



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 113th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 159

WASHINGTON, WEDNESDAY, FEBRUARY 27, 2013

No. 28

House of Representatives

The House met at 10 a.m and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN).

DESIGNATION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

WASHINGTON, DC,
February 27, 2013.

I hereby appoint the Honorable ILEANA ROS-LEHTINEN 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.

SEQUESTRATION WORKDAYS

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

Mr. BROOKS of Alabama. Madam Speaker, Secretary of Defense Leon Panetta states sequestration "would be a disaster in terms of the Defense Department. As far as our budget is concerned, as far as our ability to respond to the threats that are out there, it has a big impact."

Over time, sequestration's disproportionate cuts to national defense will reduce our military to its smallest number of uniformed personnel since before

World War II, its smallest number of operational naval vessels since World War I, and its smallest number of operational aircraft in the history of the United States Air Force.

But national security is not the only sequestration risk. In my home district in north Alabama, President Obama has ordered that roughly 14,000 highly skilled and irreplaceable Department of Defense civilian employees suffer 20 percent furloughs and 20 percent salary cuts.

Redstone Arsenal's engineers, scientists, and other civilian defense staff are critical to national security in a time of international instability. Their knowledge and skill sets are unique, virtually irreplaceable, and may be lost to national security forever if these workers are forced to find work elsewhere.

The damage I've just described to north Alabama's economy is before President Obama starts hammering defense and NASA contractors and many other Tennessee Valley Federal employees who provide worthwhile services to their country.

Nationwide, the economic impact is absolutely staggering. Sequestration risks 1.5 to 2 million job losses, with a resulting 1 percent worsening of America's unemployment rate. It is unwise to subject America's fragile economy to job losses of this magnitude.

For emphasis, and despite White House, Senate leadership, and House leadership efforts to the contrary, I voted against sequestration and the Budget Control Act of 2011, quite frankly, because the risk to America was simply unacceptable. Unfortunately, my vote was in the minority.

In 2012, and despite President Obama's veto threats, the House twice passed legislation to fix sequestration. In response, the Senate not only refused to vote on the House's sequestration solutions, the Senate irresponsibly refused to propose solutions of its own.

Hence, despite the Senate enjoying more than a year and a half to do its job, Senate inaction and delay have given America yet another short-term crisis.

So here we are. America faces three major crises: Sequestration, a continuing resolution to fund the government, and yet another debt ceiling crisis.

While I agree with the House leadership's view that, since the Senate has done nothing to solve this problem, it is appropriate for the Senate to act first on sequestration this time, I am troubled the House is scheduled to work only 24 days in March and April, combined. Conversely, there are 19 workdays in which the House is not in session. Stated differently, the House will only work 56 percent of workdays and be on recess from Washington 44 percent of the time.

The American people work on workdays. Congress should do no less. Actions speak louder than words. Under the circumstances America faces, a part-time Congress is simply unacceptable.

As sequestration unfolds, as national security, Federal Government functions, and the American economy slowly but surely deteriorate, the American people will intensify pressure on HARRY REID's Senate to finally do its job.

Americans are suffering. National defense is suffering. The suffering of Americans is not in recess during this crisis. Congress should not be in recess either.

We signed up to do a job, and that job is not done. The House must provide leadership and prove we are serious about doing the people's business, and Washington is where the people's business is done.

Given the magnitude of the risks and damage done by sequestration to America on a daily basis, I respectfully request that the House remain in session and do our jobs on each and every

□ 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.

H663

workday until sequestration is resolved.

The House has passed numerous sequestration solutions. It is long past time for the Senate to wake from its slumber, respond to the clarion call of the American people, and pass a sequestration solution.

CLIMATE CHANGE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New Mexico (Mr. BEN RAY LUJÁN) for 5 minutes.

Mr. BEN RAY LUJÁN of New Mexico. Madam Speaker, in recent years we've seen an increase in major weather events, especially in the continental United States. From record-setting superstorms to severe droughts and devastating wildfires, the recent impact of climate change cannot be ignored.

In my home State of New Mexico, ranchers and farmers are struggling to maintain their livelihoods in the face of drought conditions, while last year wildfires threatened communities that have still not fully recovered.

A rapidly changing climate affects everyone on the planet. Climate change impacts agriculture, water supplies, power and transportation systems, and even our health and public safety.

In the aftermath of Hurricane Sandy and one of the worst wildfire seasons in the western United States that we've ever seen, it's time to work together on commonsense solutions that will allow us to use power in a smarter manner, produce clean and abundant renewable energy, and reduce emissions through energy efficiency. These are things we should be able to agree on and work together on in a bipartisan manner.

It is critical that we move forward with a sense of urgency and take meaningful action that addresses the very real threats of climate change that are already impacting our country.

Sequestration is devastating America today. Madam Speaker, we just heard from one of my colleagues. This week we're scheduled to go on recess on Friday. I hope that my colleague that spoke today, Madam Speaker, reaches out to Speaker BOEHNER and ERIC CANTOR and says, Keep us in session. Let's stop this sequestration from happening. And it's quite simple. The fix to this legislation could be put together in one sentence: Stop it. I guess even better, in two words.

Madam Speaker, we have a sense of urgency across the country when it comes to working on climate change legislation, but as we talk about the impacts to each and every one of our districts with what sequestration will bring with job losses, let's stand together and stop this. Let's ask our leadership to allow us to vote on a simple couple of words: Stop sequestration, and let's prevent it from happening.

SEQUESTRATION: THE LAST TOOL WE HAVE

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

Mr. McCLINTOCK. Madam Speaker, the decline and fall of the Roman Empire offers us a sobering warning of a great nation that became overextended and war-weary abroad while it became utterly profligate and decadent at home. Its economy in shambles and its treasury bankrupt, the mightiest military power on Earth fell prey for backward hordes that had previously existed only on the fringes of civilization.

Now, 3 years ago Admiral Mike Mullen warned our Nation that our national debt is our biggest national security threat. Now, that was 3 years ago when our debt stood at \$13.5 trillion. Today we owe over \$16.5 trillion. In other words, just since he issued this warning, we've added more to our country's debt than we did in our Nation's first 200 years of existence.

No nation has ever taxed and borrowed and spent its way to prosperity, but many nations have taxed and borrowed and spent their way to economic ruin and bankruptcy, and history today is screaming this warning at us, that bankrupt nations aren't around very long because before you can provide for the common defense, you have to be able to pay for it, and the ability of our Nation to do so is now coming into grave question.

□ 1010

Now, just in the first 4 weeks of this year, Congress added more than a third of a trillion dollars of new spending to this already crushing burden. The fiscal cliff deal added \$300 billion and the Hurricane Sandy bill another \$50 billion, more than 90 percent of which had nothing to do with emergency relief for storm victims.

Earlier this month, Congress simply did away with the debt limit altogether until mid-May. Two years ago, Congress passed the Budget Control Act that authorized the biggest single expansion of debt in our Nation's history; but Congress at least also agreed to reduce the projected deficit by \$1.2 trillion over the next 10 years, either through the supercommittee or, failing that, through automatic budget reductions called "the sequester."

Now, the sequester doesn't actually cut spending in any conventional sense of the word. After a decade in which spending has grown 64 percent, or nearly twice the rate of inflation and population growth, the sequester merely limits the increase next year to about one-half of one percent.

I opposed that act, in part because the sequester was less than one-third of what officials at Standard & Poor's warned was the minimum deficit reduction necessary to preserve our Nation's AAA credit rating. I also objected to across-the-board cuts that treat our highest priorities the same as

our lowest priorities and to the disproportionate impact that it would have on our defense budget. Those warnings fell on deaf ears at the time.

But since then, twice the House has tried to correct these shortcomings with legislation to replace the worst of the defense cuts with long-term entitlement reform. Ultimately, that's the only way we're going to bring our fiscal crisis and its spiraling debt under control.

Both measures died in the Senate; and after the November election, the likelihood of entitlement reform over the next several years is exceedingly remote, which means that however imperfect the sequester may be, it is at this moment in our history the only tool currently available to us to begin to point our Nation back toward fiscal solvency and away from the perilous fiscal path that we are now upon.

We need to give administrators, especially the military command, the flexibility to set priorities and manage our money accordingly; but the overall sequester reductions must be maintained.

A few months ago, the chief of sovereign debt for Standard & Poor's made this point: that although the sequester was insufficient to justify maintaining our AAA credit rating, it was at least a step in the right direction. He said:

The sequester was an agreement that Congress made with itself, and we would view any step back from that agreement very negatively.

Madam Speaker, when the history of our era is written, let it not be said that ours was a generation of locusts that consumed not only the wealth we inherited from our fathers and mothers, but also stripped bare the futures of our sons and daughters. Let us instead begin a new direction for our Nation, stepping back from the fiscal precipice that threatens to destroy our Nation from within.

INSURANCE PREMIUM PRICE CHANGES

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

Mr. McDERMOTT. Madam Speaker, I rise to talk about the health insurance industry and its role in our greatest national achievement: full implementation of the Affordable Care Act.

In the last few weeks, insurance companies, companies that reported \$12.7 billion in profits, had been running a scare campaign arguing that premiums will increase later in the year. They tell us that when they roll out their 2014 health care coverage plans, they will increase premiums unless we weaken the Affordable Care Act's key consumer protections.

The insurance companies didn't get 100 percent of what they wanted, but they got a lot. They blocked the public option, secured an individual mandate guaranteeing that 30 million Americans soon will be customers. That's one

of the most successful lobbying experiments I've ever seen.

But now that we are just a few months away from full implementation of the Affordable Care Act, the health industry is launching what The Washington Post calls "an all-out, last-ditch effort to shield themselves from the blame" for the rate increases that they will impose. Unless they are allowed to charge significantly more money, they tell us, the whole system will collapse.

Now, this is perplexing. We made every effort to address the concerns of the industry when we developed this landmark legislation. It's also deeply troubling that the industry that will gain so much from health reform is now engaging in a misleading PR campaign against it. Despite unprecedented profits and surplus cash reserves, it is deliberately undermining the law. It already succeeded in shaping its benefits.

So let's take a careful look at their claims. For years, companies have offered healthy young adults junk health insurance at cut-rate prices: plans with sky-high deductibles and lifetime limits that didn't cover much. For \$100 a month, you could get a plan that offered practically no useful coverage.

Meanwhile, older people with escalating health care costs were stuck with crippling bills or locked out of the market altogether. Across the board, plans dropped consumers, coverage changed without warning, and people of all ages went without care. ObamaCare will finally put a stop to these abuses.

With better plans with real benefits costs, more than the meager plans marketed by the industry to young people, the stability and affordability will win out in the long run. There are no more games. Instead of avoiding risk, the industry will have to manage it.

ObamaCare will financially help the large majority of healthy young consumers. In fact, 90 percent of the currently uninsured adults under 30 will be eligible for subsidized coverage. Additionally, increased transparency and competition will force rates to drop further, along with the growing pool of young participants who are cheaper to cover. We did all this in my home State of Washington years ago, so I know it can be done.

For the first time, average Americans not insured through a job will get health insurance without having insurance that won't drop you when you're sick, insurance that won't discriminate against women, insurance that won't waste your money on excessive marketing, and will actually cover needed care. These are the crucial consumer protections we fought and got.

Which is the heavier price: an extra \$20 a month for a young person with a healthy income to have reliable insurance or bankrupting an uninsured family? Meeting the needs of the Nation and preserving the well-being of our population is healthiest for all.

So I'm calling on the health insurance industry to be team players and to be good corporate citizens. They have a lot riding on this roll-out, at least as much as the Obama administration and the Congress. We need to work together, not against each other. We have to make this advance work.

We don't need to have a scare campaign on television telling people that if ObamaCare goes in, your premiums are going to go up, and it's his fault. They're the ones with the profits, they're the ones with the reserves, they're the ones that are raising the prices.

They have to be faced with that, Madam Speaker, because otherwise the public is going to be confused. They tried to confuse people all through the establishment of the Affordable Care Act. They didn't succeed. And, in fact, when they used it in the campaign, the people said, do you know what, we like Obama, we like what he did, we want it to happen. So the insurance companies had to go back to the trenches and figure out a way to confuse the American people. Stop it, insurance industry.

SEQUESTRATION

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

Mr. WILLIAMS. Madam Speaker, President Obama's sequester is bad for America. There's no getting around it. Good programs are going to be cut, good people are going to be furloughed; and bad leadership from President Obama is to blame. In the last four years, almost every important budget deadline has been met with impasse and little has been done to enact a responsible budget.

□ 1020

Systematic failure to perform the basic responsibilities of governing has led us to the catastrophic sequestration we see today.

President Obama came up with this idea for the sequester as a temporary solution for another fiscal crisis in 2011. As we've been saying for months, House Republicans are the only ones who have taken action to balance the budget. Last Congress, the House passed two bills, the Sequester Replacement Reconciliation Act and the Spending Reduction Act. However, in recent remarks at the White House, President Obama attempted to blame House Republicans—who control only one-half of one-third of the government—for the looming cuts.

If there's going to be a solution, President Obama is going to have to work with his own political party in the Senate and negotiate with the House. Yet all the President has done so far is call for higher taxes again. He got his higher taxes—\$600 billion from higher earners, with no corresponding spending cuts—at the end of 2012. It seems he will not stop until every single American has to hand over more of

their hard-earned money to the Federal Government—which, I might add, has a bad track record of spending it.

There is no denying that the government spends too much, but these blind cuts are irresponsible and will have a disastrous effect on our military. Yesterday, the Joint Chiefs of Staff testified at a hearing that our national security will be put at risk if they are forced to make deep reductions in spending for manpower, training, and equipment modernization programs.

This is no longer a debate between Congress and the White House to gain the upper hand. This is real, this is serious, and this is the time to take action. In fact, I sent a letter to the President this week urging him to act now to prevent the harmful fallout that the sequester will cause. I pray that he reads it.

While Friday does mark the sequester deadline, we have until March 27 to do the right thing on behalf of our men and women in uniform, as well as the hundreds of thousands of employees expected to be drastically impacted by the sequester.

If the President continues his unwillingness to stop campaigning and start helping the American people who elected him to lead, then at the very least we need to allow the Department of Defense and the Department of Veterans Affairs to operate under a budget rather than a continuing resolution. This would give them greater flexibility and put them in the best possible position to absorb these across-the-board cuts. By letting the DOD and VA operate under a budget, these agencies can prevent permanent damage from the arbitrary sequester cuts.

Madam Speaker, I represent Texas' 25th Congressional District, which includes a large portion of Fort Hood—one of the largest military installations in the world. The United States Army estimates \$291 million in cuts for Fort Hood, including nearly 600 civilian jobs and nearly 30,000 jobs statewide.

This is preventable. And quite frankly, it's totally unacceptable. We shouldn't have to move a third bill in the House before the Senate finally acts. It's time for President Obama to drop the politics and campaign speeches and do something. Putting our public safety, national security and economy at risk by letting the sequester pass without preventative action is reckless and destructive. Our troops, our businesses, and our families deserve better. Americans expect our President to lead.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

Washington, DC, February 25, 2013.

Hon. BARACK H. OBAMA,

The White House,

Washington, DC.

DEAR PRESIDENT OBAMA: I am writing to express my outrage over the proposed cuts to the Department of Defense as part of the sequestration phase of the Budget Control Act of 2011. As commander-in-chief of the U.S. military, your inaction to prevent these cuts from happening to our military and their families is unconscionable.

In the 112th Congress, the House of Representatives passed two bills, H.R. 5652, the Sequester Replacement Reconciliation Act of 2012 and H.R. 6684, the Spending Reduction Act of 2012 which would have canceled the sequester of approximately \$98 billion in discretionary defense, discretionary non-defense, and mandatory defense FY2013 spending. Neither bill was even considered by the U.S. Senate. The House of Representatives shouldn't have to move a third bill before you or the Senate finally acts.

Secretary of Defense Leon Panetta recently stated, "If sequester happens, it is going to badly damage the readiness of the United States of America. We have the most powerful military force on the face of the earth right now. It is important in terms of providing stability and peace in the world. If sequester goes into effect, and we have to do the kind of cuts that will go right at readiness, right at maintenance, right at training, we are going to weaken the United States. And make it much more difficult for us to respond to the crises in the world."

Gen. Martin Dempsey went further in recent testimony before the Senate Armed Services Committee and stated that sequestration would put our military on a path where the "force is so degraded and so unready" that it would be "immoral to use the force."

Mr. President, I represent the 25th Congressional District of Texas which includes a large portion of Fort Hood—one of the largest military installations in the world. The United States Army estimates \$291 million in cuts for Fort Hood including nearly 600 civilian jobs, and nearly 30 thousand jobs statewide. This is preventable! Let's cut the nonsense—drop the politics, drop the campaign speeches, and do something.

We shouldn't put our national security, public safety, and the economy at risk by letting the sequester pass without preventative action. Our troops, our businesses, and our families deserve better. Mr. President, Americans expect you to lead.

Sincerely,

ROGER WILLIAMS,
Member of Congress.

SEQUESTER

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Arizona (Ms. SINEMA) for 5 minutes.

Ms. SINEMA. Madam Speaker, my State, Arizona, has made tremendous sacrifices in the struggle to stand strong through our Nation's fiscal crisis. Today, Arizona is last in education funding, last in retail growth, and first in home foreclosures.

I'm proud to say, however, that Arizonans are resilient. We are tough. Our State was forged out of rugged frontierism—we're independent and we have deep respect for the traditions that make us Arizona. We've never shrunk from a tough fight and we've never been afraid to roll up our sleeves and work hard. Right now, we're working hard to climb out of the recession that we all face together. It hasn't been easy, but we're doing it.

Arizona is sixth in the Nation for defense sector jobs. Most of these are private sector jobs. Employers have come to Arizona because of our people and our work ethic. We innovate and compete alongside booming defense States like California, Texas, and Virginia.

Employers are hiring thousands of skilled workers from our communities. Our State is a vital resource to our Nation's military readiness. We were able to get there through hard work, innovative thought, and intense collaboration between community and industry partners.

In the greater Phoenix area, our economy is currently growing steadily at the rate of 3 percent, but the deep cuts, known as the sequester, would cut our growth in half. In fact, Arizona's potential job losses caused by sequestration rank 13th among all U.S. States. These losses will be felt by families working in Arizona's defense sector and military base operations. These are skilled, middle class jobs.

Of the nearly 50,000 jobs that we expect to lose in Arizona from the sequester, approximately 35,000 are linked to military readiness and base operations. Furloughs will affect 10,000 civilian workers, and Arizonans will experience a devastating \$52 million pay cut.

I come home each week and I talk about the work that we're doing in Congress, but most of the time I come home to listen. A few weeks ago, I had the opportunity to listen to plant engineers at General Dynamics in Scottsdale. They showed me the high-tech and innovative defense products that were coming right out of our own community, built and programmed by our friends and neighbors. This type of innovation in our own backyard is the future of our State, and that future is in danger.

Last week, a bipartisan group of city elected officials, business leaders, and community advocates gave me a message to bring back to Congress. I'm proud of their joint effort, and I'm proud of their service to our community. I consider it a privilege to deliver their message.

In our State, we are concerned that Congress will turn the clock back on Arizona's hard work and progress. We are worried about hardworking families losing their jobs.

As the granddaughter of a World War II veteran and a proud sister of a gunner's mate in the U.S. Navy today, I remember every day that it is our moral duty to do right by the men and women in uniform who risk their lives to keep us safe.

Avoiding the sequestration should not be about partisanship or finger-pointing; it's about jobs. It's that simple. I stand with the dean of our State's delegation, Senator JOHN MCCAIN, when I say that this sequester will be devastating for Arizona. It's bad for hardworking Americans, and it turns a blind eye to my State's proud efforts and proven perseverance. I affirm my commitment to working with anybody who's willing to put our differences aside and put the people we serve first.

We still have time to stop this. Let's roll up our sleeves together and get the work done.

SEQUESTER

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

Mr. QUIGLEY. Madam Speaker, I rise today because we have to get our fiscal house in order, but sequestration is not the way to do it.

There is no question we need to address our unsustainable debt and deficit. Our debt remains above 73 percent of GDP—up from 36 percent just 6 years ago—and our deficit still hovers just below \$1 trillion. But the solution must be a big, balanced, and bipartisan deficit reduction plan modeled on plans like Cooper-LaTourette over a 10-year period, not the meat-ax approach of sequestration.

We can't pursue deficit reduction at all costs. The cure shouldn't be worse than the disease. The sequester will undermine our growing—but still fragile—economic recovery.

The nonpartisan Congressional Budget Office predicts sequestration would halve economic growth for 2013. Another study projects job loss in 2013 alone would hit 2.1 million jobs, mostly from small businesses. We just went through this not more than 2 months ago, as we remember, the fiscal cliff. Sadly, we seem no wiser for that experience. We continue to bicker rather than plan; we posture rather than negotiate; we delay rather than decide. We go from one crisis to the next, thereby threatening our economy and further undermining the public's tenuous faith in its political institutions.

We lack a comprehensive approach to just about every challenge we face, including climate change, energy, transportation, health care, social insurance, defense spending, immigration reform and gun violence. It is management by paralysis. It's budgeting with a meat cleaver. It's absurd, and it has to end.

The sequester lops off \$1.2 trillion from the Federal budget over the next decade, cutting \$85 billion just this year.

□ 1030

Over the last week, I have met with dozens of groups for whom the sequester is not some abstract budgeting term. For these organizations and people back in my district, sequestration will have real, damaging effects.

I met with the AIDS Foundation of Chicago, which explained that under sequestration in Illinois, 125 AIDS-afflicted families will lose their housing. Another 613 people in Illinois won't receive their medication through the AIDS Drug Assistance program, which will be cut by \$3 million. I also met with the Illinois Partners for Human Service and heard from the Ounce of Prevention Fund. Both groups informed me that 4,000 children in Illinois won't receive Head Start services under sequestration. Thanks to sequestration, 4,100 college students in Illinois won't receive Federal work-study assistance.

The bigger picture in Illinois is equally devastating. Sequestration will cost Illinois more than 53,000 jobs and \$5.3 billion in the State's economic output. Nationwide, sequestration threatens our physical safety as well as our economy. Ten percent of the FAA's workforce could be furloughed, resulting in reduced air traffic control, longer delays, and economic losses for our tourism industries. Meat and poultry inspectors at USDA would also face furlough, potentially shuttering meat processing facilities and even affecting restaurants and grocery stores. Layoffs at the FDA would mean 2,100 fewer safety inspectors. There would be 25,000 fewer breast and cervical cancer screenings for low-income women. Mindless cuts to military and law enforcement affect our ability to protect our borders and meet the ever-present threat of terrorism, both here and abroad.

