subparagraph (A) is not a multiple of \$10,000, such amount shall be rounded to the next lowest multiple of \$10,000.

“(d) PAYROLL TAX.—For purposes of this section, the payroll tax for any taxable year is an amount equal to the excess of—

“(1) the taxes imposed on the taxpayer under sections 1401, 1411, 3101, 3201, and 3211(a) (to the extent such taxes are attributable to the rate of tax in effect under section 3101) with respect to such taxable year or wages or compensation received during the taxable year, over

“(2) the deduction allowable under section 164(f) for such taxable year.

“(e) SPECIAL RULE FOR ESTATES AND TRUSTS.—For purposes of this section, in the case of an estate or trust, adjusted gross income shall be computed in the manner described in section 67(e).

“(f) NOT TREATED AS TAX IMPOSED BY THIS CHAPTER FOR CERTAIN PURPOSES.—The tax imposed under this section shall not be treated as tax imposed by this chapter for purposes of determining the amount of any credit under this chapter (other than the credit allowed under section 27(a)) or for purposes of section 55.”.

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—Section 26(b)(2) of such Code is amended by redesignating subparagraphs (C) through (X) as subparagraphs (D) through (Y), respectively, and by inserting after subparagraph (B) the following new subparagraph:

“(C) section 59B (relating to fair share tax),”.

(c) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of parts for subchapter A of chapter 1 of such

Code is amended by adding at the end the following new item:

“Part VII—Fair Share Tax on High-Income Taxpayers”.

(d) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall apply to taxable years beginning after December 31, 2013.

TITLE V—SENSE OF THE HOUSE

SEC. 501. SENSE OF THE HOUSE ON THE NEED FOR A FAIR, BALANCED AND BIPARTISAN APPROACH TO LONG-TERM DEFICIT REDUCTION.

(a) The House finds that—

(1) every bipartisan commission has recommended – and the majority of Americans agree – that we should take a balanced, bipartisan approach to reducing the deficit that addresses both revenue and spending; and

(2) sequestration is a meat-ax approach to deficit reduction that imposes deep and mindless cuts, regardless of their impact on vital services and investments.

(b) It is the sense of the House that the Congress should replace the entire 10-year sequester established by the Budget Control Act of 2011 with a balanced approach that would increase revenues without increasing the tax burden on middle-income Americans, and decrease long-term spending while maintaining the Medicare guarantee, protecting Social Security and a strong social safety net, and making strategic investments in education, science, research, and critical infrastructure necessary to compete in the global economy.