Madam Speaker, this is unacceptable. Somewhere along the way, buried in the din of the 24-hour news cycle and partisan bellowing, we lost the art of compromise. But that's what allowed the passage of civil rights legislation in the 1960s and saved Social Security in the 1980s. Legislators of both parties sat down and talked to each other, not past each other, to hammer out their differences and achieve something that made this country better.

I have no illusion that everyone in this body agrees with my ideas about reshaping Pentagon spending or reforming entitlements to ensure they provide benefits for generations to come; but I do know that making the changes that are best for the long-term interests of this country can't be accomplished overnight. These decisions require our best effort and precise planning. As the threat of sequester has painfully revealed, a chain saw is no way to create a budget for the most powerful country on Earth.

JUMP-STARTING THE ECONOMY

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

Mr. POCAN. Madam Speaker, as a lifelong Wisconsinite and a proud resident of Madison for the last 30 years, I am deeply humbled and honored to represent Wisconsin's Second District in the House of Representatives. The Second District is home to a world-class university, innovative small businessowners, and hardworking dairy farmers and cheese makers who produce the best milk and cheese you can find.

I ran for Congress because I wanted to ensure these voices, the voices of south central Wisconsin, are heard, respected and represented in Washington. And I am committed to serving their needs by working with my colleagues—all of my colleagues—regardless of party affiliation. But I hate to say it, Madam Speaker, right now the people of Wisconsin's Second District are frus-

trated, and I understand why. When I went home last week, I met with people from all kinds of professions and all walks of life, and their concerns could not have been more different from what we talk about right here in Washington. What they care about is what all families care about: how can they make a living so they can pay their bills, provide for their loved ones, and create opportunities for their children.

They don't care about political finger-pointing. They care about how we in Congress can support an environment where businesses can attract more buyers for their products, hire more workers, and increase wages; in other words, how do we grow the economy.

What I told them, and what I'll repeat here today, is that the sequester and its irresponsible, indiscriminate and across-the-board spending cuts is the exact opposite of what we need to be doing right now to grow our economy. Taken as a whole, these spending cuts represent a harsh austerity policy that I fear could only move our country backwards.

We've seen in Europe the severe effects austerity policies have had on fragile economies working their way back from recessions. Four years after the global economic crisis, our friends across the ocean are at risk of a triple-dip recession. Unemployment is climbing; and even with these massive spending cuts, countries have seen their debt loads increase. Is this the model we want to follow in our country?

Madam Speaker, we must remember that the biggest threat to our long-term economic security is not the deficit. It's the economy. It's a lack of jobs, and it's about the more than 12 million people who are unemployed in this country.

I own a printing shop in Wisconsin; and as a small businessowner, I can tell you that it's about the lack of access to capital because of economic uncertainty, it's about a lack of consumer confidence, and it's about people needing to get back to work. These are the issues we need to address, not austerity; and we are not going to create jobs or help spur spending by gutting critical government programs without any thought to the consequences. To people in Wisconsin, that's just politics as usual.

We need to change the conversation right here in Washington. We need to be talking about what people are talking about in Beloit, in Baraboo, and in Sun Prairie. Instead of asking about how much we can cut, we need to be asking ourselves how we can jump-start the economy, how we can invest in our future, and how we can support our local small businessowners who are the backbone of our communities. That's how we'll fix the economy.

We need to support education, infrastructure projects, research and development, and new industries such as green energy that will help lead to job

growth and bring our unemployment rate down. And by growing the economy, we will fix our fiscal problems.

Now, that doesn't mean I don't see a place for responsible restraint. As the former chair of the Joint Finance Committee in Wisconsin, I understand that when you put together a budget, tough decisions have to be made, and you can stay up all night agonizing over the smallest details, the tiniest programs, because these programs make a difference in people's lives. It's a lot of work, and it should be, because our budget priorities have a direct effect on our middle class families and on long-term economic growth. But the sequester trades in the tough work and replaces it with massive, indiscriminate, and irresponsible spending cuts. It's like taking a meat cleaver to the budget instead of a scalpel.

It could cost 750,000 jobs nationwide, including 36,000 jobs right in Wisconsin. It could mean 70,000 students across the country, and 1,000 in my State, would see their Head Start services eliminated this year, and it would mean \$900 million less in loan guarantees to small businessowners nationwide, including in Wisconsin.

Now, I'm a cosponsor of a plan put forward by Representative VAN HOLLEN that would avert these disastrous spending cuts and replace them with a balanced approach that promotes economic growth while responsibly reducing the deficit. I strongly urge my colleagues to come to the table, stop this irresponsible sequester, and then refocus our efforts.

The time has come to stop talking about harmful spending cuts and start talking about getting the people of Wisconsin and of America back to work. We need less austerity and more prosperity. We don't have time to waste.

SEQUESTRATION AND WEST POINT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York (Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY) for 5 minutes.

Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York. Madam Speaker, earlier this week, I was home in the Hudson Valley at the United States Military Academy at West Point talking to the cadets there to better understand these arbitrary cuts to that legendary American institution that will happen if we fail to act.

West Point has been educating and training our Nation's next generation of military leaders since 1802. It is as old as the Nation itself. Each year, over 1,000 young men and women from all across our country step into the long gray line where two American Presidents, 18 astronauts, 74 Medal of Honor recipients, 70 Rhodes Scholars, and three Heisman Trophy winners have stood before them.

These kids take the hard road. They give up the easy life to serve us and our country. For many of them, their time

at the Point is just the beginning of a lifetime of selfless service. Indeed, scores of West Point graduates—recent West Point graduates—have made the ultimate sacrifice serving us in Iraq and Afghanistan.

While I was there, I had the opportunity, in fact, to walk among the graves of the heroes buried there on that beautiful plain high above the Hudson River. Many are buried by year with the classmates with whom they went to school.

Tomorrow, General Norman Schwarzkopf will be laid to rest in this cemetery; and in that very hour, we will be here facing a choice of whether we will ask more of those who love and serve West Point or whether we will look elsewhere.

□ 1040

If we do nothing, sequestration will clobber West Point with \$92 million in arbitrary cuts. In fact, West Point is taking the biggest cut of any Army institution in New York. Sequestration means that our cadets will continue to live and train in outdated facilities that are over 40 years old. It means that furloughs will happen for 1,300 employees working there.

The men and women who feed, instruct, and protect our Nation's next generation of military leaders shouldn't lose their jobs because this Congress can't do ours. Sequestration is a terrible idea. It is the dead hand of the last Congress reaching out to strangle economic activity. We are 2 days away from the deadline, and there are people here who actually think it's a good idea to let it happen.

I believe we need to cut spending. I believe we need to bring down our debt and start balancing our deficit. But we have choices: we can end lavish tax breaks to private jet owners before we ask the kids at West Point to do with less; we can stop giving tax breaks to companies that ship our jobs overseas before we weaken the Long Grey Line; and we can end massive tax cuts for oil companies before we weaken a great American institution like West Point.

This Congress has a clear choice. And for those colleagues who choose to do nothing, I ask you to head home to your district and explain to the kids whom you nominated to West Point that these are good ideas and necessary sacrifices, that it's better for them to sacrifice than for private jet owners, for big oil companies, or for companies that ship our jobs overseas.

The Army's motto is "This we'll defend." West Point is something that we should defend because the cadets there will continue to honorably serve all of us and our country.

Congress doing nothing is not a choice. It's not good for our cadets, and it's not good for our country. Let's stop this series of self-inflicted crises and work together to reach a balanced compromise to replace these across-the-board cuts with a smart, balanced approach that will address our fiscal challenges.

SEQUESTRATION

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

Mr. COURTNEY. Madam Speaker, it just came over the newswire a few minutes ago that on Friday morning, March 1, there will be a meeting at the White House involving President Obama, the leadership of the House, Speaker BOEHNER, and the leadership of the Senate, Senate Majority Leader REID to begin a process of talking about resolving the issue that we're obviously confronting as a Nation a few hours away, which is an automatic mechanism put into effect by the Budget Control Act of 2011 to cut discretionary spending across the board.

I begin with that point because, in fact, that really should have been happening months ago. In fact, that was the intent of sequestration, which is a mechanism that was created in 1985 by the Gramm-Rudman-Hollings legislation that set up the formula for sequestration that cut across defense and non-defense programs. And as Senator Phil Gramm, who was the inventor of sequestration, said in a speech a couple of years ago: It was never the objective of Gramm-Rudman to trigger sequester. The objective of Gramm-Rudman was to have the threat of sequester force compromise and action.

In other words, this was a mechanism that was designed to hurt. It was designed to create so much pain politically that the two sides, which again were in a similar point of gridlock in 1985, would begin the process of negotiation to deal with a structural deficit.

If you look at the history of what occurred from 1985 up until early 2000, that pressure actually did force Congress to face up to the fact that we could not continue to pile up deficits and burden our children and grandchildren with further debt. Unfortunately, in this present Congress, it's taken a little longer for the message to get through, but, nonetheless, the meeting that's scheduled on Friday morning hopefully is going to begin the process of having the two sides do what their predecessors did in the eighties and nineties and begin the process of a balanced plan to eliminate the structural deficit that our Nation confronts today.

Yesterday, President Obama was over in Newport News, Virginia, talking to shipyard workers about the fact that the Navy, which is obviously a critical part of our Federal Government, now has to hit spending cut targets over the next 7 months. We're 5 months into a fiscal year right now. They have begun the process of cancelling the refueling of the USS Lincoln, one of our 10 aircraft carriers which are so critical to force projection in this country. And he was absolutely right to be there. This is a program which, if it is cancelled or delayed, it's going to daisy-chain its way through our Navy's fleet

of 287 ships which must be repaired and maintained constantly to make sure that they're available for operations.

I represent southeastern Connecticut, the home of Electric Boat shipyard that builds and repairs nuclear submarines. We have the USS Providence slated to come in for a needed overhaul and repair later this fiscal year. The Navy has notified the shipyard that that work is going to be suspended. That's 200,000 man-hours for welders, for shipwrights, for machinists, for electricians that do amazing work with incredible skills to make sure that our fleet is capable of meeting the mission requests that are out there. The USS Miami, which is a submarine that was burned in an arsonist fire last year, is another repair job which EB was going to be on the road helping the shipyard workers in Kittery, Maine, to make sure that that critical vessel was going to be back in the fleet. That project has now been put on ice because of sequestration.

These are just totally irrational, destructive outcomes for a bill which was designed to force compromise. It was not to be a policy, not to be an outcome. When you look at Admiral Greenert, the CNO of the Navy, who is one of the most outstanding leaders in our country, he has cancelled the USS Harry Truman, which is a carrier strike force that was scheduled to go over to the Middle East to fly air-cover missions for our troops in Afghanistan, to keep the Strait of Hormuz open where 20 percent of the world's oil supply passes every single day. This is a policy or an outcome that threatens the military readiness of this country. Secretary Panetta at the Department of Defense and General Dempsey, the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs, has made that crystal clear.

So the stakes could not be higher for our country to make sure that this process, which belatedly is starting on Friday morning, is going to result in smart, balanced ways to reduce the deficit.

I can offer one big idea that will get us to that point. I sit on the Agriculture Committee, which is a great bipartisan committee that's been working hard in terms of reforming ag policy in this country. It is time that the direct payment system to farms comes to an end. The good news is that Republicans and Democrats on that committee and Republicans and Democrats in this Chamber agree on that. We can help farmers deal with the vagaries of weather and unexpected events through risk insurance, which is far cheaper to the U.S. taxpayer than direct payments. That will save \$30 billion over the next 5 years. That is a huge step forward that we can use as a building block to avoid these horrible outcomes and make sure that Senator Gramm's warning to us is heeded by this Chamber and by this Congress.

SEQUESTRATION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Arizona (Mrs. KIRKPATRICK) for 5 minutes.

Mrs. KIRKPATRICK. Madam Speaker, the voters sent us to Congress because they want solutions, but reckless, across-the-board cuts are not solutions. We are just 2 days away from the start of these cuts known as sequestration, 2 days away from hurting, rather than helping, the people who elected us.

Let me share with you some examples.

I represent Arizona's District One. This is a vast, beautiful, mostly rural district. It's larger than the State of Pennsylvania. My district includes one of the greatest natural resources of the world, the Grand Canyon, and many other national parks. The Grand Canyon is not only an environmental treasure; it is an economic driver. It brings \$700 million to our economy and creates 12,000 jobs annually.

If our national parks are forced to cut operating hours, cut services or even close facilities, we will be hurting the economy, not helping it. Thousands of jobs and small businesses are connected to the national parks in my district and across our Nation. Hurting our national parks is not a solution.

I'm also concerned about how sequestration will hurt education. Thousands of low-income students in Arizona would no longer receive aid to help cover the cost of college. Work study jobs would be eliminated, and Arizona is the largest recipient of impact aid funding in the Nation. Impact aid compensates local school districts for revenue they lost due to the presence of federally owned and, therefore, tax-exempt property.

□ 1050

It compensates local school districts for costs incurred due to federally connected students.

What are federally connected students?

These are students who are Native American, who have a parent in the military, or who live on Federal property.

In my district in 2012, for example, the Chinle Unified School District received more than \$22 million in impact aid. Sequestration cuts would deeply affect a district like Chinle's. It would hurt its capacity for everything from transportation to staffing and from construction to classroom size. Hurting our schools and our students is not a solution.

Madam Speaker, what about our tribal communities?

My district has 12 Native American tribes; 25 percent of my district is Native American. These are residents of some of our most remote and rural communities. The median household income is \$7,000 a year. These folks often struggle with access to the most basic medical care and resources. If se-

questration takes effect, their primary source of health care, the Indian Health Service, will take a major hit. Other Federal programs, such as Medicare, Medicaid and veterans benefits, are exempt from sequestration cuts. The Indian Health Service is not exempt. IHS may be cut by over \$200 million.

What does a cut like that mean to tribal communities in my district?

It would mean losing hundreds of jobs. It would mean cuts in primary health care. Nationwide, it's estimated that 3,000 fewer people would be admitted for inpatient care and that 800,000 fewer Native Americans would be able to receive outpatient visits.

Hurting our tribal communities is not a solution. The consequences of these cuts are not TV sound bites. They are real, and they hurt my district and our Nation. It will take both parties working together to find a responsible, thoughtful solution to our budget challenges. It will take both parties working together to put a stop to these reckless cuts of sequestration.

So let's work together, and let's show the American people that we are a Congress that can find solutions.

SEQUESTER

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Pennsylvania (Ms. SCHWARTZ) for 5 minutes.

Ms. SCHWARTZ. There are just 2 days that are left for Congress to work together to avert these very deep, across-the-board, automatic cuts to our domestic priorities.

The Obama administration released a State-by-State report outlining the harmful impact these cuts would have on middle class families, on jobs and on economic growth. Yet Republicans continue to reject any balanced approach to deficit reduction presented by House and Senate Democrats, which includes spending cuts, additional revenues and economic growth. Moving from crisis to crisis does not move us any closer to finding a long-term solution to deficit reduction. Instead, these crises cause uncertainty, inhibit private sector investment, undermine consumer confidence, and slow economic growth.

In Pennsylvania, thousands of jobs in both the public and private sectors are at risk of elimination due to the inaction of House Republicans—from elementary school teachers to scientific researchers. Here are just a few examples:

Sharon Easterling, who is the executive director of the Delaware Valley Association for the Education of Young Children, said that Republican inaction would hurt Pennsylvania's children as "nearly 2,300 Head Start children will lose access to preschool almost immediately";

Holly Lange, who is the president of the Philadelphia Corporation for Aging, said:

These cuts may force the Philadelphia Corporation for Aging to limit vital transpor-

tation services for our seniors, who depend on shared rides to remain independent in their homes;

Cinda Waldbuesser, the senior Pennsylvania program manager for the National Parks Conservation Center, said:

Every national park in the system would be affected, including treasured places like Gettysburg, Independence Hall and Valley Forge, and the local economies that depend on visitor spending would also suffer.

The President and House and Senate Democrats have put forth a balanced solution that would replace the across-the-board cuts with a plan that does cut spending but that raises revenues and builds economic opportunity for all of us in this Nation. Republicans have yet to offer a balanced plan or to be willing to engage in the serious discussions of a reasonable bipartisan alternative for our seniors, our children, our first responders, our teachers, our civilian workers in the Department of Defense, our law enforcement officers, our public health professionals, our qualified medical researchers—who research not only at NIH but at medical centers across our country—and business owners who are seeking loan guarantees.

I could go on and on. You've heard some of the examples, but the fact is that all Americans are counting on us to act. It is our responsibility to act, and we should.

I urge my Republican colleagues to reject their partisan, one-sided approach and to be willing to work with us to find common ground and to reach a solution to deficit reduction that takes a balanced approach; that respects our obligation to Americans, particularly our seniors and our children; that strengthens the middle class; that creates certainty for the business community and for our middle class consumers; and that creates opportunities for families and businesses across the country.

The meeting called this morning by the President is an opportunity to find that solution, and I encourage Republicans to take this moment seriously, to be willing to compromise in order to avert these cuts and to set us on a path to both deficit reduction and economic growth. It is not too late. It is increasingly almost too late, but let's get it done on behalf of the American people and our future.

PROTECTING SMALL BUSINESSES

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

Mr. BENTIVOLIO. Last quarter, the economy actually shrunk rather than grew. That's unacceptable. Something has to change.

As I've traveled throughout my district in Michigan, business leaders tell me the same thing over and over again: It's too hard to start or to expand my small business because I can hardly understand how to comply with the latest

regulations that have come out of Washington.

It appears this is no longer a Nation of laws but of regulations—more than 80,000 pages at last estimation. And they're right. Over the last 4 years, the number of business regulations has skyrocketed, and the result has been the worst economic recovery in nearly a century. We've had such weak economic growth that I'm not even sure we can call it a recovery. The millions of people still out of work sure haven't recovered.

As many of you know, I own a small business. I understand what it's like to work hard in trying to build a business from the ground up. The small business owners I know back home are not trying to game the system, and they're not trying to manipulate the market to gain a competitive advantage. What they're trying to do is build lives for their families. They're trying to put food on their tables, send their kids to college, and put a little savings away for the future. They're good, honest, hardworking people who are trying to carve out a small slice of the American Dream.

These small business owners try to follow the rules, but it's becoming more difficult to do so. This may come as a surprise to bureaucrats here in Washington, but most small businesses don't have legal departments. They have their spouses, family members or friends who are trying to get them through all the red tape. These businessmen and women are too busy creating wealth and jobs to constantly stay up to date with the thousands of new regulations being thrown at them from the White House. The work of compliance is not done in a skyscraper downtown. It's done around a kitchen table after a hard day's work.

For example, a few weeks ago, a liberal writer for Slate.com wrote about the difficulties he faced when he tried to start his own small business and how surprised he was at his experience. After describing the problems he'd had, he concluded that red tape, long lines, inconvenient office hours, and other logistical hassles probably won't stop tomorrow's supergenius from launching the next great billion-dollar company, but it's a large and needless deterrent to the Nation of humble workaday firms that, for many people, are a path to autonomy and prosperity.

□ 1100

He also said:

Ideology aside, simply putting a little more thought into the process could make things much easier.

I agree. That's why I introduced the Protect Small Business Jobs Act of 2013.

For too many businesses, the central planners in the numerous agencies of this government have set up roadblocks to their success. My bill offers a simple correction. If found to be in violation of a Federal regulation, a small business, as defined by the Small Busi-

ness Administration, is given a 6-month grace period to correct the problem before being sanctioned. It allows for an extension of 3 more months if the business is making a good-faith effort to correct the problem, and if the problem is corrected, at the end of the grace period the fine is waived.

This allows small companies to have a chance at becoming compliant without being hit with devastating fines. It levels the playing field and keeps thousands, if not millions, of American workers in their jobs because over 60 percent of new work in America is created by small businesses. Giving companies a grace period may seem controversial, but I'd like to dispel some concerns I've heard since I've introduced this bill.

What about environmental issues? Contamination will only be covered if the small business can actually clean it up within 6 months. This gives more incentive to fix the problem because, if the choice is between closing up shop due to an oppressive penalty or cleaning up their mess and staying in business, the latter is going to be chosen. Furthermore, this bill gives a grace period for regulations, not law. Any breaking of property law will still be prohibited.

What if an accident occurs? Firstly, most violations that could cause harm to people are largely covered under an exception in the bill. Secondly, this bill does not prevent workers from suing for damages if their company fails to keep their work environment safe. This bill really only affects sanctions in issues of prior restraint.

SEQUESTRATION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PAYNE) for 5 minutes.

Mr. PAYNE. Madam Speaker, I stand here today in absolute disappointment with this body and the total lack of Republican leadership. I can't even begin to express the disappointment I have with the GOP leaders who choose to play a game of chicken rather than do something to save 2 million American jobs.

After more than 20 years of watching my father serve the 10th Congressional District of New Jersey, the district that he loved, I came here to Washington to do the same. I came down here to get to work, to dig in, to get my hands dirty, and to help resolve the pressing issues that will ruin this country if ignored.

As we speak, people are terrified; and if they aren't terrified, it's because they've stopped listening to the partisan bickering. But make no mistake, these cuts will be unimaginable to people across the country and to people across New Jersey's 10th Congressional District.

So I ask my colleagues: why are we here again? Why? We've played this game before, heard this tune, danced this oppressing musical number before.

It's like I'm Bill Murray in the movie "Groundhog Day," where every morning I wake up hoping it is a new day, and every morning I wake up to the same maddening song. It's the song of a failed Republican leadership doing absolutely nothing—nothing all over again.

Talk about a do-nothing Congress. The 112th Congress passed just 283 bills, and 22 percent of them were bills to name post offices, courthouses, and other projects. So when you break it down, Congress really only voted to pass two bills a week—two bills a week. We can do better than this, but we need to work together.

When I speak to my fellow Democrat Members, there is a frustration. They are frustrated because we've seen the pain and fear in the people we speak to back home. There's frustration because we are ready to work. That's why I was sent here. That's what I was sent here to do.

So let's stop the nonsense and let's get to work. The effects of sequestration are real. Maybe people don't understand what the word "sequestration" means, but when they start to lose vital services that they need to live, it is going to devastate working families, the middle class, and the vulnerable in my district.

In New Jersey alone, more than 40,000 people could lose their jobs. New Jersey will lose \$17 million in funding for teachers, aids, and staff who help disabled children. Thirteen hundred children in New Jersey will be cut from Head Start. Eleven thousand civilian Department of Defense employees will be furloughed. Senior Meals on Wheels programs will lose nearly half a million in funding in New Jersey, possibly the only meal they have for the day. And funds will be slashed for victims of domestic violence, resulting in 700 victims not receiving the care that they need to survive.

Right now, Democrats have a plan on the table that will stop sequestration and start reducing the deficit in a balanced way. It's a plan that cuts spending responsibly, closes corporate tax loopholes, protects the most vulnerable, and ensures millionaires pay their fair share. And you know what? More than 76 percent of the American people support a balanced plan.

Including today, we have 3 days to go; and with \$85 billion in automatic deep spending cuts on the chopping block, it's time for Washington to stop playing games, stop pointing fingers and do what's right by the American people. That's what the American people expect, and, quite frankly, that's what they deserve.

Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to bring H.R. 699, the Stop the Sequester Job Loss Now Act, to the floor.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of January 3, 2013, the House is in session solely for the purpose of conducting morning-hour debate. Therefore, the gentleman's request cannot be entertained.

Mr. PAYNE. Madam Speaker, I'm deeply saddened for the American people that we are unable to bring this bill to the floor and stop the loss of 2 million American jobs.

SEQUESTRATION

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

Mr. BLUMENAUER. The sequester drama that we are watching play out this week is exactly why I voted against the New Year's Day budget package.

Two months ago, all of the forces were aligned to force a bigger agreement, but we set our sights too low. It generated too little revenue, and, most importantly, there was not a fundamental reform in the way that we do business.

We merely put off the fiscal cliff in order to have not one, not two, but three such dramas between now and next summer. Friday is the sequestration; March 27, the continuing resolution runs out; and sometime this summer, the Treasury Department is going to run out of capacity to keep juggling the national debt, and we face that drama all over again.

Actually, there's a fourth cliff if you count the so-called "dairy cliff" which will potentially double milk prices in September.

The path forward is to focus on areas of potential agreement between the right and the left. A great place to start is health care. Reform is taking place around the country. And, in fact, nowhere is it more exciting and promising than what is happening in Oregon where we are working in concert with the implementation of the Health Care Reform Act to squeeze out waste and inefficiency. We are working to reward value instead of volume, and the Federal Government has bet \$1.9 billion that we will be able to reduce health care inflation at least 2 percent a year and maintain quality.

□ 1110

Helping people stay well rather than paying people for disease and illness is a logical way to go. After all, the Affordable Care Act embedded every one of these major reforms that used to be bipartisan, that had been implemented by business, health care plans in red States and blue States, that had been advocated by Democratic and Republican Governors alike, and, indeed, supported by Members of the House and Senate in both parties. Instead of fighting health care reform, we ought to accelerate it. If we can deliver on the Oregon promise, it in and of itself will save more money nationally over the next 10 years than we're arguing about with the sequestration.

We also must address the huge budget challenges that are facing the Pentagon, in large measure because neither it nor Congress has insisted on

change and, indeed, in some cases, has institutionalized bad decisions.

We haven't scaled back our horribly expensive, outmoded, inefficient nuclear deterrent program, maintaining perhaps 8–10 times the warheads for what we need for actual deterrence today with three massive, expensive, redundant delivery systems that are out of sync with today's threats. We haven't used nuclear weapons for the last 68 years. We probably won't use them for the next 68 years, and there is no imaginable circumstance when we would use even a fraction of the weapons we have. And the cost for that conservatively is in excess of two-thirds of \$1 trillion over the next 10 years.

We've never come to grips with the cost of an all-volunteer Army. Our forces are significantly above what we had a decade earlier when we were supposedly staffed to fight two wars simultaneously. We need to scale that down, to refocus it, to supplement reductions in troop levels with beefed-up support to the National Guard, which is far more cost-effective and easier on our troops.

We need to reform our bloated, fossilized, outdated farm bill to spend less, help more farmers and the environment, and show that we can rise above politics and habits to have a farm program for this century, not 1949. The majority of farmers and ranchers in the United States get nothing. The majority of the support flows to the top 10 percent, who don't need it at all, and it distorts our international trade posture.

The final looming threat is the dysfunction, unfairness, and inefficiency of our tax system. It costs us huge sums to administer. It leaks hundreds of billions of dollars in tax avoidance, evasion, and mistakes, to say nothing of misplaced incentives, and it costs over \$160 billion a year to administer.

Now, clearly there's a need for more revenue in a growing and aging population, but fundamentally, we need a new broad base of support that will help us pay the transition necessary for a reformed system.

Madam Speaker, this is not rocket science. This is within our capacity. We ought to get started on it now.

SEQUESTRATION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York (Mr. MAFFEI) for 5 minutes.

Mr. MAFFEI. Thank you, Madam Speaker.

Since becoming central New York's new Representative, I have met with over a hundred business owners and development leaders in my community. I've visited universities, the hospitals, the factories, the public schools, and I've met with local leaders and law enforcement and public safety. The one message I keep hearing throughout my district is that we need to work together to grow and strengthen our middle class and create jobs. Work to-

gether. Now, more than ever, that's what Congress and the President needs to do. That's what the American people and my constituents overwhelmingly want.

If people do not come to the table and work together by March 1, this Friday, more than 70,000 jobs are at risk in my State alone. At Hancock Air Base, New York National Guard employees, 280 of them are at risk. Two hundred eighty National Guard employees at the 174th Attack Wing will be furloughed, notwithstanding the fact that this unit is flying missions in Afghanistan as we debate these issues.

Automatic spending cuts will force the FAA to cut air traffic controller shifts and potentially eliminate overnight shifts at the Syracuse Hancock International Airport and other upstate New York airports. Cuts will also force TSA to cut back on personnel, increasing wait times by an hour or more at many airports. This will have a chilling effect on a still-fragile economic recovery.

Seventy thousand New York college students will lose tuition assistance, and across the country, 70,000 deserving children will lose Head Start. Now, to keep America strong we are told that we need to make sure for our national security and our economy that we improve STEM education, science and technology. This is doing the opposite.

We need to take a balanced approach, trimming where necessary instead of these arbitrary sweeping cuts that hurt middle class families.

This is not a partisan issue. The Republicans on this floor have spoken about how bad these arbitrary cuts are and how damaging they might be. Our Nation needs to get its fiscal house in order, and we need to do it right away, not on the backs of our middle class and seniors, and not at the expense of thousands of jobs.

Now, there is a specific plan to do that. It balances cuts with revenue increases.

Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to bring up H.R. 699 with this balanced approach.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of January 3, 2013, the House is in session solely for the purpose of conducting morning-hour debate. Therefore, the gentleman's request cannot be entertained.

Mr. MAFFEI. Well, Madam Speaker, I do understand that, but I do hope that the leadership of this House considers just doing a vote, a regular up-or-down vote, on this or any plan to avoid these arbitrary cuts.

We need to institute better programs and methods to root out waste, fraud, and abuse and ensure that taxpayer dollars are being used most efficiently. There's no question about that. We also need comprehensive tax reform that finds revenues in ways that don't hurt the middle class, like ending the tax loopholes for corporations that ship jobs overseas and ending the tax breaks for big oil and gas companies.

Madam Speaker, our plan is a balanced approach. More spending cuts and modest revenue increases. Now is not the time for partisan politics. With the future of our economy hanging in the balance, we cannot afford inaction.

SEQUESTRATION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from California (Mrs. NEGRETE MCLEOD) for 1 minute.

Mrs. NEGRETE MCLEOD. Thank you, Madam Speaker.

Today, I urge all of my colleagues to join together to avert the automatic trigger cuts brought forth by the sequester that are scheduled to begin in 2 days. These cuts will hurt small businesses, the military, seniors, and our children.

In California, it is estimated that more than 15,000 children will not receive vaccinations for diseases such as measles, whooping cough, and influenza—all because of these automatic trigger cuts. This is unacceptable. In addition, special education services for children with disabilities will see cuts, while over 8,200 low-income children in California will not receive critical early education from Head Start. Children deserve better from their Members of Congress.

That is why we need a balanced approach to replace sequestration, which includes revenues and spending cuts, thereby ensuring the most vulnerable are not burdened.

I, therefore, ask unanimous consent to bring forth H.R. 699 to provide balanced deficit reduction.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of January 3, 2013, the House is in session solely for the purpose of conducting morning-hour debate. Therefore, the gentlewoman's request cannot be entertained.

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 19 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 (Mr. MCCLINTOCK) at noon.

PRAYER

Reverend Ronald Derrick, American Legion, Rigby, Idaho, offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, thank You for this day. Grant us Your presence.

We stand in a room representing power and authority given by Your

hand. Keep us mindful that one day we shall stand in a greater room and give an accounting of the decisions made this day.

Therefore, I pray with words that have been spoken down through the ages that You, O Lord, would grant to these leaders of our Nation health, peace, concord, and stability, that they may administer the government without failure.

Direct their counsel according to that which is good and well-pleasing in Your sight; and may it be said of them that they performed the duties of their office faithfully and impartially.

Bless each individual present here today, for by blessing the individual, You have blessed this Nation.

To You be the glory. In Your most holy Name I pray.

Amen.

THE JOURNAL

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

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

Mr. JOYCE. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to clause 1, rule I, I demand a vote on agreeing to the Speaker's approval of the Journal.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the Speaker's approval of the Journal.

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8, rule XX, further proceedings on this question will be postponed.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

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

Mr. ROSKAM 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.

WELCOMING REVEREND RONALD DERRICK

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the gentleman from Idaho (Mr. SIMPSON) is recognized for 1 minute.

There was no objection.

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure to introduce Chaplain Ronald Derrick for today's invocation.

Chaplain Derrick serves as the national chaplain of the American Legion. He is a U.S. Army veteran and a 40-year member of the American Legion, serving 18 years with Post 95 in

Driggs, Idaho, and the subsequent 22 years in Post 20 in his current home of Rigby, Idaho.

Mr. Derrick's Legion duties have included terms as post commander, district commander, and Department of Idaho vice commander. For the past 6 years, he has acted as the Department of Idaho's chaplain.

Mr. Derrick is a retired printer and mail clerk, a former county coroner, Driggs Chamber of Commerce president, and EMT and firefighter. Recognizing this latter service, the American Legion named Mr. Derrick Idaho's Firefighter of the Year in 1987.

Mr. Derrick was ordained into the ministry in 1979 through the Solid Rock Pentecostal Church and continues to serve in various aspects of ministry. Mr. Derrick and his wife of 45 years, Bird, have two sons, a daughter, and nine grandchildren.

I would like to welcome Chaplain Derrick and thank him for his dedication and outstanding service to God and country.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

SEQUESTRATION

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

Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas. In just 2 days, President Obama's devised plan of across-the-board spending cuts known as "sequester" will kick in. I voted for House legislation to replace the President's plan with smarter and more responsible cuts. Unfortunately, the President and his friends in the Senate ignored it.

Right now, America is over \$16 trillion in debt. That means every American owes more than \$52,000 each. Taxpayers all across this country know that Washington has a spending problem, not a revenue problem.

Enough is enough. Now is the time to work together to stop spending money we do not have. We need to give the American people what they want, need, and deserve. We must get our fiscal house in order by balancing our budget. It's almost too late. Let's act now.

RECOGNIZING FAITH-BASED LEADERS IN OHIO'S THIRD DISTRICT IN HONOR OF BLACK HISTORY MONTH

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

Mrs. BEATTY. Mr. Speaker, I rise to salute African American faith-based leaders from Ohio's Third Congressional District. They are here as civil

rights leaders, providers of child care, after-care, educational programs for our children. They are advocates for entrepreneurs, minority businesses, and economic development opportunities in our communities. They stand strong with their first ladies and congregations for stopping domestic violence against women, for reducing crimes in our neighborhoods.

These powerful leaders are Bishop Jerome Ross, Reverend Dr. Keith Troy, Reverend Fred Lamarr, Reverend Jerry Carter, Reverend Victor Davis, Bishop Donald Washington, Reverend John Little, the Honorable Larry Price, Reverend Dale Snyder, the Honorable Hearchel Craig, and Reverend Joel King, cousin of Martin Luther King, Jr.

Lastly, they know all too well what the impact of sequestration will be to our at-risk communities. I salute them because they will carry on their great work despite the sequestration and the unnecessary challenges it will present if imposed. Sequestration is harmful to our district, to our constituents, and to the Nation. The impact of sequestration will affect the Federal Government's ability to provide States with the necessary resources to invest in the future leaders and to protect America's strong business environment.

Our hardworking taxpayers deserve better. Let's not put our economy at risk.

VETERANS JOBS CAUCUS

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

Mr. ROSKAM. Mr. Speaker, as the Representative of the Sixth District of Illinois and the son of a Korean war veteran, I'm honored to serve over 34,000 veterans. We have a deep commitment, as we know, to support those who've risked their lives to defend our freedom and help them in their transition back to civilian life. I've been active in a program called Helmets to Hard Hats, and there's a jarring unemployment figure for veterans that we are all sobered by. More than 844,000 veterans currently face unemployment, and veterans aged 18 to 24 face a staggering 31 percent unemployment rate.

There's an opportunity for us to work together, and I'm pleased to have recently joined the Congressional Veterans Jobs Caucus in an effort to bring Republicans and Democrats together to be like-minded as we seek to serve those who have served us so well. There's a myriad of obstacles that are in place that need to be remedied, and together we can join with the Disabled American Veterans organization, which is here in Washington, D.C. this week to celebrate their success and our obligation to them.

SEQUESTRATION

(Mr. HOYER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1

minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, we are now 2 days away from failure-triggered, ideologically driven, and irrational budget cuts called "sequester." It is an extraordinarily bad policy that 229 Republicans voted for on July 19, 2011. These cuts could be incredibly harmful to our national defense, our economy, and our national welfare.

General Martin Dempsey, Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, said:

This will affect the entire country, and it will undermine our readiness for the next several years.

Hundreds of thousands of civilian defense personnel could be furloughed, and thousands of contractors could be forced to lay off critical personnel. Congress should not put our national security or economic recovery at risk. If I were the majority leader, this policy would not happen.

House Republicans should listen to Transportation Secretary Ray LaHood when he said:

As a former Republican Member of Congress for 14 years, I urge my former colleagues to address this issue and to work on a long-term, balanced solution to our deficit problem.

With only 2 days left, it is time for us to come together to find a solution that can replace these cuts with a sensible, balanced alternative.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair would remind Members not to traffic the well when others are speaking.

□ 1210

REMEMBERING THE MENIFEE COUNTY LIVES LOST IN THE MARCH 2, 2012 TORNADO

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

Mr. BARR. Mr. Speaker, today I wish to honor three precious lives lost in the tornado which devastated Menifee County, Kentucky, one year ago this Saturday.

Beverly Bowman was a magnet to children, according to newspaper accounts. Friends called her the backbone of the Tarr Ridge Union Church.

Anita Smith adored animals. Reports said she owned at least four horses, along with goats, dogs, and a mule.

And Vershal Brown was a remarkable man, recalls Menifee County Sheriff Rodney Coffee: "Day or night, if you called him, he could help you. He would be there."

Mr. Speaker, the people of Menifee County have shown amazing faith and determination in rebuilding their lives and their community. This weekend, we will celebrate together how far they have come, and we will join hands and remember.

SEQUESTRATION

(Ms. BROWNLEY of California asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. BROWNLEY of California. Mr. Speaker, this Friday, the U.S. budget faces a round of indiscriminate and severe cuts that will hurt the middle class, compromise national security, and set back our very fragile economic recovery.

I call on all of our colleagues to take immediate action to avert the sequester to prevent \$1.5 trillion in reckless, unnecessary, across-the-board cuts. If we fail, my families and businesses in Ventura County will pay the price.

Naval Base Ventura County in my district could be forced to furlough 80 percent of its civilian workers. Our seniors and our children could be severely impacted through cuts to Medicare, Head Start programs, and teachers' jobs. We need to stop these arbitrary and reckless cuts now and pass a balanced approach with H.R. 699.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to bring H.R. 699 to the floor.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the guidelines consistently issued by successive Speakers as recorded on page 752 of the House Rules Manual, the Chair is constrained not to entertain the gentlewoman's request unless it has been cleared by the bipartisan floor and committee leaderships.

GUN CONTROL

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

Mr. POMPEO. Mr. Speaker, we're now some 11 weeks out from the tragedy that occurred in Newtown, Connecticut. And while all the talk today is about the sequester, we still have politicians and pundits all across the country that are purporting to try and solve this epidemic of gun violence with new rules taking away guns from ordinary citizens.

Unfortunately—and this is humbling for many in politics—no law or set of laws can possibly address in a meaningful way all of the challenges that we face today with a violent America. In fact, we face a much deeper, more malignant problem. It's a culture that degrades and cheapens life.

That's why I continue to be disappointed to hear the President propose further gun control. The President's plan isn't so much an attempt to solve a problem as an attempt to fulfill a wish list for gun control advocates. Unfortunately, for the American people, an opportunity for a real national dialogue on the root causes of this type of violence is being missed.

I've heard from hundreds of Kansans on the issue of gun control, and the vast majority of them understand that Washington restricting their Second Amendment rights will do very little

to end the violence in our society or to improve the safety of their families or in their schools of their children.

SEQUESTRATION

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

Mr. VARGAS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong opposition to sequestration.

The word “sequester” derives from the Latin word “sequi.” It meant to follow. In late Latin, it devolved into “sequestrar,” which meant to surrender into the hands of a trustee. By the early 1500s, sequestrar grew to mean “to seize, to confiscate.”

In Spanish, the word “secuestro” means to kidnap, to hostage, to ransom. And really, that is what the majority party is doing here today. They’re holding the American people hostage, holding them ransom for these draconian spending cuts. House Republicans don’t care about the harm it will cause to our working families, our seniors, our children, our military—especially our military.

We have heard now from our military leaders that military preparedness will suffer and will suffer greatly. We’ve already heard that an aircraft carrier has been stalled in port and is not able to be deployed to the Middle East. But there is a solution. Democrats, through the efforts of the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. VAN HOLLEN), have proposed a fair and balanced plan that would replace these destructive and unwarranted cuts.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to bring up H.R. 699, a balanced bill to replace the sequester with spending cuts and revenues.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. As the Chair previously advised, that request cannot be entertained without the appropriate clearance.

CHARDON 1-YEAR ANNIVERSARY

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

Mr. JOYCE. Today marks the 1-year anniversary of a horrific day for all northeastern Ohioans. It marks the worst day of their lives for too many mothers, fathers, brother, sisters, friends, and family in Chardon, Ohio.

One year ago today, a shooter opened fire in Chardon High School, fatally shooting three students and injuring three others. These three children were cruelly taken from this Earth all too soon. They were loved by their families, embraced by their communities, and had their whole lives ahead of them.

As the county prosecutor at the time, I saw firsthand the grief and devastation that no parent should ever have to experience. Nothing will ever come close to replacing the love and

happiness these children brought to their friends and family. Our community may never truly be whole again, but we must take every moment possible to honor these victims and pray for their families.

I would like to now take a moment of silence for Demetrius Hewlin, Russell King, Jr., and Daniel Parmertor. May God bless them and may God bless their families.

VIOLENCE AGAINST WOMEN REAUTHORIZATION ACT

(Ms. MENG asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. MENG. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to urge my colleagues to pass the bipartisan, Senate-passed Violence Against Women Reauthorization Act.

Early in my career, one of my first experiences was working with victims of domestic violence who were struggling and in desperate need of help. Having personally helped victims fill out VAWA petitions so they wouldn’t be forced to live under the same roof as their abusers, I’ve seen firsthand the long-term human devastation this kind of violence can cause, and we cannot continue to ignore its toll on women and families.

VAWA funds have trained over 500,000 law enforcement and judicial officers on the realities of domestic and sexual violence, helping to protect survivors across the country. VAWA saves money, and it saves lives.

Since VAWA was first enacted, over 600 State laws have been passed to combat domestic violence, and reported incidents of violence have decreased by 60 percent. Despite these successes, there’s much work to be done, and all victims of domestic violence, including those in the LGBT community and those without documentation, must feel safe seeking help from our criminal justice system.

□ 1220

CONGRESSIONAL VETERANS JOBS CAUCUS

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

Mr. DENHAM. When the courageous Americans who volunteer to fight our wars come home, they should not have to fight for jobs. Unemployment is one of the biggest problems currently facing America’s veterans. In addition to our gratitude and support, our veterans need jobs. With more than 250,000 servicemen and -women expected to return to civilian life each year over the next 5 years, veterans’ employment issues will only grow more challenging.

That’s why for more than a year the Congressional Veterans Jobs Caucus has worked to bring the public and private sectors together—to end the vet-

erans’ unemployment crisis. I am proud to join more than 70 of my House and Senate colleagues from both sides of the aisle in this important mission to raise awareness and to increase employment among our Nation’s veterans. Today and every day, we are asking our colleagues and private businesses, small and large, to make a personal and public commitment to hiring veterans by displaying this sign: “I hire veterans.” This logo should be displayed in our windows.

It is our greatest duty as leaders in Washington to uphold our commitment to our veterans, and we invite members of the public, especially business owners, to join us in this important mission.

VIOLENCE AGAINST WOMEN REAUTHORIZATION ACT OF 2013

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

Mr. RUIZ. I would like to thank the Senate for working in a bipartisan manner to pass the Violence Against Women Reauthorization Act. However, the House Republican version of the bill fails to protect all women, including Native American women, immigrant women, and the LGBT community.

I rise today in strong opposition to the House Republican version of the Violence Against Women Reauthorization Act. As an ER doctor, I have seen firsthand the beaten and bruised bodies of women victims and the invisible scars left on the victim, her family, and community. Native American women in my district and across the country endure an epidemic of domestic violence, and in most cases the abusers are not members of the tribes. Tribes must have the right to protect their daughters, sisters, and mothers from violence.

We must work to make sure that all women are protected from domestic violence. I urge all of my colleagues to join me in opposition to the House Republican version of this legislation, and I look forward to the passage of the bipartisan Senate version of this legislation.

SEQUESTRATION

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

Mr. BROUN of Georgia. Last Congress, I supported more than \$155 billion worth of real spending cuts. If Democrats are interested in finding a more targeted approach to avoiding the sequester, I’m more than happy to offer my suggestions. We only have to cut 2½ cents out of every dollar that we spend in 2013 to dodge the effects of the sequester. If we can’t shrink spending by 2 percent without causing a meltdown, what does that say about the size of Washington?

Frankly, I don't think this administration wants to cut spending at all. The President is only interested in raising taxes, but this year, he has already levied \$150 billion worth of new taxes on the American people. I wholeheartedly support making meaningful cuts, but there is a better way to go about doing it than with the sequester.

Congress needs to sit down and go through the budget line by line, and it needs to figure out what wasteful programs we can get rid of in the middle of this debt crisis. I hope that Democrats will work with Republicans to find a smarter way to cut spending while we also protect American jobs and our national security.

GEORGE ARATANI

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

Mr. SCHIFF. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor a constituent and philanthropist, George Aratani, who passed away last week.

Mr. Aratani was part of the Greatest Generation, and served his country as a member of the Military Intelligence Service, or MIS, during World War II. His service came at a time when tens of thousands of his fellow Japanese Americans were interned in camps scattered in the Western United States. He chose to serve and defend America with no guarantee that his own freedom would be defended in return.

I was proud to work to ensure that MIS members like George Aratani and all of the Go for Broke veterans received the credit and thanks they were due through the Congressional Gold Medal.

When he returned home, Mr. Aratani started and ran several businesses, and dedicated himself to Japanese American educational and cultural causes, including the Go for Broke veterans' memorial and foundation. George Aratani had a profound impact on our country and on his community, and he will be terribly missed.

TOUR DE BLAME

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

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, the sequester was a bad idea. I voted "no." It actually came from the other end of Pennsylvania Avenue, however. The House has voted twice to replace the President's sequester with other spending cuts. However, the "siesta" Senate ignored the House bills and did what it does best—nothing.

Now, in the 11th hour, the President has disowned his sequester and instead has launched the taxpayer-funded tour de blame. He has also dispatched his Cabinet on a tour de fear. The White House "sky is falling" crowd says flights will be delayed and undocumented immigrants in custody will be freed. That is a Madison Avenue-style

campaign to instill fear into Americans.

The President holds the power to determine what bills will be paid, not Congress—but he does not have the will to prioritize spending or manage the people's money. He only knows one way to lead: tax more, spend more, and continue the tour de blame.

And that's just the way it is.

BORDER AND SEQUESTRATION

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

Mr. HIGGINS. Mr. Speaker, the effect of sequestration on our borders will be felt especially hard in my western New York community, home to four crossings on the northern border.

According to the Department of Homeland Security, if sequestration occurs, Customs and Border Protection will be forced to eliminate 2,700 officers and 5,000 Border Patrol agents. In addition to the job losses, this could mean delays of as long as 4 hours at our border crossings.

\$1.5 billion in goods and 300,000 individuals cross the U.S.-Canada border each and every day. Western New York businesses and institutions depend on predictable access to and from southern Ontario. Increased wait times will discourage Canadian consumers from visiting western New York, and that is business we can't afford to lose.

I call on the House to take immediate action to repeal the sequester and to prevent this unnecessary injury to our economy.

THE PRESIDENT'S SEQUESTER

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

Ms. FOXX. The President is hitting the road this week for yet another tax increase on hardworking Americans. He already raised taxes just 8 weeks ago. Why the sudden urge to do it again?

The President says this is the plan to replace his sequester that's scheduled to hit on March 1, but the President and the rest of the Democrats who run Washington apparently haven't figured out that we cannot tax our way out of this mess. Tax revenues are set to double over the next decade, and top tax rates have hit their highest levels since 1986. We are already taxing wages and salaries at rates as high as 44 percent.

We need to replace the President's sequester with commonsense spending cuts and reforms, not more taxes. The House has acted twice to achieve this, and now the President needs to put forward a serious plan.

GEORGE ARATANI

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

Mr. TAKANO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the legacy of George Tetsuo Aratani, a philanthropist and business executive who was a champion for Japanese Americans.

Mr. Aratani was born and raised in California and, along with 122,000 other Japanese Americans, was forced into internment camps during World War II. Never letting a poor situation get the best of him, Mr. Aratani used his bilingual skills to serve his country in the Army Military Intelligence Service. Following the war, he started two successful businesses—Mikasa tableware and Kenwood electronics—and enjoyed a wonderful life with his family.

Though he achieved great commercial success, he will always be remembered for his upstanding citizenship in his community. Mr. Aratani and his wife, Sakaye, established the first endowed chair in the country to study the injustice of the Japanese American internment and the efforts to rectify it. In addition, the Aratanis gave millions in support of the Japanese American National Museum, UCLA's Departments of Asian American and East Asian Studies, the Japanese American Cultural & Community Center, Keiro Senior HealthCare, and countless Asian American candidates.

I look to Mr. Aratani as an inspiration for all as he truly lived the American Dream.

MICHAEL ANTHONY SOLIS

(Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in the memory of Mr. Michael Anthony Solis, who was an educator. He taught at Anaheim High School in my district. He was a champion for lower income students.

He grew up in Riverside, California, and his family grew up in pretty poor circumstances, but education was always important to them. He enrolled in Riverside Community College where teachers encouraged him to be an educator. As a student teacher, Michael became involved with the AVID program, a program that helps to close that achievement gap from lower income students to the normal. Mr. Solis went on to teach AVID in various southern California schools. He was also the director of AVID for our county education program. He most recently served as our assistant principal at Anaheim High School.

He was impassioned about education. He knew that this would make a difference in so many people's lives. Even though he lost a 40-month battle with cancer, he will be remembered by all who knew him, and his legacy will move forward in all of those students whose lives he has impacted.

□ 1230

THE IMPACT OF SEQUESTRATION FOR NEW JERSEY

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

Mr. SIREs. Mr. Speaker, unless Congress acts this week, a series of drastic spending cuts known as the sequester will take effect. Sequestration threatens the jobs of hundreds of thousands of middle class Americans, as well as vital services for children, seniors, and our troops. Congress must not wait any longer to come to an agreement.

Should sequestration take effect, my State of New Jersey would lose almost \$12 million in funding for primary and secondary education, putting around 160 teachers and their aides at risk. New Jersey would also lose \$17 million in funding, or about 210 teachers who help children with disabilities. In addition, Head Start and Early Head Start services would be eliminated for an estimated 1,300 children in New Jersey. Furthermore, New Jersey would lose funding cuts for public safety grants provided to local law enforcement officials designed to improve the safety of our communities, as well as reduction in funding to provide meals for New Jersey seniors. Mr. Speaker, these are just a small portion of the impact sequestration will have on New Jersey and America as a whole.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to bring up H.R. 699, a balanced bill to replace the sequester with spending cuts and revenues.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. As the Chair has previously advised, that request cannot be entertained absent appropriate clearance.

VIOLENCE AGAINST WOMEN ACT

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

Mr. HUFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to express my grave concerns over the Republican substitute to the Senate-passed Violence Against Women Act. The Senate passed this bill with overwhelming bipartisan support, including a majority of Senate Republicans. But apparently, leadership in the House has decided that this law should protect only some women.

The substitute that we're being asked to vote on excludes LGBT victims. It weakens protections for women on college campuses, Native American women, and immigrants. As a father of a young daughter and a husband, I cannot begin to understand why we would gut commonsense protections for women or why we would pick and choose the type of women that we want to protect from violence.

A few minutes ago, we swore allegiance to this flag and to a Republic that stands for liberty and justice for all, not for some. In fact, Americans have long fought for equality for women and protecting all women from

violence. The Violence Against Women Act has been an important part of that arc of our history. It's not something that should be politicized or used for political games. Let's vote against this substitute.

BAY DELTA CONSERVATION PLAN

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

Mr. COSTA. Mr. Speaker, in our San Joaquin Valley in California, unfortunately we are facing yet another fight for every drop of water that's critical to our economic recovery. For over the last 2 months, we have lost over 700,000 acre-feet of water that represents \$2.2 billion in economic activity because of an unlawful biological opinion that puts a 2-inch fish before 25 million Californians.

Had the Bay Delta Conservation Plan been implemented, none of this valuable water would have been lost today. To add insult to injury, our valley was dealt yet another blow when the Bureau of Reclamation announced this week a 25 percent water allocation. This is simply unacceptable.

It remains to be seen if the Obama administration and their nominee to replace Secretary Salazar has forgotten or ignored the tough lessons from the failures of 2009 and 2010. Immediate action is necessary to keep a bad situation from becoming devastating to our valley this year and throughout the State.

The Bay Delta Conservation Plan must move forward to resolve this situation in the future. Every day wasted is valuable time and water lost.

VIOLENCE AGAINST WOMEN ACT

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

Mr. LOWENTHAL. Mr. Speaker, I stand here today to urge my colleagues to bring the Senate version of the Violence Against Women Act, or VAWA, a bill that would provide critical services to all victims of domestic abuse, to the House floor. My friends, my colleagues, my constituents, it is time to reauthorize.

I want to applaud all the Senate Democrats, all the female Senators, and the vast majority of Republican Senate Members who believe that VAWA is good for the safety of all women, regardless of their sexual orientation, their ethnicity, or tribal heritage.

As for the altered House version, which clearly rejects the equal protections outlined in the Senate version, it is unfair, unjust, and unacceptable.

I have a few questions for my colleagues in the House who altered this bipartisan Senate VAWA bill:

Why do our LGBT, Native American, and immigrant brothers and sisters not deserve the same protections?

Why are they exceptions in your eyes?

And why must they continually be denied the same freedoms and liberties that we all enjoy under our Constitution?

By reauthorizing the Senate version of VAWA:

We can make sure our LGBT brothers and sisters receive appropriate care when they are victimized;

We can make sure that immigrants, who so desperately want to be a part of this great Nation, will not have to hide behind their abusers in fear of deportation;

And, we can make sure that the three out of five American Indian women who will experience domestic violence in their lifetime can have the peace of mind to know that their abusers will not be given a way out of prosecution.

My colleagues, this is not politics and this certainly is not a game. This is simply the right thing to do.

SEQUESTRATION

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

Mr. RUPPERSBERGER. Mr. Speaker, I rise to voice strong opposition to the sequester, which was designed to be so severe and so catastrophic that we would be compelled to make the necessary compromises to avoid it, and yet we have done nothing.

The Second District is the home to Fort Meade, NSA, Aberdeen Proving Ground, the Port of Baltimore, and hundreds of contractors reliant on these institutions. We're neighbors to the Social Security Administration, the National Institute for Health, and BWI Airport.

Nearly 140,000 workers at these facilities would be furloughed. Maryland will lose about \$14.4 million in funding education, putting the jobs of 200 teachers at risk. We'll lose nearly \$50 million in funding for medical research, which supports thousands of jobs in Maryland.

Maryland can't afford this approach to deficit reduction and neither can any of the other States in this Nation. We have to put forward serious alternatives to avert sequestration, and I encourage leadership to either allow a vote on one of these alternatives or to propose one for themselves.

We are in this most ridiculous situation and we must resolve this problem now.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to bring up H.R. 699, a balanced bill to replace the sequester with spending cuts and revenues.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. As the Chair has previously advised, that request cannot be entertained without appropriate clearance.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF S. 47, VIOLENCE AGAINST WOMEN REAUTHORIZATION ACT OF 2013

Mr. NUGENT. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 83 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 83

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider in the House the bill (S. 47) to reauthorize the Violence Against Women Act of 1994. 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 Majority Leader and the Minority Leader or their respective designees; (2) an amendment in the nature of a substitute consisting of the text of Rules Committee Print 113-2, if offered by the Majority Leader or his designee, which shall be in order without intervention of any point of order, shall be considered as read, and shall be separately debatable for 20 minutes equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent; and (3) one motion to commit with or without instructions.

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

Mr. NUGENT. Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. SLAUGHTER), pending which I yield myself as much time as I may consume. During consideration of this resolution, all time yielded is for the purpose of debate only.

□ 1240

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. NUGENT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. NUGENT. Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 83 provides for a structured rule for consideration of S. 47, the Violence Against Women Reauthorization Act of 2013. The rule also provides for consideration of one substitute amendment to this underlying legislation. This process ensures there's ample discussion on both options presented to the House, to give Members, both the minority and the majority, the opportunity to participate in these debates.

I support the rule, and I hope my colleagues will support it as well because, by supporting and passing this resolution, we'll be able to move on to debating the reauthorization of the Violence Against Women Act.

As a former law enforcement officer who spent 38 years fighting against all types of violence, I have seen the evils and cruelty of domestic violence issues firsthand. That's why I also volun-

teered with and even served on the board of directors for the Dawn Center, which is a refuge for victims of domestic and sexual violence in Hernando County, Florida.

With these sorts of experience, I know and understand how important grant programs like these authorized by the Violence Against Women Act are to law enforcement agencies fighting domestic violence, the advocates serving the victims of domestic violence, and most importantly, the victims themselves.

Violence against women is unacceptable in any terms. It should be unacceptable to everybody in this room, regardless of your gender, regardless of your sexual orientation, and regardless of your age. I hope it's that obvious.

The rule we have before us today provides the House the ability to consider measures that would help provide stakeholders with the tools they need to combat this terrible crime.

If House Resolution 83 passes, then tomorrow the House will debate two separate versions of reauthorizing the Violence Against Women Act. We will have 1 hour debate on the underlying bill, which passed the Senate just 15 days ago.

We'll also spend 20 minutes debating a Republican alternative to the Senate bill. At the end of the debate, we will vote first on the Republican alternative to the Senate bill, and if that House amendment fails, then we'll have an up-or-down vote on final passage of the Senate reauthorization. It's that simple.

These options offer two separate and distinct visions on how the Federal Government can help aid in the fight against domestic violence.

I can say that, during my time as sheriff, I never saw a single Federal domestic violence case ever prosecuted, but I know the Federal dollars went to the States and counties to help combat these types of crimes. I also know that victims of all genders and sexual orientations found shelter and safety in places like the Dawn Center because of grants like those authorized in the Violence Against Women Act.

For all those reasons, I know this a debate we need to have. That's why I'm proud to stand here today sponsoring a rule that lays the options out on the table, provides for vigorous and enthusiastic discussion of those options, and ultimately, let's the people's House work its will.

I encourage my colleagues to vote "yes" on the rule, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, good afternoon.

I thank the gentleman for yielding me the customary 30 minutes, and yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, when I joined my former colleague, Representative Pat Schroeder of Colorado, to write the original Violence Against Women Act, it didn't occur to us to exclude or dis-

criminate against anyone. And in the multiple times the law has been reauthorized, we, as a legislature, have always tried to ensure that all victims of domestic violence receive the protections under the law.

As my colleague pointed out, up till now they have. Unfortunately, the latest attempt to reauthorize the Violence Against Women Act has been different. This time, the majority has alternately tried to pass extreme legislation that would weaken current law and rejected calls to pass bipartisan legislation that would strengthen the current law.

On February 12, with 23 Republican Senators voting in favor, including every Republican woman in the Senate, they approved a reauthorization that is both comprehensive and inclusive in nature. Unfortunately, instead of allowing a clean, up-or-down vote on this bipartisan bill, the majority leadership proposed a substitute amendment that removes key provisions from that bill.

For example, the leadership's amendment fails to explicitly protect LGBT victims, and limits protections for immigrants. At the same time, the amendment fails to close the legal loopholes that leave Native American victims of domestic violence with nowhere to turn.

Additionally, despite the high rate of dating violence and sexual assault on college campuses, the amendment entirely omits protections for young women who are victimized in college. And that's why the majority's amendment is opposed by groups including the National Task Force to End Sexual and Domestic Violence Against Women, the National Congress of American Indians, and the Leadership Conference on Civil and Human Rights, among many others.

It's dismaying that some in the majority want to weaken a strong bipartisan Senate bill, and it's vital that this Chamber reject their alternative partisan amendment.

With the votes we are about to take, we will be asked to choose between an amendment that fails to protect some victims of domestic violence, and the bipartisan Senate bill protecting all victims. The choice is so clear.

We'll be asked to choose between an amendment opposed by victims and victims' rights advocates and a bipartisan bill. And when looking at those options that are before us, it is clear what we must do. I strongly urge my colleagues to vote "no" on the substitute amendment tomorrow to the Senate bill, so the original Senate legislation will receive a vote in the House.

Mr. Speaker, I want to take a moment and talk about the incredible impact the Violence Against Women bill has had since it was enacted. Thanks to that Act, instances of domestic violence have fallen by 67 percent, and over 1 million people have obtained protective orders against their batterers.

Before the passage of the Violence Against Women Act, police officers were not trained to separate a victim and abuser when they responded to a domestic violence call. Thanks to the law, the police officers are now trained to do just that, a most important change that stopped violence from resuming the moment the police left and the front door closed.

But perhaps the greatest victory of the Violence Against Women Act is that the law finally brought millions of victims out of the shadows and gave them a place to stand.

In 1994, domestic violence in our country was not even discussed, and its scars were never acknowledged. And as a result, the victims often became abusers in a cycle of violence that simply wouldn't end. We wrote the law to stop that cycle of violence, and we think we have achieved much of that. For 18 years, this law gave victims a choice and made incredible progress in ending the cycle of violence.

Every time we've renewed the law, our goal has been the same: to ensure that all victims of domestic violence, no matter their ethnicity, their sexual orientation, their age or their gender, are acknowledged and helped and protected by the law.

It has been now more than 500 days since the Violence Against Women Act expired. Today is the day that ends, and we act in the name of justice. I urge my colleagues to vote "no" on the exclusionary substitute amendment tomorrow so we can vote "yes" and get this bill to the President right away.

Now, in addition, I want to mention on the previous question, today we're going to have an opportunity to stop the sequester, which is scheduled, as you know, to take effect in just 2 days.

We all know all the harms. We know very well what the sequester is going to do to the economy and to the workforce in the United States. And most importantly, we know that we cannot afford such a slowdown.

Now, today we're going to give Members of the House an opportunity to vote on a sequester solution. If we defeat the previous question—and please pay attention: If you want to go on record against having the sequester go into effect, we are giving you an opportunity to do that.

By voting "no" on the previous question, you will allow the House to vote on a measure that Mr. VAN HOLLEN, ranking member of the Budget Committee, has come to the Rules Committee three times with to try to achieve the end of saving us from ourselves. Mr. VAN HOLLEN's legislation would reduce the deficit in a balanced and responsible way but stop the devastating sequestration cuts.

□ 1250

Today is the last chance for the House of Representatives to stop the sequester. Despite what some have said, this Chamber has not passed a solution to the sequester during this Con-

gress. It is vital that the inaction of the majority come to an end. We must take a step to stop the sequester today.

So let me urge you to vote "no" on the previous question if you wish to be on record saying you do not support the sequester, you do not want to see this damage done to the economy and to the United States and, incidentally, to our reputation in the country and in the rest of the world. Doing so will allow Mr. VAN HOLLEN's legislation to have the serious debate and vote that it deserves.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. NUGENT. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. HANNA).

Mr. HANNA. I rise today in support of the rule which provides for consideration of S. 47, the Violence Against Women Reauthorization Act of 2013.

Mr. Speaker, the Violence Against Women Reauthorization Act has been successful. We have seen its benefits. It has saved lives and helped millions of women find safety, security, and self-sufficiency. While there are deeply held differences about some policies in the bill we consider today, now is the time to reauthorize the Violence Against Women Reauthorization Act.

If a daughter, sister, or perfect stranger were raped, battered, or needed help, no one would ask or care what her ethnicity, national origin, or sexual orientation was before coming to her aid—nor should the Violence Against Women Act. No community, no person should be neglected when it comes to domestic violence. As a father of a young daughter, Grace Catherine, I don't know or care what her orientation is—and neither should Congress. I simply know that she and all women and girls should be equally protected under its laws.

We have an opportunity now to finally pass a bipartisan, inclusive Violence Against Women Act that service providers, law enforcement and, most importantly, all victims deserve. I urge my colleagues to support this rule and the underlying bill.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. I am pleased to yield 1½ minutes to my colleague, the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. VELÁZQUEZ), the distinguished ranking member of the Committee on Small Business.

Ms. VELÁZQUEZ. I want to thank the gentlelady from New York for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, twice in two decades Members of both parties have crossed party lines to reauthorize the Violence Against Women Act. Yet this week we are considering a partisan bill that excludes some victims based on sexual orientation or immigration status. Does abuse not "count" if the victim happens to be a gay man or a lesbian? What if the victim is an undocumented worker?

Here are some facts my GOP colleagues may be unaware of: 40 percent of gay men experience domestic abuse, as do 50 percent of lesbian women. For

undocumented women, abuse rates are slightly higher than the rest of the population, but go unreported for fear of deportation. Those are millions of people and thousands of New Yorkers who are being hurt. This legislation adds insult to their injury by basically saying because of who you are, we won't help you.

I hope my Republican colleagues agree that that is not the message we want to send. Vote "no" on the rule and the underlying bill so we can approve a real Violence Against Women Act that protects all victims equally. Shame on us. This should not be a partisan issue.

Mr. NUGENT. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. COLE).

Mr. COLE. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I rise to support the rule and the underlying legislation. This rule brings the Senate-passed version of VAWA to the floor and allows us to vote on House language to replace that version. I want to particularly thank my good friend, Chairman SESSIONS of the Rules Committee, for devising a rule that will help the House work its will on this important issue—and do so smoothly, fairly, and quickly.

I want to particularly thank Leader CANTOR for his hard work and effort to truly understand and deal with the problems that Native American women face. That part of our population, as many of my colleagues have learned during the course of this debate, is in many ways the most at-risk part of our population. One in three Native American women will be sexually assaulted in the course of her lifetime. The statistics on the failure to prosecute and hold accountable the perpetrators of those crimes are simply stunning. I'm very proud that both the Senate and the House have turned their attention to this issue and finally begun to give it the consideration that it merits. Again, I particularly want to thank Leader CANTOR. The House version has improved tremendously over what this body passed in the last Congress; and that's due, in large measure, to his hard work.

That being said, I cannot support the House version of VAWA. While it's made great strides in recognizing the jurisdictions of tribal courts over non-Indian offenders, it falls short of giving tribes what they need to keep their citizens protected from the scourge of domestic violence. Unlike the Senate version, the House version fails to recognize existing tribal sovereignty that's enshrined in the Constitution and has been recognized throughout the history of our country. The House version requires tribes to seek Department of Justice certification before exercising jurisdiction over non-Indian offenders. I cannot think of any example where one sovereign has to seek permission to exercise their rights as a sovereign. It doesn't make sense to ask

tribes to willingly abdicate part of their sovereignty to exercise another part of their sovereignty.

In the same vein, the House bill waives sovereign immunity on behalf of the tribes. As sovereigns, tribes should make that decision on whether or not to waive sovereign immunity. In the final analysis, Indian tribes and Indian women need help—and I don't think there's much debate about this in this body. And they prefer the Senate bill to the House bill. That settles the issue for me.

I support this rule. I urge my colleagues to vote "no" on the House amendment to the underlying bill, and I support the underlying bill that's been passed by the Senate.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 1½ minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ).

Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California. I rise today in opposition to the amendment made under this rule to gut the Senate-passed Violence Against Women Reauthorization Act of 2013. The Senate bill is a bipartisan approach that protects vulnerable populations, and the amendment made under this rule would remove those protections. Furthermore, S. 47 includes legislation that I have worked on in these two past Congresses with Representative VIRGINIA FOXX of North Carolina, who I call my good friend, and Senator KLOBUCHAR of Minnesota. I reintroduced the STALKERS Act this Congress and am pleased that it is included in the underlying bill.

No one can deny that the Internet is a great tool for all of us that connects billions of people around the world. But one of the problems with it is that it's proven to be an effective weapon for stalkers to prey on innocent people. Current Federal stalking statutes simply have not caught up with the new tools and the emerging technologies that these criminals use. The STALKERS Act would bring our laws into the 21st century by giving law enforcement the tools they need to combat stalking in the digital age.

The STALKERS Act would protect victims and empower prosecutors by increasing the scope of existing laws to cover acts of electronic monitoring, including spyware, bugging, video surveillance, and other new technologies as they develop. Currently, Federal laws cannot be enforced unless stalking victims can demonstrate that they are in reasonable fear of physical injury.

Again, I thank you for including the STALKERS Act in the underlying bill.

□ 1300

Mr. NUGENT. I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. I am pleased to yield 1½ minutes to my colleague from New York (Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY).

Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to pass the rule and the underlying bipartisan Senate Violence

Against Women Act. This is the first bill that I worked on when I came to Congress with the great LOUISE SLAUGHTER and Patricia Schroeder, and then-Senator JOE BIDEN. It has been reauthorized in a bipartisan way many times.

From 1994 to 2010, about four in five victims of intimate partner violence have been female. These numbers are real people, and so are the tragedies behind them. But this is not about politics. This is about the single most fundamental task that we require of our government: to keep its citizens safe from violent assaults—all of our residents, all of our citizens, immigrants, no matter what the sexual orientation is of our citizens. It's for all of our citizens.

I am pleased that two of the bills that I have authored are part of the Senate version. It would be ripped out by the Republican version, so I strongly support the bipartisan Senate version. One I authored with Representative POE in a bipartisan way, and that was the SAFER Act. This took the monies and directed Justice not to spend more money but to process the backlog of DNA kits in rape cases to put rapists behind bars. And also, the Campus SaVe Act.

There's too much violence on campus. One in five women will be sexually assaulted during their college years. This provision that I authored would increase the obligations of colleges to keep students safe and informed about policies on sexual assault. Also, the very bipartisan, important anti-trafficking bill is part of it.

So I urge my colleagues, in a bipartisan, historic way, to reauthorize, re-pass the Violence Against Women Act, the Senate version.

Mr. NUGENT. I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. MATSUI).

Ms. MATSUI. I thank the gentlelady from New York for yielding me time.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support for the bipartisan, Senate-passed Violence Against Women Reauthorization Act.

Since the Violence Against Women Act first became law in 1994, the incidence of domestic violence is down more than 60 percent. It is with that same record of success that we should address the prevalence of domestic violence in underserved communities.

In my district of Sacramento, we are fortunate to have an organization called WEAVE, which provides crisis intervention services to domestic violence and sexual assault victims. Recently, WEAVE admitted a woman and her 8-year-old son, Tucker, to their safe house. By the time Tucker reached the safe house, his father's verbal abuse had convinced him that he was stupid and insignificant. For an 8-year-old boy to no longer smile, to play games, to enjoy life is heartbreaking.

Fortunately, Tucker's mother rescued herself and her son by using the

resources that the Violence Against Women Act makes available. Tucker is now living away from his father, in counseling, and on his way to a happy and healthy future.

Time and time again we hear that programs like this break the cycle of domestic violence. We must view this legislation not just as a women's issue, but as a family issue, as a community issue that touches all of our lives.

It is essential for all past and future victims of domestic violence, sexual assault, dating violence, and stalking that we strengthen and reauthorize the Violence Against Women Act. I urge my colleagues to reauthorize an all-inclusive version of the Violence Against Women Act.

Mr. NUGENT. I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. I am pleased, Mr. Speaker, to yield 1½ minutes to the gentlewoman from Nevada (Ms. TITUS).

Ms. TITUS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to support the rule but oppose the House Republican substitute, and to urge my colleagues to vote for the real Violence Against Women Act's reauthorization. This passed the Senate with overwhelming bipartisan support.

Real VAWA focuses on key programs to address sexual assault, including the backlog in testing rape kits. It also consolidates programs to ensure that resources are reaching victim services and local law enforcement, and it ensures protection for all victims of abuse and violence.

In Nevada, nearly half of all women have been the victim of some kind of sexual assault, and more than a quarter have been the victim of rape. The Rape Crisis Center in Las Vegas—an excellent organization that I've worked with closely over the years—assists victims in the transition to become survivors. This Congress should support the Center's efforts, not hinder them.

Violence against women is not a game. It is time for House Republicans to stop playing games and to reauthorize this final legislation now.

Mr. NUGENT. I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 1½ minutes to the gentlewoman from Texas (Mr. AL GREEN).

Mr. AL GREEN of Texas. I thank you so much for the time.

Isn't it ironic that today, the Supreme Court of the United States of America is considering section 5 of the Voting Rights Act in terms of whether it will continue to apply to the United States of America and those specific States and areas that are included therein. This is being done at the same time we are considering the Violence Against Women Act, which in my opinion should be called a Family Violence Act. I say this because we cannot exclude people because of their sexual orientation.

This is my watch. I have a duty to stand up for those who are being left out or left behind. This act should include the LGBT community, and any

substitute that would remove the LGBT community is a substitute that I cannot support.

Isn't it ironic that today, the Supreme Court is considering section 5 of the Voting Rights Act, and we just had a statue of Rosa Parks made available to the public in Statuary Hall? Friends, it's time for us to come up to the standards of this time, and let's bring all of our people with us. The LGBT community merits our consideration. I will not vote for the substitute. I support the LGBT community.

Mr. NUGENT. I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. VAN HOLLEN) to discuss the previous question. Mr. VAN HOLLEN is the distinguished ranking member on the Committee on the Budget.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. I thank Ranking Member SLAUGHTER.

I hope tomorrow this House will finally have a chance to vote on the bipartisan Senate bill to prevent violence against women. I hope tomorrow we will also have a chance to vote on a proposal that we've now put forward three times this year to replace the sequester. Unfortunately, the rule reported out of the House Rules Committee denies us that opportunity. So let's just remind people what will happen starting March 1.

Starting March 1, if this House does not take action to replace the sequester, we will lose 750,000 American jobs between March 1 and the end of this year. Those are not my numbers; those are not President Obama's numbers; those are the numbers from the non-partisan, independent Congressional Budget Office—750,000 fewer American jobs by the end of this year if we don't replace the sequester.

This majority in this House has not taken any action this year in this Congress to prevent that sequester from happening beginning Friday, not one step. We have now asked three times for the opportunity to vote on our alternative.

So what's our alternative, Mr. Speaker? Our alternative would replace the sequester with a balanced mix of cuts and revenue generated by closing tax loopholes and tax preferences that benefit the very wealthy.

So very specifically—because it's a concrete proposal—we would get rid of the direct payments that go to agribusinesses, something that used to have bipartisan support because that's an unnecessary subsidy that has outlived its purpose. So that's a cut.

□ 1310

We also say we no longer need taxpayer subsidies for the big oil companies. Guess what? That's an idea that was proposed by President Bush who said taxpayers should no longer be giving these big breaks to big oil companies; they don't need that extra taxpayer incentive in order to keep pro-

ducing oil and making record profits. So we do that.

Then we say to folks who are making \$2 million a year that we're going to limit the number of preferences you can take. We're going to limit the number of tax breaks that you take that allow you to effectively pay a lower rate than the people who work for you. So if you're making \$2 million or more per year, we say you should pay an effective tax rate of 30 percent.

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

Ms. SLAUGHTER. I yield the gentleman an additional 2 minutes.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. If you take that balanced combination of targeted cuts and the elimination of tax breaks that disproportionately benefit very wealthy people, guess what happens? You get the same deficit reduction over the budget window, so you reduce the deficit by the same amount as you would get if you allow the sequester to take place throughout this year, but you do it in a way that does not lose 750,000 American jobs. You do it in a way that does not cause disruption at our airports; in a way that does not cause disruption to our food safety system; in a way that does not cause disruption to the nurses who are caring for our veterans in military hospitals and veterans hospitals around this country; and in a way that does not disrupt our military operations.

So, Mr. Speaker, we just have a simple question: Why is it that as we gather here Wednesday, we're denied the opportunity to even have a vote on this alternative, this balanced alternative, to prevent the loss of 750,000 American jobs? We're not asking Members of this House to vote for our alternative, although we think it's a good one and would urge them to do so. We're simply asking that in the people's House we have a vote on an alternative to something that will create these great job losses and that great disruption.

I think the American people are going to ask themselves why we were not even granted that opportunity with less than 3 days to go before we hit that across-the-board sequester, which is just Washington-speak for massive job loss and massive economic disruption.

In addition to the job loss, according to the independent Congressional Budget Office, it will cause one-third less economic output in the United States of America in this year at a time when the economy remains very fragile. So I ask, finally, Mr. Speaker, give us that opportunity at least to vote so people have a choice to prevent the sequester.

I thank the gentlelady from New York, the ranking member of the Rules Committee.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I'm delighted to yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from California, the Democratic leader, Ms. PELOSI.

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding and for

her leadership as the senior Democrat on the Rules Committee.

Today, we have an interesting discussion. We are debating the rule that will enable us to bring to the floor the Violence Against Women Act. As part of the debate on the rule, we are asking a "no" vote on the previous question which will enable us also to not only vote on the Violence Against Women Act but, at completion, to go on to voting on the proposal that the Democrats have to resolve the sequester issue.

I'll start first, though, with the Violence Against Women Act. As of yesterday, it was over 500 days since the Violence Against Women Act had expired. The reauthorization is long overdue. Last year, the Senate, in a bipartisan way, passed a bill that was comprehensive, that did the job. The House Republicans resisted that. Here we are again, this year, last week, the Senate, in a bipartisan way, passed 78-22 the Violence Against Women Act, which is comprehensive and does the job. That means 78 percent of the Senate voted—78 percent of the Senate voted—for this Violence Against Women Act. It means also that all of the women in the Senate, Democrats and Republicans alike, voted for this act. It also means that a majority of the Republicans in the Senate—a majority of the Republicans in the Senate—voted for this comprehensive Violence Against Women Act.

So the Senate has passed it overwhelmingly with the majority of Republicans supporting it. The President stands ready to sign it. Democrats in the House support it. We will call upon the leadership of GWEN MOORE, who has a similar bill in the House. We stand ready to support the Senate version. The Senate has passed it, we support it, the President is ready to sign it, and, once again, the Republicans in the House are the obstacle to passing this legislation.

It's really hard to explain to anyone why we would say to the women of America, Women of America, step forward; we are stopping violence against women. Not so fast if you're an immigrant, not so fast if you're a member of the LGBT community, not so fast if you're a Native American. What is that? Violence against some women but not others? Quite frankly, the groups that are excluded by the House bill are the groups that are in the most need of protection against violence.

So I would hope that in the course of the debate that we will move on to on the Violence Against Women Act that we will all open our hearts to what is needed to reduce violence in the lives of America's women.

In the meantime, we have a procedure that is not preferable, we have asked over and over again, as the distinguished gentleman from Maryland (Mr. VAN HOLLEN) has said, this will be the third time we've asked to get a vote on a Democratic alternative. The American people want to know why we can't pass something to avoid sequestration. We have this proposal that is

fair, that does make cuts, that does produce revenue, and that does not impede growth with jobs in our economy. All we want is a vote. Why do we have to beg, hat in hand, for a vote on the floor of the House in this marketplace of ideas? What are the Republicans afraid of? They may be afraid that it will win because it makes so much sense that their Members may be attracted to vote for it. Or they may not want to put their Members on record voting against something that is so balanced, that is so commonsense driven that is a solution, a solution to sequestration.

What does sequestration mean? Well, whatever it means, this is what it equals: sequestration equals unemployment. Sequestration equals job loss. And we just cannot have a slowing down of our economic growth. We cannot afford losing the 700,000 jobs. That's the low estimate that has been put forth by economists and by the Congressional Budget Office itself.

We urge people to vote "no" on the previous question, which means that we would then be allowed to come to the floor to take up the Violence Against Women Act and also to take up the sequestration bill. It is really something that deserves debate on the floor of the House.

The Republican leadership has said, well, we voted on that last year. Last year was another Congress. That Congress ended. How to make a law: Congress ends, we have an election, and a new Congress begins. The Constitution says that bills that relate to revenue or to appropriations must begin in the House. So they said, We did it last year. It doesn't count. Let the Senate begin. That's not what the Constitution says.

So let us take our responsibility and not be afraid of the ideas that people sent us here to discuss. We don't have to agree on every point, but we certainly should have an opportunity on the floor of the House. People across the country are talking about this. You can't turn on any media without their talking about this. The only place we can't talk about it or get a vote on it is on the floor of the House of Representatives. That's plain wrong.

I urge a "no" vote on the previous question, a "no" vote on the Republican Violence Against Women Act, and a "yes" vote on the bipartisan Senate bill when we have an opportunity to vote on that.

□ 1320

Mr. NUGENT. I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I would like to yield 15 seconds to Mr. VAN HOLLEN for clarification, and following that I will yield 2 minutes to the gentlelady from Florida (Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ).

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Speaker, just three numbers: 750,000 fewer American jobs, cutting growth in GDP by one-third, not economic output but growth

in GDP by one-third. That's one number. The second number: three, the number of times we've tried to get a vote on this. The third number: zero, the number of times our Republican colleagues this year have tried to resolve the sequester issue.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman from Florida is recognized for 2 minutes.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I rise today in support of this comprehensive and bipartisan effort to end violence against women.

The Violence Against Women Act recently passed by the Senate properly updates this crucial legislation for the 21st century by providing necessary resources and support to all victims of domestic violence regardless of their race, ethnicity, or sexual orientation. An overwhelming 78 Senators, including 23 Republicans, recognize the need for these protections, and I'm thrilled that we're finally moving to recognize that same.

I'd like to express my gratitude to the champions of this bill in the House, including the gentlelady from New York. Several of my colleagues and I, along with hundreds of groups and thousands of concerned citizens all across the country, have worked tirelessly these past few weeks to make sure that the voices of survivors and advocates could be heard over partisan debate. That is why the bill we consider today reflects the needs of vulnerable populations that have been ignored in the past. It will give Native American tribes the tools to hold abusers accountable, LGBT survivors the protection they need to access services, and immigrant survivors the independence necessary to escape violence.

I'm proud to vote in favor of a comprehensive Violence Against Women Act for my constituents, for my children, my daughters, and I urge all of my colleagues to do the same.

Mr. NUGENT. I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time.

May I inquire of my colleague if he has any more requests for time?

Mr. NUGENT. I do not.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. If not, then I'm prepared to close.

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

This has been a wonderful day for us in some way because we are finally debating the Violence Against Women Act, with a great possibility of passing the Senate bill, which will protect all women in the United States and not just some. It's terribly important that we do that. And I think we may have caused some confusion there as we talk about violence against women, and we're also talking about the previous question which deals purely with sequestration. I would like to close speaking about that.

I think everyone understands the importance that we attach to the Violence

Against Women Act, but we are also very much concerned about sequestration. The reason we have brought it up on a previous question on the Violence Against Women Act is we've had absolutely no other opportunity to bring it up.

The American public has been told over and over again that twice this House has passed legislation dealing with sequestration. All of us know—I'm not sure the public knows, but let me make it clear—that anything done before December 31 of last year is no longer valid.

Nothing has been done this term to stop the sequestration. The only effort that has been made to do so has been done by Mr. VAN HOLLEN, the ranking member of the Budget Committee. He has a very moderate request, one that does not do great harm either to the employment situation in the country or to the output of GDP, and what he said was terribly important.

What we are about to embark on here is totally unknown. We know that it's bad. I think everybody has understood that it's bad. Why we would continue to do it is beyond my imagination. But let me make it absolutely clear here: no opportunity has been given to our side of the House to even attempt to deal with sequestration. This is it.

For any Member of the House of Representatives who would like to go on record saying that they don't want sequestration to take place on March 1, this is your only opportunity. So we are asking that you will vote "no" on the previous question so we can at least go on record in this House and we can do our very best to stop what, by all accounts and by what all important economists say, will be an unmitigated disaster.

If we defeat the previous question, we will offer the amendment, which will 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 deficit. It is a balanced approach, Mr. Speaker, not a meat-ax across the board.

We have to act now if we're going to avert this crisis. I can't reiterate enough that this is our only chance. If we're going to avoid the unnecessary cuts to essential programs, the time is now.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert the text of the 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 gentlewoman from New York?

There was no objection.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I strongly urge all of my colleagues in this House, because none of us want to face that abyss, to vote "no" to defeat the previous question, and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

I support this rule and encourage my colleagues to support it as well.

Every day, people flee their homes because of violence they suffer at the hands of a domestic partner. If there's something we can do to stop that violence to save those women and children, then we need to do it. Inaction is unacceptable. I've seen the consequences of doing nothing too many times when it comes to domestic violence.

We have before us a rule that provides the House with multiple options on how we take a stance against domestic violence right here and right now. We may not agree on which of these two visions is the best one, but I think we can all agree that something must be done. That's why I say to you, Mr. Speaker, support the rule before us today. If you want to do something, anything, then you need to start with voting for the rule. That's the first step. That's what we need to pass first and foremost so we can debate those options.

Some folks here will like the Senate's vision of the Violence Against Women Reauthorization Act more than they like the House alternative. Others have problems with the Senate bill and think the House's plan is the way to go forward. Either way, if you want to take a stand against violence against women, then you need to support this rule.

This rule is how we move to the next step, to debate the options before the House to ensure that law enforcement departments, organizations like the Dawn Center back home, and victims of domestic violence can get the support that they so desperately need.

There are those who want to confuse this with another issue before this House, but this is the issue that we have today, the issue on domestic violence, the Violence Against Women Act.

The material previously referred to by Ms. SLAUGHTER is as follows:

AN AMENDMENT TO H. RES. 83 OFFERED BY
MS. SLAUGHTER OF NEW YORK

At the end of the resolution, add the following new sections:

SEC. 2. Immediately upon adoption of this resolution the Speaker shall, pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule XVIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the bill (H.R. 699) To amend the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 to repeal and replace the fiscal year 2013 sequestration. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. General debate shall be confined to the bill and shall not exceed one hour equally divided among and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Ways and Means, the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on the Budget, and the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Agriculture. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. All points of order against provisions in the bill are waived. At the conclusion of consideration of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report

the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions. If the Committee of the Whole rises and reports that it has come to no resolution on the bill, then on the next legislative day the House shall, immediately after the third daily order of business under clause 1 of rule XIV, resolve into the Committee of the Whole for further consideration of the bill.

SEC. 3. Clause 1(c) of rule XIX shall not apply to the consideration of the bill specified in section 2 of this resolution.

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 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 ques-

tion 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. NUGENT. With that, Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time, and I move the previous question on the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on ordering the previous question.

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, further proceedings on this question will be postponed.

RECESS

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

Accordingly (at 1 o'clock and 28 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1514

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. McCLINTOCK) at 3 o'clock and 14 minutes p.m.

HOURLY MEETING ON TOMORROW

Mr. NUGENT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet at 9 a.m. tomorrow.

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

There was no objection.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER
PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 and clause 9 of rule XX, proceedings will resume on questions previously postponed. Votes will be taken in the following order:

Ordering the previous question on House Resolution 83; adopting House Resolution 83, if ordered; and agreeing to the Speaker's approval of the Journal.

The first electronic vote will be conducted as a 15-minute vote. Remaining electronic votes will be conducted as 5-minute votes.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF S. 47, VIOLENCE AGAINST WOMEN REAUTHORIZATION ACT OF 2013

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on ordering the previous question on the resolution (H. Res. 83) providing for consideration of the bill (S. 47) to reauthorize the Violence Against Women Act of 1994, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on ordering the previous question.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 229, nays 196, not voting 6, as follows:

[Roll No. 51]

YEAS—229

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

Valadao
 Wagner
 Walberg
 Walden
 Walorski
 Weber (TX)
 Webster (FL)

Wenstrup
 Westmoreland
 Whitfield
 Williams
 Wilson (SC)
 Wittman
 Wolf

Womack
 Woodall
 Yoder
 Yoho
 Young (FL)
 Young (IN)

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 414, nays 9, not voting 8, as follows:

[Roll No. 52]

YEAS—414

Andrews
 Barber
 Barrow (GA)
 Bass
 Beatty
 Becerra
 Bera (CA)
 Bishop (GA)
 Bishop (NY)
 Blumenauer
 Bonamici
 Brady (PA)
 Braley (IA)
 Brown (FL)
 Brownley (CA)
 Bustos
 Butterfield
 Capps
 Capuano
 Cárdenas
 Carney
 Carson (IN)
 Cartwright
 Castor (FL)
 Castro (TX)
 Chu
 Cicilline
 Clarke
 Clay
 Cleaver
 Clyburn
 Cohen
 Connolly
 Conyers
 Cooper
 Costa
 Courtney
 Crowley
 Cuellar
 Cummings
 Davis (CA)
 Davis, Danny
 DeFazio
 DeGette
 Delaney
 DeLauro
 DelBene
 Deutch
 Dingell
 Doggett
 Doyle
 Duchowicz
 Duffey
 Edwards
 Ellison
 Ellmers
 Engel
 Enyart
 Eshoo
 Esty
 Fattah
 Fazio
 Fenchel
 Fincher
 Fitzpatrick
 Fleischmann
 Fleming
 Flores
 Forbes
 Fortenberry
 Foxx
 Franks (AZ)
 Frelinghuysen
 Gardner
 Garrett
 Gerlach
 Gibbs

Grayson
 Green, Al
 Grijalva
 Gutierrez
 Hahn
 Hanabusa
 Hastings (FL)
 Heck (WA)
 Higgins
 Himes
 Hinojosa
 Holt
 Honda
 Horsford
 Huffman
 Israel
 Jackson Lee
 Jeffries
 Johnson (GA)
 Johnson, E. B.
 Kaptur
 Keating
 Kennedy
 Kildee
 Kilmer
 Kind
 Kirkpatrick
 Kuster
 Langevin
 Larsen (WA)
 Larson (CT)
 Lee (CA)
 Levin
 Lewis
 Lipinski
 Loebbeck
 Lofgren
 Lowenthal
 Lowey
 Lujan Grisham (NM)
 Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
 Lynch
 Maffei
 Maloney,
 Carolyn
 Maloney, Sean
 Markey
 Matheson
 Matsui
 McCarthy (NY)
 McCollum
 McDermott
 Engel
 McGovern
 McInerney
 Meeks
 Meng
 Michaud
 Miller, George
 Moore
 Moran
 Murphy (FL)
 Nadler
 Napolitano
 Neal
 Negrete McLeod

Nolan
 O'Rourke
 Owens
 Pallone
 Pascrell
 Pastor (AZ)
 Payne
 Pelosi
 Perlmutter
 Peters (CA)
 Peters (MI)
 Peterson
 Pingree (ME)
 Pocan
 Polis
 Price (NC)
 Quigley
 Rahall
 Rangel
 Richmond
 Roybal-Allard
 Ruiz
 Ruppersberger
 Rush
 Ryan (OH)
 Sánchez, Linda
 T.
 Sanchez, Loretta
 Sarbanes
 Schakowsky
 Schiff
 Schneider
 Schrader
 Schwartz
 Scott (VA)
 Scott, David
 Serrano
 Sewell (AL)
 Shea-Porter
 Sherman
 Sinema
 Sires
 Slaughter
 Smith (WA)
 Speier
 Swalwell (CA)
 Takano
 Thompson (CA)
 Thompson (MS)
 Tierney
 Titus
 Tonko
 Tsongas
 Van Hollen
 Vargas
 Veasey
 Vela
 Velázquez
 Visclosky
 Walz
 Wasserman
 Schultz
 Watt
 Waxman
 Welch
 Wilson (FL)
 Yarmuth

Aderholt
 Alexander
 Amash
 Amodei
 Andrews
 Bachmann
 Bachus
 Barletta
 Barr
 Barton
 Bass
 Beatty
 Becerra
 Benishek
 Bentivolio
 Bilirakis
 Bishop (GA)
 Bishop (NY)
 Bishop (UT)
 Black
 Blackburn
 Blumenauer
 Bonamici
 Bonner
 Boustany
 Brady (PA)
 Brady (TX)
 Braley (IA)
 Bridenstine
 Brooks (AL)
 Brooks (IN)
 Broun (GA)
 Buchanan
 Bucshon
 Burgess
 Calvert
 Camp
 Cantor
 Capito
 Carter
 Cassidy
 Chabot
 Chaffetz
 Coffman
 Cole
 Collins (GA)
 Collins (NY)
 Conaway
 Cook
 Cotton
 Cramer
 Crawford
 Crenshaw
 Daines
 Davis, Rodney
 Denham
 Dent
 DeSantis
 DesJarlais
 Diaz-Balart
 Duffy
 Duncan (SC)
 Duncan (TN)
 Ellmers
 Farenthold
 Fincher
 Fitzpatrick
 Fleischmann
 Fleming
 Flores
 Forbes
 Fortenberry
 Foxx
 Franks (AZ)
 Frelinghuysen
 Gardner
 Garrett
 Gerlach
 Gibbs

Cummings
 Daines
 Davis (CA)
 Davis, Danny
 DeFazio
 DeGette
 Delaney
 DeLauro
 DelBene
 Denham
 Dent
 DeSantis
 DesJarlais
 Deutch
 Diaz-Balart
 Dingell
 Doggett
 Doyle
 Duckworth
 Duffy
 Duncan (SC)
 Duncan (TN)
 Edwards
 Ellison
 Ellmers
 Engel
 Enyart
 Eshoo
 Esty
 Farenthold
 Farr
 Fattah
 Fincher
 Fitzpatrick
 Fleischmann
 Fleming
 Flores
 Forbes
 Fortenberry
 Foster
 Frankel (FL)
 Franks (AZ)
 Frelinghuysen
 Larson (CT)
 Latham
 Latta
 Lee (CA)
 Levin
 Lewis
 Lipinski
 LoBiondo
 Loebbeck
 Lofgren
 Long
 Lowenthal
 Lowey
 Lucas
 Luetkemeyer
 Lujan Grisham (NM)
 Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
 Lummis
 Lynch
 Maffei
 Maloney,
 Carolyn
 Maloney, Sean
 Marchant
 Marino
 Markay
 Matheson
 Matsui
 McCarthy (CA)
 McCarthy (NY)
 McCaul
 McCollum
 McDermott
 McGovern
 McHenry
 McIntyre
 McKeon

NOT VOTING—6

Granger
 Hoyer
 Waters
 Young (AK)

□ 1543

Ms. SINEMA, Ms. ESHOO, Mrs. BEATTY, Messrs. AL GREEN of Texas and GALLEGRO changed their vote from "yea" to "nay."

Mr. MCINTYRE changed his vote from "nay" to "yea."

Mr. MCCLINTOCK changed his vote from "present" to "yea."

So the previous question was ordered. The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HARPER). The question is on the resolution.

McKinley
McMorris
Rodgers
McNerney
Meadows
Meehan
Meeks
Meng
Messer
Mica
Michaud
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Miller, George
Moore
Moran
Mullin
Mulvaney
Murphy (FL)
Murphy (PA)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Negrete McLeod
Neugebauer
Noem
Nolan
Nugent
Nunes
Nunnelee
O'Rourke
Olson
Owens
Palazzo
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Paulsen
Payne
Pearce
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Perry
Peters (CA)
Peters (MI)
Peterson
Petri
Pingree (ME)
Pittenger
Pitts
Pocan
Poe (TX)
Polis
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Price (NC)

Quigley
Radel
Rahall
Rangel
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rice (SC)
Richmond
Rigell
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Ruiz
Runyan
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Ryan (WI)
Sánchez, Linda
T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Scalise
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Schock
Schrader
Schwartz
Schweikert
Scott (VA)
Scott, Austin
Scott, David
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sessions
Sewell (AL)
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Sinema
Sires
Slaughter

NAYS—9

Broun (GA)
Garrett
Gohmert

NOT VOTING—8

Coble
Culberson
Davis, Rodney

□ 1550

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 for:

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 52 I was on the floor and tried to vote when it was closed. Had I been present, I would have voted "yea."

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the question on agreeing to the Speaker's approval of the Journal, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The question is on the Speaker's approval of the Journal.

This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 293, nays

119, answered "present" 1, not voting 18, as follows:

[Roll No. 53]

YEAS—293

Aderholt
Alexander
Amodei
Bachmann
Bachus
Barber
Barletta
Barr
Barrow (GA)
Barton
Beatty
Becerra
Bera (CA)
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Blumenauer
Bonner
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Braley (IA)
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Broun (GA)
Brown (FL)
Brownlee (CA)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Bustos
Butterfield
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Capps
Carney
Carson (IN)
Carter
Cartwright
Cassidy
Castro (TX)
Chabot
Chu
Cicilline
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Connolly
Cook
Cooper
Costa
Cramer
Crawford
Crenshaw
Daines
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
DesJarlais
Deutch
Diaz-Balart
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle
Duckworth
Duncan (TN)
Ellison
Ellmers
Engel
Enyart
Eshoo
Esty
Farenthold
Fattah
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Fudge

Watt
Waxman
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Welch
Wenstrup

NAYS—119

Amash
Andrews
Benishek
Bentivolio
Bishop (NY)
Brady (PA)
Burgess
Capito
Capuano
Cárdenas
Castor (FL)
Chaffetz
Clarke
Coffman
Conaway
Conyers
Courtney
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis, Rodney
DeFazio
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Edwards
Farr
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Foxo
Gardner
Gibson
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Griffin (AR)
Hanna
Hastings (FL)

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—1

NOT VOTING—18

Bass
Bonamici
Cantor
Coble
Cotton
Culberson

□ 1558

So the Journal was approved.
The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AVERTING SEQUESTRATION

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

Mr. LANGEVIN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to call on Republican leaders to keep the House in session until Congress fulfills its responsibility to the American people by averting sequestration.

With Rhode Island unemployment at 10.2 percent, my constituents cannot afford a single day of these indiscriminate cuts. They will have a negative impact on Rhode Islanders seeking job assistance, teachers educating our children, and countless seniors who rely on food assistance, not to mention the numerous jobs in our defense industry.

We've found compromise in the past. Since April of 2011, Congress has reduced the deficit by over \$2.5 trillion, cutting spending by over \$1.4 trillion,

with almost \$3 in spending cuts for every \$1 of revenue. Mr. Speaker, Democrats in the House and the Senate, along with the President, have put forward balanced proposals to avert these devastating cuts. I urge you to listen to the American people and bring balanced legislation to the floor for a vote. Our communities cannot afford to wait.

NATURAL GAS OFFERING ENERGY REVOLUTION

(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, the Congressional Natural Gas Caucus has relaunched with a four-member bipartisan leadership team in order to expand efforts and organizational resources in the 113th Congress.

Despite a fragile economic recovery, the Nation is witnessing an energy revolution through which energy resource development is offering economic growth, new jobs, and lower energy costs. America's newly found ability to access expansive reserves of natural gas is a large part of this new domestic resource base, which has afforded new opportunities for America's manufacturing sector based on the comparative advantages of lower energy costs and for American families as they heat their homes at a fraction of the cost.

Despite these new fortunes, there are countless policy challenges that must be leveraged for the Nation to continue benefiting from this abundant, clean, low-cost energy source.

The mission of the Congressional Natural Gas Caucus is to educate Members of Congress and the public about the importance of natural gas as a domestic energy resource and its role in meeting the Nation's energy demand and in attaining energy security.

I, along with my fellow cochairs—Representative GENE GREEN from Texas, Representative TOM REED from New York, and Representative JIM COSTA from California—encourage Members to join us in this effort today.

AVERTING SEQUESTRATION

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

Mr. ENYART. Mr. Speaker, I rise today because southern Illinois folks are worried about sequestration undermining the economy and costing us jobs. I want to share with you today a letter about those concerns. This letter is from the supervisor of a young National Guard family.

Sarah and Mike, a young couple, one small child and another on the way, both deployed to Afghanistan with us in 2008. If nothing changes, Sarah will get hit with the furloughs, and Mike will probably lose his full-time National Guard job entirely. This is just devastating. Obviously, don't blame

you. You weren't even in Congress when the Budget Control Act passed. But real people are going to get hurt—bad—veterans and soldiers. This is just incredible. I cannot believe Congress is going to let this train wreck happen. I know you know this, but it matters a great deal to us in DOD and the Guard, both to the civilian employees who will be the immediate victims, and to the rest of us who have to deal with the fallout.

OBAMA ADMINISTRATION PLAYS POLITICS

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

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, yesterday the administration, in an effort to drive home the devastating impacts of sequestration, indicated that they would begin releasing criminal aliens held in detention centers across the United States. This policy is not only a shortsighted scare tactic, but it is also a completely inappropriate way to handle our fiscal problems.

By releasing these criminals out into the communities, the Obama administration is also playing politics with American safety. Not to mention, the administration is placing an undue additional burden on the already strained Federal programs that have succeeded in identifying, arresting, and removing criminal aliens. Ordering the release of criminals back into our communities because their crimes aren't serious enough to qualify for deportation completely ignores DHS's core mission to address our Nation's illegal immigration problem. We're putting our communities at risk, stressing local law enforcement, and not saving a dime once repeat offenders find themselves back in the system.

Mr. Speaker, we are a Nation of laws. We would do well to remember that.

AVERTING SEQUESTRATION

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

Mrs. BUSTOS. Mr. Speaker, I rise to speak out today against the automatic cuts known as sequestration which are set to kick in days from right now. These cuts were designed to be so painful and so terrible that they would never see the light of day. This is budgetary insanity. That is why I have opposed sequestration from the start.

Earlier today, I met with the Quad Cities Chamber of Commerce and representatives from the Rock Island Arsenal. Last week, I met with a defense contractor from Rockford, Illinois, and I toured the USDA Research Lab in Peoria, Illinois. That's the place where they figured out how to mass produce penicillin, and these are the kinds of programs that are at risk. These programs are rightly worried about the impact of sequestration.

We will see job losses because of this flawed budget process, and it will have a trickle-down effect throughout the region that I represent. Our residents

will have less money to eat out. They'll have less money to see a movie or to shop at our small businesses. We cannot afford to have this happen.

I introduced my first piece of legislation a couple of weeks ago, the Government Waste Reduction Act. It is a bipartisan, commonsense approach to reduce government waste and not impact the middle class. This type of approach is reasonable, responsible, and rational, and that's what I would call for in a bipartisan fashion.

□ 1610

SEQUESTRATION

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

Ms. FRANKEL of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to talk about Ruth. She's 91 years old, from my hometown. And Ruth, like many of my constituents, through the years, she's lost her network of family and friends.

After coming home from the hospital, she was unable to shop or cook and could barely get out of bed. According to Ruth, her life was literally saved by a Federal program called Meals on Wheels that delivers more than a million meals to seniors in need each day.

On Friday, as a result of mindless, indiscriminate budget cuts known as sequestration, folks like Ruth, across this country, will be in jeopardy of going hungry, and that is wrong. So I urge my colleagues to do what is right, come together, stop the sequestration, and implement a long-term, balanced approach to reducing our national debt.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to bring up H.R. 699, a balanced bill to replace the sequester with spending cuts and revenues.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BENTIVOLIO). Under the guidelines consistently issued by successive Speakers, as recorded on page 752 of the House Rules Manual, the Chair is constrained not to entertain the gentleman's request until it has been cleared by the bipartisan floor and committee leaderships.

SEQUESTRATION

(Ms. DUCKWORTH asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. DUCKWORTH. Mr. Speaker, last week I traveled across my district listening to my neighbors, who cannot afford the cuts that will go into place under sequestration. At Harper College, school superintendents told me that sequestration will cut vital programs and jeopardize the future of our children.

In Hanover Park, I listened to officials discussing desperately needed

transportation investments. With sequestration, we will lose both construction jobs and potential new investments in our business parks.

In Itasca, veterans who would sacrifice everything for our Nation wonder why Congress can't come together and stop the cuts that will hurt this country they love so much. They didn't go home until they got their mission accomplished, and we shouldn't go home until we revolve this self-inflicted crisis.

Both parties agreed to the sequester. The time for finger-pointing and assigning blame is over. We should immediately vote on and pass commonsense measures like stopping Medicare fraud, ending subsidies for oil and gas industries, and ending tax loopholes for large corporations.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to bring up House Resolution 699, a balanced bill to replace the sequester with spending cuts and revenues, a measure that would save thousands of jobs.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. As the Chair previously advised, that request cannot be entertained absent appropriate clearance.

SEQUESTRATION

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

Mr. BARBER. Mr. Speaker, we are now less than 48 hours from sweeping and irresponsible, across-the-board budget cuts that will go into effect on Friday. These cuts will weaken our military, harm our border security, undermine economic recovery, and hurt southern Arizona families.

We must work together. We can, I am confident, craft a rational, bipartisan solution to reduce the debt so these cuts can be avoided.

Last week I stood with officials from the University of Arizona, the city of Tucson, law enforcement, Border Patrol agents, civilian employees of the airbase and the garrison at Fort Huachuca, and local health care groups and community agencies to demand that we take action on sequestration.

The critical services that these groups and individuals and countless others provide to Arizonans will be cut because Congress has not come together with a commonsense solution. In my districts, these cuts mean longer wait times at the border and ports of entry, and less security between them. This is absolutely unacceptable.

Sequestration hurts the ability of returning veterans to find a job. This is also unacceptable.

And as I've said before, I'm willing to work here with all of my colleagues to find a middle ground. We owe our communities a budget, one that balances new revenues, eliminates ineffective programs and allows vital services to continue.

We should not recess tomorrow. We should stay here and do our job.

SEQUESTRATION

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

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Speaker, as a freshman here on the House floor just 2 years ago, it does my heart good to see my freshman colleagues coming down from the other side of the aisle, because I came down with that same vision 2 years ago to work together to address the big issues that are out there.

I serve on the Budget Committee, Mr. Speaker, and for fiscal year 2013, we're going to post a \$1 trillion annual deficit. This sequester that every Member is rightly concerned about is \$85 billion, less than one-tenth the magnitude of the decisions we really need to make to get America back on fiscal track.

Is the sequester anybody's idea of the right way to do it? I don't believe that it is.

Is everyone's idea of the right way to do it to deal with that part of the budget that we don't do in discretionary spending? The big two-thirds, that mandatory spending that we have to come together on to deal with? And the answer is absolutely, yes.

I stand ready to work with my freshman colleagues on both sides of the aisle to do those big things that need to be done. But Mr. Speaker, we have raised taxes already in 2013. The CBO reports that an additional \$1 trillion will come into the Treasury over the next 10 years.

What we need is not more taxes. What we need are responsible spending cuts, Mr. Speaker.

SEQUESTRATION

(Ms. DELAURO asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. DELAURO. The House majority should bring legislation to this floor that will prevent the automatic, across-the-board cuts that will occur on Friday. These dangerous, indiscriminate cuts threaten our economy and vital services for our children, for women, for seniors, small businessmen, and our servicemembers in uniform.

Today, we are spending \$12 billion less on labor, health, and education programs than we were in 2002. And because of the cuts we made in the Budget Control Act, we will be spending \$21 billion less on these programs in 2022. And yet, despite these already made cuts the sequester will gut labor, health, and education programs by nearly another \$7 billion this year.

The results? Over 10,000 fewer people in my State will get the assistance they need to find jobs. Over 1,500 fewer Connecticut children will see vaccines for diseases. And 8,000 disadvantaged students will lose access to educational services. This will also relieve teachers and teacher aides of their jobs, thereby raising unemployment.

This is in addition to cuts that will impact food safety inspection, Meals on Wheels for seniors, support for public safety officers, and to keep air traffic controllers on the job.

I ask unanimous consent to bring up my colleague Mr. VAN HOLLEN's Stop the Sequester Job Loss Now Act. It replaces sequestration with a balanced, bipartisan approach to deficit reduction.

We have a responsibility in this body: pass a budget that protects the middle class, our seniors, and the most vulnerable—and we have to act.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. As the Chair previously advised, that request cannot be entertained absent appropriate clearance.

□ 1620

HOUSE VOTED TWICE TO REPEAL THE SEQUESTER

(Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia. What I want to remind the people of is that this House has twice passed legislation to repeal the sequester. The Senate has not done anything. Quite honestly, they have just chosen not to do their job over there.

The President has yet to give us a written proposal. But this House, the people's House, twice voted to repeal the sequester with responsible spending cuts.

THE SEQUESTER

(Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico. Time is short, Mr. Speaker. March 1 is just a few hours away, and the Republicans refuse to bring forward a balanced plan to replace the meat-ax approach to governing known as sequestration.

My constituents have been clear with me: We should stop the blame game, and we must stop this sequester from happening. New Mexicans are worried. They know what happens if we don't stop the sequester:

More than 750,000 jobs are at risk just this year.

Almost 10,000 New Mexicans won't be able to get the help and skills they need to find a job.

Small businesses, the backbone of our economy, won't be able to get the loans that they need to expand and grow.

Just in New Mexico, almost 7,000 civilian furloughs from the Defense Department, resulting in \$42 million less in gross pay for those employees, forcing middle class families to deal with losses equal to one mortgage payment or more.

Lastly, one of my State's and district's largest employers, Sandia National Laboratories, has implemented a

hiring freeze. This move will stunt economic growth and be devastating to New Mexico's economy.

I ask unanimous consent to bring up H.R. 699, a balanced bill to replace the sequester with spending cuts and revenue.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. As the Chair previously advised, that request cannot be entertained absent appropriate clearance.

SEQUESTRATION

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

Mr. GARAMENDI. I rise today to tell the story of how northern California communities that I represent will be harmed by sequestration.

Travis Air Force Base in my district makes sure that the equipment and personnel that our military needs are delivered quickly and safely around the world. They're the world's first responder when disaster strikes. Thirty-two hundred civilians will be furloughed beginning next week. They will have a loss of some \$30 million of income over the next 6 months.

Near Marysville, California, Beale Air Force Base operates an intelligence, surveillance, and reconnaissance mission that supplies our Nation's military with timely information to save American lives on the battlefield. Fourteen hundred civilians will be furloughed, with \$13 million in lost wages.

Families and their income are important. But so is national security, which will be compromised by sequestration.

Yuba City, one of the major places in the United States prone to flood problems, will see their critical levee protection that the Army Corps of Engineers is working on delayed and not completed for next winter's floods.

The University of California-Davis will similarly be harmed.

It's time to end sequestration, and I ask unanimous consent that H.R. 699 be brought up for a vote.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. As the Chair previously advised, that request cannot be entertained absent appropriate clearance.

THE EFFECT OF SEQUESTRATION ON THE MILITARY

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

Mr. PETERS of California. Tomorrow is the last day we have to avoid sequester. I've spoken on the House floor about how San Diego will be disproportionately affected. Today, I want to address our national security.

Almost one in four jobs in San Diego County are defense related. Nearly 25 percent of defense contractors are small businesses. Already, shipbuilding and maintenance contracts have been canceled, including 10 ship repairs in

San Diego. Manufacturing companies that rely on defense funding could lose 223,000 jobs. Neglecting ship repairs will not only lead to job loss and threaten morale—it undermines our national security and our readiness.

Mr. Speaker, let's prove to San Diego and the America people that Congress is not broken. Let's work together to find a solution that doesn't compromise our national security and that balances fiscal responsibility with economic growth.

SEQUESTER

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

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to urge my colleagues to come together and avoid sequestration. Make no mistake: These cuts aren't just fodder for newspaper headlines. They are real. They are deep. And they will hurt.

Back home in my district in Taunton, Massachusetts, we have an active chapter of Jumpstart, a national literacy organization that pairs community volunteers with low-income preschool children. They operate in tandem with the local Head Start. If sequestration happens, over 70,000 children across the country could lose access to Head Start—1,500 in Massachusetts—jeopardizing the ability of Jumpstart to continue offering their services. On top of that, the organization is run on the hard work of volunteers, most of whom come through Federal work-study programs—800 jobs lost in Massachusetts alone—or AmeriCorps—\$38 million in cuts across the board.

Those are big numbers. But for a moment forget the numbers. The numbers are just a succinct way of saying there's a 4-year-old girl in Taunton, Massachusetts, whose single mother depends on Jumpstart to get her child up to speed for kindergarten while she works two jobs to keep food on the table.

Our budget is in difficult shape. It will require tough choices to clean up. But they have to be smart choices, worthy of our constituents back home who put their faith and trust in each and every one of us.

SEQUESTRATION

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

Mrs. DAVIS of California. The once inconceivable now seems to be becoming the inevitable. On Friday, the sequester, a plan designed to never be implemented, will be triggered. And now the question among the papers and pundits is exactly how bad sequester will turn out to be. My question is: Why aren't we debating how to stop it? Why are we not working together on a balanced fiscal plan? We all know it's

not the right thing to do. We all know it's not the smart thing to do.

My constituents in San Diego and everyone outside of D.C. knows that it's harmful. San Diegan air traffic controllers, our Border Patrol officers, and civilian defense personnel put on leave, making us less safe and less efficient? San Diegan senior citizens, many who have served our country, sent messages stating that they will not be able to receive the meals they depend on.

San Diego teachers furloughed, disrupting our children's education? Blindly taking an ax to our budget is not a solution, it's a problem.

With that, I ask unanimous consent to bring up H.R. 699, a balanced bill to replace the sequester with spending cuts and revenues.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. As the Chair previously advised, that request cannot be entertained absent appropriate clearance.

SEQUESTRATION

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

Mr. CROWLEY. Starting Friday, careless and devastating across-the-board spending cuts will hit America's economy and stifle our recovery. But the only thing my colleagues on the other side of the aisle can say is: It's about time.

Do we need to address our Nation's deficit? Absolutely. But cutting 750,000 American jobs, food safety inspections, and health care benefits for our 9/11 first responders isn't the right way to do it. The U.S. can't lead the world in medical research if we aren't funding the National Institutes of Health. We can't protect ourselves from cybersecurity threats if the very people who work on this issue are laid off. And we can't expect our children to compete in tomorrow's global economy if we deny them access to critical programs like Head Start today.

It doesn't have to be this way. Democrats and President Obama have a solution. Our plan will put an end to the slash-and-burn cuts and replace it with reductions to our deficit through the closure of tax loopholes and an end to wasteful spending.

So, Mr. Speaker, there's a way out. There's another path forward that will ensure we protect investments in our Nation's future.

I will ask that tomorrow the Speaker ask unanimous consent to bring up H.R. 699, a balanced plan to reduce our deficit.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. As the Chair previously advised, such a request cannot be entertained absent appropriate clearance.

□ 1630

VIOLENCE AGAINST WOMEN ACT

(Mr. FARR asked and was given permission to address the House for 1

minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. FARR. Mr. Speaker, tomorrow, we have two choices. We will be able to vote on this floor on a Senate version of the Violence Against Women Act. We will also have a House version that will try to be amended to that bill.

There are several reasons why the House version is not a good bill and ought to be opposed. In my district, the immigrant provisions left out of the House bill will have a profound impact on my constituents. Immigrant women are at risk of domestic violence more than any other women, and they are less likely to report their attackers due to fear of deportation. The Senate version offers protections that the House bill does not.

I have several college campuses in my district. The Senate bill would help combat violent crimes on college campuses; the House bill does not. The Senate version of the Violence Against Women Act also includes the reauthorization of the Trafficking Victims' Protection Act; the House bill does not.

Mr. Speaker, sadly, domestic violence affects the entire country. That is why it is absolutely a shame that the Republican leadership has brought up a House bill that will jeopardize the safety of millions of women by making it even harder to receive the services and programs that are available.

THE SEQUESTRATION MYTH

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

Mr. WESTMORELAND. Mr. Speaker, I'm joined by some of our colleagues tonight here to talk about the sequester. We've heard a lot about it in the last, I guess, 10 or 12 1-minute speeches about the sequester and how bad it is and how it's going to wreck our economy.

We know that it is going to affect some people's lives, and we hate that. We much preferred a different way to do the cuts. We actually have passed two bills to address the cuts in the sequester that better address the needs of this country and our spending habits and didn't affect the many thousands of people that will either have to go to part-time work or no work due to these cuts.

It's been over 300 days since we passed the first bill out of this House; yet the Senate did not take it up. And so 2 months later we passed another one that the Senate has not taken up.

The President, over the past 3 weeks or so, has traveled a little over 5,000 miles, going down to North Carolina, to Georgia, to West Palm Beach, to Ohio, to Virginia, talking about the problems. Yet even though he's traveled that many miles, it's only 1.7 miles from the White House over to the Senate. So he could have cut down on

all those trips of the rhetoric and the campaign-type attitude that he's put towards governing just by traveling 1.7 miles down to the Senate Chamber and sitting down with the majority leader over there and the rest of his party and saying, look, we need to offer something back because we believe in regular order.

We think the best business that we can have and we think that our Founders and the way our Constitution is set up, that we work under regular orders. If the House passes a bill, we send it to the Senate. If the Senate doesn't agree with it, then they can either put their own bill, send it back over to us and we'll go to conference, or they can amend our bill and send it back. And then if we can't agree with that, we'll go to conference.

But that's not the way things have been operating over here.

It's been a failure, in my opinion, on the majority leader's part in the Senate that he just refuses to take them up. We're not going to do it. We're not going to debate it. It's either my way or the highway. I think the American people deserve better than that.

I'm going to give Mr. GOHMERT a few minutes, if he would like to take the time, before he has to make one of his dignified appearances, so I'll yield to him.

Mr. GOHMERT. I appreciate my friend from Georgia hosting this hour and also yielding. This is a very important topic, and people need to understand what's going on.

Now, as someone who was totally opposed to the deficit ceiling bill back in July, 1½ years ago, I told our conference the Democrats and the President are never going to allow the supercommittee to reach an agreement because they want to blame cuts to Medicare on Republicans, when the fact is that ObamaCare cuts \$700 billion from Medicare, and it has been and it's starting to be and it's going to get really much worse because of those cuts from ObamaCare.

To ourselves here in the House, over the last 2 years we have cut our own budgets—the Senate hasn't, but we've cut our own budgets here in the House over a 2-year period by over 11 percent, about 11.5 percent. This sequester is going to cut us another 11 percent. We're going to have cut nearly 23 percent of our own budgets. How did we do that? Did we lay off all our staffs and have a big press conference and talk about how terrible it was going to be? No. I know in my office we basically have what you'd call a hiring freeze. If we lost somebody, we haven't replaced them.

TOM COBURN first raised this point in a letter to the Deputy Director of Management for the White House, with all this gloom and doom about all the people that the President's going to have to fire because of the sequestration, because of a cut of about 2 percent of the budget, they're going to be firing all these people or furloughing all these

people. At the same time, you can go online, you can order books, and you can see all the Federal jobs that this administration is still offering.

So an easy suggestion is how about instead of firing and furloughing all these people, just hold up on hiring some folks for a while. Across America, people know how to do that in business. Instead of firing everybody that's been with you for years, that's counting on that salary, if you have to cut the budget, the first thing you do is you maybe wait to hire somebody for a bit. That would be more caring—unless of course this administration is more concerned with showing that they hired somebody instead of just maintaining what they have.

□ 1640

We will have cut our ourselves here in the House, our own budgets 23 percent, approximately, over a 3-year period. If we can do it and still get the job done, then I feel sure the people in the White House, the people in the executive departments and all those people at the EPA that are trying to shut down our own energy production and put those people out of work, heck, maybe if they just shut down EPA for a little bit and let the States continue, like Texas has, to get their water cleaner and their air cleaner, maybe the jobs would increase. The President could take credit for that just by slowing the amount of regulation this President has been throwing on the American economy.

Another thing we hear today is that the President is now saying that on Friday, after the sequestrations have started and the military is having all these massive layoffs—and actually, the truth be known, after the President will have gotten what he had been hoping and trying to get for years, even as a U.S. Senator, and that is big cuts to the Defense Department—after the Defense Department cuts kick in, then, and only then, is he going to sit down and talk to congressional leaders.

Well, that's not hard to figure out. What a great political ploy, what a great political plan. A year and a half ago, the President and the White House came up with the idea of this massive sequester, and the biggest loser would be the Defense Department. Reluctantly, some people like me said, let's don't do this, let's have other cuts, let's don't let the President's plan, with all his massive cuts to defense and basically 2 percent cuts to other entities, let's don't let that happen. Let's really cut departments, cut things we really don't need.

But we ended up going along with the President's idea for sequester. Then after he gets the cuts to defense that he's been pushing for years and years, going back to his days as a U.S. Senator, he gets to come forward and spend millions and millions of dollars running around on Air Force One condemning Republicans in the House for cutting defense.

What a great thing. He cuts defense as he's been wanting to do for years, forces the Republicans to go along with it, and a year and a half later blames the Republicans for cutting defense and says, I wouldn't have done that, but now that defense is cut, now let's talk about restoring some of that money to groups, the Acorn-like groups out there that are going to suffer because they're not going to have money to spend on electing Democrats in the next election if we don't return the sequestered money.

The thing is, it's about \$85 billion in cuts from a \$3.6-trillion budget—not that we've passed a budget. That's just how much money will likely be spent, approximately. And it doesn't have to be that way.

One of the things that The Wall Street Journal pointed out in an editorial February 19 was they said that Americans need to understand that Mr. Obama is threatening that if he doesn't get what he wants, he's ready to inflict maximum pain on everybody else. He won't force government agencies to shave spending on travel, conferences, excessive pay, and staffing. He won't demand that agencies cut the lowest priority spending, as any half-competent middle manager would do.

Then they go on to talk about things. One of the things we find out today is that the administration has released people charged with felonies and said, look, if you don't restore the money to my agencies that I'm demanding, then I'm going to end up releasing more criminals on the American public. That is incredible. But he knows the mainstream media will give him cover. I hope and pray the American people will not give him cover, that we will demand what we've been telling the American public we were going to do, we made cuts. The cuts will be made. Now let's look for better ways after this to make cuts to other programs that need it.

With that, I yield back to my friend from Georgia.

Mr. WESTMORELAND. I want to now introduce somebody from New York. I believe he was the executive for Monroe County for 4 years. He took a county that was going bankrupt, or fixing to go bankrupt, and turned it around, \$125 million, I believe, in the rainy day, so to speak, fund. So he's got knowledge on how to do it. He's also been a very successful businessman. I think that all these agency and department heads that we have, if you can't manage to cut about 2.4 percent of your budget, you need to take a look if you're really capable of managing people and managing a department of that size.

So I would ask the gentleman from New York, one of our freshmen, a businessman, a great guy, Mr. COLLINS, to come up and try to enlighten us a little bit on what steps he took of running a government, actually turning it around and made it to where the citizens got something from the taxes that they were paying.

Mr. COLLINS of New York. I want to thank the gentleman from Georgia for that kind introduction.

I would put two words forward: when I came to my period of time as county executive in Erie County, the largest upstate county in the State of New York, and it's "common sense." Common sense is something that I think frustrates the American public; it's something that we don't see in U.S. Government.

I'd like to point to the sequester as a prime example of what's wrong with Washington. We have a broken government, and we all know it. As someone who ran for Congress to focus on improving our economy, Washington can be a very frustrating place.

We are now only 2 days away from sequestration taking effect. In typical Washington fashion, we're now staring a deadline in the face with no answers for hardworking taxpayers.

The timing of this whole process should not be taking anyone by surprise, certainly not the President. President Obama is the one who proposed this sequester, and that is a fact. The President insisted that these arbitrary across-the-board spending cuts become law as part of the debt negotiations in 2011. Now, 2 days away from these cuts taking place, I'm very disappointed the President is not working with us to find a solution.

Instead, he is deliberately scaring the American people and attempting to convince them that the only way to avoid the pain is to raise taxes again. The President is threatening an apocalypse if he doesn't get his second tax hike in just 8 weeks. The hardworking families of New York's 27th District can't afford it.

And I believe the American public are seeing this sideshow for what it is: a blatant attempt to raise taxes again on American families and small businesses instead of addressing our spending addiction. Because if the President and the Senate didn't want to raise taxes again, they would have a plan. And they don't.

The House has twice passed a bill to replace the across-the-board sequester with responsible spending reductions and reforms. The House first passed this legislation 10 months ago to replace the President's sequester with smarter, more responsible, and commonsense spending cuts. The Senate and the President never addressed those bills; and they don't have a plan of their own, except raise taxes.

The good people of western New York and the Finger Lakes region know there are smarter, more bipartisan ways to cut government spending. They know that this country must reduce its spending and pay off its debt. They know that failing to do so will only mean a continued sluggish economy—and even worse, leaving our children and grandchildren with nothing but a bag of IOUs. And they know that before Washington politicians have the audacity to talk about raising taxes

again and cutting our military, there are millions of dollars in waste in the Federal Government around every corner. And they are waiting—not so patiently anymore—for us to cut that waste before we tell them to hand over even more of their paycheck to the bureaucrats in the Federal Government.

Here is a question: Why is the EPA doling out grants to foreign countries, including China, at the expense of \$100 million over the last decade? Why does the IRS need to run a TV studio that costs \$4 million a year? And why are we paying senior citizens to play video games so we can study the impact on their brains?

□ 1650

Now, I understand these three examples don't equal \$85 billion of sequester cuts, but these are just three examples of the waste. This is crazy.

Washington must do better because the American people deserve better. They deserve a Federal Government focused on balancing its budget, reducing its spending, paying off its debt, honoring its commitments to seniors, and making sure our younger generations can actually live the American Dream.

Mr. President, let's stop the scare tactics and let's get to work.

Mr. WESTMORELAND. I want to thank the gentleman for participating.

Next I want to introduce another one of our bright young freshmen, the gentleman from California (Mr. VALADAO) of the 21st District, a dairy farmer, the son of Portuguese immigrants that has come here. He is a veteran legislator that has been with the California Assembly. We're excited about having him. He also represents a district that has been really hurt by some of the regulations and the environmental requirements that this administration has pushed.

Where he lives and where he farms, his neighbors have lost a great number of jobs due to the fact that we can't provide them any water that we promised them probably 40 or 50 years ago that had been coming to them and they really had the basket of the fruit and vegetables that we eat every day.

I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. VALADAO. Mr. Speaker, I agree, Congress needs to get serious about our Nation's irresponsible spending; however, broad-based, automatic spending cuts and tax increases are not the way to get our fiscal House in order.

This week, the administration warned of the devastating effects that sequestration will have on many essential services provided by the Federal Government. To be clear, while the Budget Control Act of 2011 defined the amount of sequestration cuts, implementation of these cuts is at the discretion of the administration. The administration has now threatened to cut crucial services, including laying off air traffic controllers and the inspectors that make our food safe. At the same time, our government is spending

\$1.7 billion operating unused Federal properties. There are numerous bipartisan alternatives to increase the Federal Government's efficiency and eliminate wasteful spending that do not include raising taxes or cutting the essential services my constituents depend on.

Ultimately, the real solution lies in reviving our struggling economy and giving our small businesses the tools to create jobs. In California's San Joaquin Valley, burdensome environmental regulations have resulted in the fallowing of 200,000 acres of land and the loss of countless jobs. This is a prime example of government ignoring the solution while creating a problem. At no cost to the taxpayers, we could provide certainty to our communities and to the farmers in my district that we can protect jobs and actually grow our economy.

With just 2 days until sequestration takes place, it's time for all of us to get serious about our Nation's spending problem and come together to do what's best for the American people.

Mr. WESTMORELAND. I want to thank the gentleman for being here.

Next I want to allow one of my fellow Georgians some time to speak, who is another veteran legislator that came out of Georgia, who I've served with in the Georgia House, somebody from south Georgia who understands what it's about when you have to work hard and farm. He's a private business owner, an insurance agent, and a good friend.

I yield to the gentleman from Tifton, Georgia (Mr. SCOTT).

Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia. Thank you, Mr. WESTMORELAND. I certainly enjoyed serving with you in the Georgia House where we balanced the budget on an annual basis and made cuts certainly much larger than this on a percentage basis. Quite honestly, we did it on an annual or a semiannual basis when we were there.

I want to point out one thing that you talked about that's not being talked about much here, and that is that the total cut that we're talking about is a little less than 2.5 percent of Federal spending. The problem with the sequester is not that it's an unreasonable amount that's being cut; it's where it's being cut from.

So here we are less than 48 hours from the President's sequester, our Commander in Chief's sequester, that's going to go into effect and set into place \$1.2 trillion over the course, ladies and gentlemen, of 10 years. That's one of the things that needs to be pointed out. It's not \$1.2 trillion over the course of this year; it's over 10 years. So you're talking about \$100 billion a year out of a little better than a \$3 trillion annual budget.

Of this cut that our Commander in Chief has insisted on, over half of that is going to come from national defense and our men and women in uniform and our civilian workforce and taking its toll on them. Our Secretary of De-

fense, Leon Panetta, I thought did a great job when he actually explained it as hollowing out our military. He told the truth about that and just what the Commander in Chief's budget reductions were going to do to our military. Obviously, we have a new Secretary of Defense coming in now, and I can't help but wonder if Secretary Panetta speaking out about what those cuts were going to do to the military isn't one of the things that maybe led to his replacement.

On October 22—just to give you a couple of specifics—in his campaign for election as our Nation's Commander in Chief, the President promised that his sequestration “would not happen.” The President, the Commander in Chief, promised that it would not happen. He went to great lengths to assure Americans that are working in our military and on our military bases, our civilian workforce—I represent Robins Air Force Base—he told them this will not happen. He told our defense contractors to not comply with the law and actually issue the notices that were required under the law that furloughs and layoffs may be coming.

I personally think it was politically motivated, but that's just a personal stance of mine, Mr. Speaker.

On February 6, I asked the President for a solution. I sent a letter. I've got the letter right here. I'm sure that somebody at the White House got it. We have never gotten any response from any letter that we have sent to the White House as a Member of Congress. We simply asked him to give us a written proposal on what he would do given his choice of having it exactly his way and replacing the sequester. Again, no response, no action.

On February 15, he came to our State, Georgia, and didn't go to any of our military installations. We have seven major military installations and over a dozen major military communities in the State of Georgia. He went to a county and he talked about expanding the role of the Federal Government in public education as we were approaching the sequester. The men and women at Robins Air Force Base and the other bases were left wondering what was going to happen to their paycheck. He did not even address the issue while he was in Georgia with our seven major military installations and our 12 major military communities.

Mr. Speaker, I didn't vote for the sequester, but what I'll tell you is I'm reminded of what Teddy Roosevelt said when I look at the national debt and the things we're facing right now:

The best thing to do is the right thing, the next best thing is the wrong thing, and the worst thing is nothing.

We have to cut Federal spending or we're going to rob the next generation of Americans of the American Dream.

So I would say that here we are as a House having passed two separate bills to undo the President's sequester and 48 hours prior to the sequester going

into action, and all we've heard from the President is just words. He hasn't had the guts to put a proposal in writing before this House for the American people to see. Here we are, Mr. Speaker, at the 11th hour with no action from the President, no response to my letter or any other Member's letter, to my knowledge, no plan to Congress, no plan to America. He's just a President, a Commander in Chief that's willing to let this happen to our military. Half the cuts are coming from our military. What kind of Commander in Chief do we have?

Congressman, I appreciate the opportunity to speak today and thank you so much for doing this.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

Washington, DC, February 6, 2013.

DEAR PRESIDENT OBAMA: As the representative of the Eighth Congressional District of Georgia, home to Robins and Moody Air Force Bases and a member of the House Armed Services Committee, I am very concerned about the impact that sequestration will have on our national security. As you are aware, on March 1, 2013, \$500 billion in defense cuts will go into effect unless a law is enacted to prevent it. According to many of our nation's top military leaders, the indiscriminate cuts caused by sequestration would hollow out our forces and severely degrade our military capabilities.

On October 22, 2012, you promised that “sequestration will not happen.” You went to great lengths to reassure Americans that you would work to prevent it, and you even urged defense contractors not to issue layoff notifications required under law. Given your role as our nation's Commander in Chief, I believe that you share my concern over a hollowed military force. However, without your leadership I am fearful that a solution will not be reached.

We in the House of Representatives passed several bills during the 112th Congress, including H.R. 3662 and H.R. 5652, that would repeal the sequester. Based on your statements, you do not support these bills, yet have offered no alternative. Furthermore, representatives from your Administration were highly ambiguous in explaining your plan for preventing sequestration cuts. In a hearing on August 1, 2012 Acting OMB Director Zients testified that your plan to address sequestration was your 2013 budget proposal. Yet this is not a real proposal Congress could act upon, and your budget did not receive a single vote in either the House or the Senate.

We are running low on time to address sequestration and your administration's lack of meaningful action is concerning to many of my constituents. I urge you to take a more active role in resolving these senseless cuts to our national defense. I look forward to your response and to reviewing a detailed and concrete proposal that Congress can act on so that we can cooperate in a bipartisan manner to resolve sequestration.

Sincerely,

AUSTIN SCOTT,
Member of Congress.

Mr. WESTMORELAND. I thank the gentleman.

Now I want to introduce another one of our freshmen, somebody that comes to us from Florida's Third Congressional District, a veterinarian. He is actually a small business guy. I think he's been in that business for about 30 years. He also understands the effect that this sequester will have on our

military because his oldest daughter, Katie, is an active Member of the United States Coast Guard. So I hope that the gentleman will express some of those things that he feels about these cuts that are coming to our military.

With that, I yield to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOHO).

□ 1700

Mr. YOHO. I thank the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today on behalf of my constituents in Florida's Third District to voice the concerns they have shared with me over the President's sequester that will go into effect on Friday.

Make no mistake: cuts need to be made. However, I know, and my constituents know, the sequester is not the answer.

We in the House have shown, and will continue to show, where responsible spending cuts can be made. In fact, the House has tried multiple times to address this issue and has passed legislation as recently as 6 weeks ago. However, the majority leader, Mr. REID, would not address these issues.

With a Federal Government of this size and magnitude, Washington bureaucracy can afford to bear the brunt of these cuts. Not our military, not communities like Lake City, or Mayo, or Newberry, or Middleburg, Florida.

I'm working with my friend from Georgia, Congressman DOUG COLLINS, on the new Freshman Regulatory Reform Working Group, to help show exactly where some of these cuts are and to help businesses do what they do best. They grow the economy and they create jobs, bringing in more revenues to our government.

We need to, and we will, show the President and the American people that we can cut wasteful spending without hurting kids, our seniors, and that we can make responsible cuts that do not put our national security at risk, and not add to the heavy tax burden of hardworking Americans that they're already carrying.

It is a shame that the President and the Senate have avoided working with the House in a real budgeting process. I look forward to working with all my colleagues on restoring faith to the American people and bringing order back to this process.

Mr. WESTMORELAND. I thank the gentleman for being here and giving us those great comments.

Now I want to introduce another friend, our policy chairman in our Republican Conference, somebody that comes from the great State of Oklahoma, somebody that has great experience in managing people. I think he ran a youth camp, the largest youth camp in the United States, if not the world. I'm afraid to even tell you how many people. I'll let him do that. But I would like to recognize the gentleman from Oklahoma, our policy chair, Mr. LANKFORD.

Mr. LANKFORD. I thank the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. Speaker, it's an honor to be able to stand in front of this House today.

Let me talk about families that all across America right now are struggling with their own finances. They're sitting at a dinner table this evening, because they have run out of paycheck before they have run out of month, and they're struggling through just the basics of how they're going to do life, because they're in debt and they're struggling through day to day.

They will make decisions to be able to put their house in order and to be able to resolve where they're headed as a family, because they don't want to be a family that's going to live heavily in debt. Because once you're in debt as a family, everything is about money. Every day there's a new battle about money; every day there's a new battle about spending and who's going to spend and what bill are we going to pay and how are we going to handle day-to-day life.

The hard part is that's where we are as a Nation right now. The House and the Senate and the President, we continue to argue through things about money. And every week it seems like we're fighting a new fight about money. Because, guess what, we're \$16.5 trillion in debt.

For 5 years in a row, we've overspent the budget by \$1 trillion a year, and there's no end in sight. We've come to a day that we have to resolve how do we get out of this hole, how do we fix this.

Let me give a quick history of how we actually got here. In 2011, the House and the Senate and the White House all agreed if we're going to have a large debt plan to get us out—at that point a debt ceiling request of \$2.4 trillion—we had to have with that extension of the debt ceiling also a plan of how to reduce spending by that same amount or more so that we didn't just infinitely continue to increase debt.

So the plan was made to cut \$1.2 trillion over 10 years. And then there would be a second tranche of \$1.2 trillion again to reduce spending.

We couldn't come to an agreement on that. So Jack Lew, who was the President's chief of staff, came to HARRY REID and said, here's our suggestion, do a sequestration. HARRY REID rejected it initially. Then Jack Lew came back to him and said, what if we do half of it in defense spending? So an automatic across-the-board cut, if we can't find a way to reduce spending in other ways, we'll just do an across-the-board cut with half of it in defense and the other half of it from other parts of the budget.

HARRY REID agreed with Jack Lew, the President's chief of staff, and the President's plan then went to the Senate and came to the House where begrudgingly we all agreed, because none of us wanted to see this. I don't believe that the White House wanted to see sequestration as well.

But this plan that was put in place that the House, the Senate, and the White House all agreed to was to find some way to reduce spending by \$1.2 trillion in long-term spending.

The first option was the select committee, the supercommittee, as it was called. It obviously failed in its task.

Shortly after that, the House of Representatives said that the select committee has failed in its task, we cannot have sequestration. And so in May of last year, the House of Representatives passed a replacement plan for sequestration so that we would not get to this point. As Americans constantly talk about Congress waiting 'til the last minute, almost 300 days ago the House of Representatives passed a plan to avoid sequestration and to do cuts and waited for the Senate to respond so that we did not have a moment like this. The Senate never answered us back.

So in December of last year, the House again passed a plan to say here's how we can replace sequestration. And, again, the Senate has never responded to that.

We're at a point now, hours away from sequestration beginning, at a point none of us wanted to be here, facing the reality that if the Senate never responds to us, we're at a point that we will step into across-the-board cuts. When that occurs, half of those cuts being in defense and a very severe cut after there was already \$100 billion cut from defense 4 years ago, then \$500 billion cut from defense 2 years ago, now another \$500 billion cut in defense. Defense is carrying a very disproportionate number of cuts in this administration.

We've got to find a way to be able to stabilize all of our programs and to do smarter reductions of spending without having this huge hit. We've got to learn how to be able to plan ahead, both in the House and the Senate.

Why must this be done in the first place? That's the challenge. We have individuals that look at programs that are some of their favorite programs and say they're going to face an 8 percent reduction in that program this year. And there's going to be a spending cap so they don't have infinite growth over the next 10. And they look at it and say, why does it have to be that way?

Well, I can tell you why. Because we are facing a debt crisis that is not just something for the next generation. It's now.

Two weeks ago, the Congressional Budget Office released its report on the status of America and where we're headed on current law and what happens now. In that report, it detailed that right now we pay \$224 billion a year just in interest. CBO 2 weeks ago released a report and said on the current path we will pay in interest \$857 billion a year just 10 years from now.

So where we have said in the past, for our children they're going to have a

crushing debt, it is now this generation, because debt continues to accelerate; \$857 billion, ladies and gentlemen, is larger than what we paid for the entire war in Afghanistan. We will pay that each year just in interest payments just 10 years from now if we don't get a handle on this. That's larger than all defense for a single year, that's larger than all Medicare, that's larger than all Social Security. \$857 billion in interest alone is by definition unsustainable for us as a Nation. We cannot afford to do that. We have to deal with our spending.

So how do we get on top of that? Well, the President's proposal is, let's just raise taxes on a few people. Well, guess what, the President got his tax increase in January.

As of all the reports that are coming back in now, 2013 will bring in the largest amount of revenue in the history of the country to the Treasury. We will have no year in our history we will bring in more revenue than 2013, and yet the President's proposal is we need to raise taxes again to cover that.

Well, one of the tax increases that he recommends is to just raise taxes on the energy companies. Just find energy companies and raise taxes on that. His proposal raised another \$4 billion a year from energy companies.

Well, there are a couple of problems with that. One is, that's a great way to raise gas prices again, as this administration has done so many times in some of the regulatory schemes that have happened to watch gas prices continue to trickle up. It is one more shot to do that. And the second part of that is, it's \$4 billion. We have over \$1 trillion in deficit spending. That does not solve the problem.

□ 1710

We are overspending a trillion dollars a year, and we are spending more than a trillion dollars more than what we did just 5 years ago. It is obvious with the highest amount of revenue in the history of our country coming in, we're spending more than a trillion dollars more than we did just 5 years ago, this is a spending-driven crisis.

Mr. WESTMORELAND. We borrow about \$4 billion a day. We spend roughly \$10 billion and borrow about \$4 billion. So this energy tax would just keep us from borrowing for 1 day.

Mr. LANKFORD. Right. And it would drive up the cost of gasoline yet again for all Americans. It doesn't solve the problem; it continues to exacerbate the problem.

Our issue is we're facing a difficult moment. But this is not a moment that is manufactured by some sequestration event. This is a moment that has been created by overspending year after year after year. And now the acceleration of debt and deficit and interest payments each year is climbing so quickly that if we don't get on top of it soon, we will not be able to get on top of it in the days ahead.

This is not just a manufactured, short-term crisis. This is a serious eco-

omic crisis for the United States. And if it is a serious crisis for us, it is a serious crisis worldwide. We have the responsibility as the largest economy on the planet to be responsible with our finances and to get our economy back on track so that the entire world's economy can begin to get back on track.

Mr. WESTMORELAND. I thank the gentleman for bringing up that point because I think a lot of people may not realize that we're talking about \$85 billion here. As the gentleman stated, you know, we spend \$10 billion a day. So, I mean, this is 8½ days that we're saving.

My son-in-law was a DA, assistant DA, and I remember a couple of years ago, he was furloughed for 14 days, which is almost twice as much as we're talking about here. He didn't have to put his children in an orphanage or go hungry or anything else. They managed their bills. That's all we're saying. While we've all heard the sky is falling, I think it is something that we can deal with, especially if we have competent heads of these agencies.

So, you know, just looking at some of the other money that we're spending, \$268 million in executive branch conferences, whether it's for the Department of Defense, Homeland Security, Health and Human Services, \$268 million just for the conferences, I think we can cut those conferences out for a year. Or maybe cut them down, maybe not be quite as expensive or elaborate as they are.

You know, when I came to Congress, I came from a building, a construction background. I considered myself somebody capable of looking at a set of plans and giving an estimate of what it was going to cost and having a vision of what it was going to look like. I remember one time I had a customer come in who wanted a roof designed a certain way, and I tried to tell them it wasn't going to work. They had seen it somewhere else and had gotten somebody to draw it. The one thing I did learn in the building business is that somebody can draw something, but it doesn't necessarily mean that you can build what they draw. And so I tried to explain to them, I said, This isn't going to work; it's going to cause problems; it's going to look bad. But they still wanted to do it. Their house, I did it. The next thing I know, they come up complaining about it. And I said, Look, this was your idea; I did exactly what you said. And they didn't like it, but it was something that they had to live with or pay to get it changed.

The same thing has happened here with this administration. You know, this was their idea. This was something that they wanted to do. I think a lot of people said, No, this is a bad idea; we don't want to do this. But yet they were so desperate to come up with something to cut the spending of this country that they agreed to it. And now all of a sudden, the originator of the idea doesn't like it. And he says, Oh, no.

But rather than sitting down and talking to the people that could make a difference and make a change, he decided to go out and travel the country to talk to people who couldn't. And it's turned out it's going to be a bad outcome, but it is the only outcome that could come from the plan that was drawn.

Now, let me say this again about the spending. When you think about the fact that we spend \$10 billion a day—think about that, \$10 billion a day. And we borrow about half of it. About 42 percent of it we borrow from somebody else. And keep this in mind: the Federal Reserve buys, in combination with different things, they buy about \$85 billion worth of mortgage-backed securities every month—\$85 billion every month. They print the money to do that. So we've got bigger fish to fry.

As several people have said today, we've got to get serious about this. I'm accountable to 700,000 people—just like every Member of this body is—at home, but I'm also accountable to my children and my grandchildren and their children. And I want one day, when they sit in my lap or come up to me and say, Papa, couldn't you do something about this? I want to be able to tell them, I tried, baby. I tried to do it. We all tried to do it, but nobody wanted to cut. Nobody wanted to save. We just kept putting it on your charge card.

And so while this \$85 billion is going to be tough, it's going to be hard, it's going to hurt some families, it's going to cause some people to go to part-time employment rather than regular employment, but you know what, it's \$85 billion that's not going to go onto our children's credit cards. I think that's what we've got to remember. We keep kicking the can down the road. People my age and in my generation, we may not ever have to pay the tab for this, but my children, and for sure my grandchildren and my great grandchildren, are going to end up paying this tab. So we're not really doing that much other than shifting it from our responsibility and our burdens to the next generation and the next generation's burdens.

I see another one of our bright freshmen. Mr. Speaker, anybody out there who has been watching, they understand that we have a bright freshman class. This gentleman is from Illinois, Mr. RODNEY DAVIS. And so, Mr. DAVIS, I'm glad to yield you time.

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. I thank the gentleman from Georgia.

I rise today, Mr. Speaker, to remind us all what President Kennedy told us. He said:

Let us not seek the Republican or Democratic answer, but the right answer. Let us not seek to fix the blame for the past, but let us accept our own responsibility for the future.

That's where we stand today with this looming sequestration. It's time to get beyond the party politics. It's time to stop the blaming and the finger-

pointing. The truth is, it took both parties, the House, the Senate, and the President, to approve sequestration. And it's going to take both parties, Republicans and Democrats, a House, a Senate, and the President, to resolve it. The decisions we will have to make won't be easy, and no one—no one—will get everything they want, but that's why we were elected. That's why our constituents entrusted us to serve in this body.

So let us take this opportunity to do the job that we were sent to Washington, D.C., to be in this House, the privilege of serving in this House, let's do our jobs, do what our constituents sent us to do. Let's put aside the partisan politics. Let's work together, compromise with principle, and govern, govern like statesmen. It is expected and, I will say, Mr. Speaker, it is demanded of us.

Mr. WESTMORELAND. I thank the gentleman for those words.

I'll close by saying this. This job is not easy. It's not exactly what everybody might think it is, but it's something that we don't need to squander.

□ 1720

It's an opportunity that everybody in this House has been given that probably less than 12,000 people have ever had since this country has been founded. We don't need to squander this opportunity.

And we need to honor those that have come before us, that have fought and died, the men and women right now that are in Afghanistan and other parts of the world that are putting their lives on the line and in danger every day, not for us to be running up the debt on them.

We've got less than 1 percent of the people in this country that protect the rest of us. And so, you know, why are we trying to do them harm?

We're trying to fix that, and I want them to know that, that we are trying to fix that, and we're going to try to fix it in the CR.

And for the young voters out there, I want y'all to know that this is not something that we're purposely doing to hurt you or your family. This is something that we're doing for your children, or trying to do for your children.

All we're asking is that you might encourage others to join us in this fight, to try to save this country from going down the road of debt and bankruptcy that we're headed on, and instead turn it around to the bright future that we all want to have for this country and for a better Republic, and something that will bring us back to the forefront, to be held in the same esteem that we've always been held in by the other countries in this world, not somebody that's continuing to dig a hole of debt for our future.

I yield back the balance of my time.
ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SALMON). The Chair would ask Mem-

bers to address their remarks to the Chair.

CONGRESSIONAL PROGRESSIVE CAUCUS HOUR: SEQUESTRATION

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

Mr. POCAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today on behalf of the Congressional Progressive Caucus to repeat and enhance the calls made by our colleagues today to put a stop to these disastrous spending cuts known as sequestration.

It's been interesting. For the last 45 minutes I've listened to people from the other side of the aisle talk very passionately about their concerns on government spending, on debt, on government waste. And yet, almost not a single one of those issues is covered by what we have before us in the next 48 hours, which is sequestration.

Sequestration is a thoughtless approach that makes irresponsible, indiscriminate cuts down virtually every single budget line. If you think there is waste with a \$4 million TV station in the IRS, as one speaker said, sequestration won't stop that. If you think we have too much debt, sequestration won't stop that. If you think we have too much fraud, abuse, and waste, sequestration won't stop that.

But what sequestration will do is have a real impact on the middle class families, not just in Wisconsin, where I come from, but across the country, and that's why so many of the people in the Progressive Caucus and Democrats have such a strong concern about what this country is facing, because of this House, this Chamber's inability to act in the next 48 hours.

You will hear from a number of people from different parts of the country this afternoon who are going to talk about the very real impact of sequestration on their States and on their districts, and the very impact that I think the middle class is feeling that doesn't really relate to what we heard for the last 45 minutes, but relates to the very issues that people care about—education, health care and so many other areas.

It's funny, last week I got a chance to be back home in my district, and as I talked to the people of south central Wisconsin, it's not at all what you hear talked about here in Washington, D.C. It's almost as if it was a different country, not just the District of Columbia, but a completely different country when we talk about sequestration.

And what people care about is, how do they make sure they've got a job? How do they make sure they've got enough money to pay for the food on their table, to support their children, to provide opportunities for their families?

But instead what we see is quite different with the sequestration cuts that

are going to happen. There's a real impact on the middle class, and it's pending and it's looming because we can't get the people in this room to sit down and get our jobs done.

I heard multiple stories over the last week, and just in the last 45 minutes, about how sequestration came about. I can tell you, people in Beloit and people in Barneveld and people in Baraboo and small communities across Wisconsin don't care about the finger-pointing of how it happened. They don't care that in 1985 this idea started, and it's been a bad idea. It was such a bad idea that it was agreed to last year because they thought absolutely no one would go for this idea, and now we have people arguing, don't worry; we'll fix it a month from now.

I can tell you, in Wisconsin, we're a little different. When our check oil comes on in Wisconsin, we check our oil, and if we have to we put oil in the engine. Here in Washington, D.C., we just keep running it until the car stops and the engine breaks down, and then we all decide that we're going to somehow fix the engine, which is a much more costly process. But I guess that Wisconsin common sense doesn't happen in Washington, D.C., and it's clearly not happening in this House as we deal with sequestration.

I have a couple of colleagues here who are going to share some stories, and then I'm going to come back and share some more stories from my area, some of the very cuts you're going to see in Wisconsin and nationwide. I'm going to share some real stories from people who, not just from my district but across the country, are talking about the impact on their lives.

I want to share a little bit about my experience. I spent 6 years on a budget-writing committee in the Wisconsin Legislature, and I chaired that committee. And we did things in a very different way and in a very bipartisan way, something that is a foreign concept to Washington, D.C.

First I would like to recognize one of my colleagues from the west coast. Representative MARK TAKANO is a fellow freshman. He represents the Riverside area of California. A teacher by profession for over 20 years, also a community college board member, so he's had a lot of experience and is recognized in our caucus as one of our foremost experts on education. But he knows the real-life impact that this is going to have on California and on his district.

I would like to yield some of my time, Mr. Speaker, to the gentleman from California.

Mr. TAKANO. I'd like to thank the gentleman from Wisconsin for yielding some time to me this evening.

Mr. Speaker, there seems to be a lot of talk from my friends on the other side of the aisle about whose idea the sequester was, instead of actually working to stop this from happening.

Make no mistake. If the House Republican leadership really wanted to

stop the sequester from taking effect, they could do so. It's the House Republican leadership that is sitting back and letting the sequester go through.

My friends on the other side of the aisle seem to forget how we arrived here. In 2011, it was the Democrats who wanted a clean raise of the debt ceiling, which had been the process for decades, under Republican and Democratic Presidents. But the extreme wing of the Republican Conference demanded cuts, and chose to hold the American economy hostage.

What we got was the Budget Control Act of 2011, which Speaker BOEHNER said was 98 percent of what he wanted. And here we are, a year and a half later, Mr. Speaker, up to the eleventh hour again, dealing with another manufactured crisis instead of talking about jobs and how to improve the economy.

But again, we must deal with the soap opera that is the House of Representatives. Every time the House of Representatives wants to pass some meaningful legislation, we're forced to go through this pattern where our citizens are put through weeks of drama on pins and needles wondering what will happen. But then what happens is the governing majority finally comes together to pass legislation with substance, legislation that is sensible.

But who is this governing majority that passes meaningful legislation?

It's made up nearly of the entire Democratic Caucus, and a handful of moderate, sensible Republicans. When we faced the fiscal cliff, which nearly every credible economist said would be disastrous for our economy, it took a commonsense governing majority of 172 Democrats and 85 Republicans to come together to save the economy from ruin.

□ 1730

On the vote to provide aid to victims of Superstorm Sandy, after weeks and weeks of delay, with leaders of their own party up in arms, finally the governing majority emerged with 192 Democrats and only 49 Republicans. I understood the need to help the victims of Superstorm Sandy. I'm from California, where earthquakes and other natural disasters are a reality, as are tornados in the Midwest and hurricanes in Florida. Most Americans understand that it is a basic function of the Federal Government to provide aid to victims of natural disasters; but still the Republican caucus was divided, and it took reasonable people to come together to help those in need.

And just last night, we got word again that the governing majority is needed in order to pass some real legislation as we take up the Violence Against Women Act. The reality is, to pass anything with substance, Speaker BOEHNER needs the Democrats.

So when the House of Representatives takes up the Senate version of the Violence Against Women Act, what will the governing majority look like?

Go to Twitter and tell me what you think the vote will look like with the hash tag Boehner Needs Dems.

Mr. BOEHNER, the governing majority has done its job with the fiscal cliff, with aid to Sandy victims, and I'm willing to bet that the governing majority will do its job once again with the sequester and the Violence Against Women Act.

Speaker BOEHNER, when you're ready to get serious, we, the governing majority, are here to help.

Mr. POCAN. I'd like to thank the gentleman from California for those remarks.

You've heard a little bit from the west coast. You heard a little bit from the heartland. Now we can hear a little bit from the east coast, the State of Pennsylvania, and another colleague of mine, another member of our freshman class that we have of 49, and now soon to be 50 freshman Democrats in this House of the 113th Congress. Representative MATT CARTWRIGHT is a lawyer by trade. He represents consumers and making sure they get their fair share in this country. Mr. CARTWRIGHT also is a member of the Oversight and Government Reform Committee, where he is the ranking Democrat on a committee to make sure that economic development is a priority for the people of this country.

It is my honor to yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. CARTWRIGHT. I thank the gentleman from Wisconsin.

I'm here to address the draconian and irresponsible and indiscriminate effects of this ridiculous sequestration program that's slated to take effect on March 1. I use the word "indiscriminate" advisedly. It is indiscriminate. It is as if the government were a surgeon and seeking to take out a cancer, a lesion making a patient sick. Instead of being given a scalpel to take out that lesion, the surgeon is forced to use a meat cleaver.

That is an appropriate analogy for what this sequestration is doing because it is an indiscriminate set of cuts across the board to the discretionary spending in the United States. No responsible business person would ever engage in such a budgetary process. No one with any sense would do this in the government. And yet we're left with this.

Instead of repealing it and replacing it promptly, what we see is that the Speaker is instead engaging in finger-pointing and in the blame game to avoid moving forward and fixing the problem in the first place. It's irresponsible, and it has to be dealt with differently.

I say that if Congress cannot come up with a replacement to the sequester before the end of this week, we should eliminate the sequester entirely. One million working Americans should not be forced to pay the price for what is nothing more and nothing less than stubbornness and hard-headedness. We would prefer to replace the sequester

with a balanced approach to deficit reduction.

The Progressive Caucus already introduced a bill called the Balancing Act that reflects what the American people already voted for this past November. The Progressive Caucus Balancing Act replaces the sequester with a balanced approach to new revenue and necessary Pentagon cuts, and it creates jobs all over the country. It equalizes the cuts we've already made with revenue by closing tax loopholes for America's wealthiest individuals and corporations.

But we shouldn't just sacrifice our economic recovery because Republicans are unwilling to vote for one single penny in new revenue, new contributions from their billionaire friends and corporations. We have to look at what these cuts mean in the sequester. The sequester involves 70,000 children being kicked off Head Start. No one in this Chamber disagrees about the importance of Head Start. Early childhood education is absolutely essential in creating the foundation for learning in children all over the world. And that's what Head Start is about. There will be 70,000 American children kicked off Head Start. That's what happens when you use a meat cleaver instead of a scalpel.

We're talking about more than a million kids who will see their schools lose education funding. We're talking about emergency responders who will lose their jobs, meaning slower response times and weaker disaster preparedness. We're talking about layoffs and furloughs for Social Security workers that is going to cause delays and hassles for millions and millions of Social Security recipients—people who depend month in and month out on their Social Security checks to put food on their table.

In my district, the 17th Congressional District of Pennsylvania, we have one county—Schuylkill County—where 149,000 people live. Out of 149,000 people who live there, fully 38,000 of them subsist on Social Security checks. If those checks are delayed, if those people get hassled getting those checks because of this sequester, that is a crying shame.

We're talking about cuts to air traffic controllers, for those of us who have to fly around as part of our jobs. We're talking about cuts to airport security agents. All of this is going to mean longer waits, travel disruptions.

The consequences of more massive budget cuts are real. This isn't a game we're talking about. In fact, economic growth in the United States is going to slow because of this sequester. Hundreds of thousands of jobs will be lost and more people will have to rely on government assistance to meet their basic needs than ever before. This is exactly the opposite of what we need to be doing in the United States, and it's the opposite of what the American people asked for in the November election. It's time that our colleagues across the

aisle—the Republicans—wake up to what is really about to happen to American families. It's time that we eliminate the sequester.

I want to talk to you a little bit about specific examples of what we expect to happen in my home State, the Keystone State of Pennsylvania. If sequestration was to take effect, we're talking about job losses to the Tobyhanna Army Depot, which is something that for the last 60 years has provided electronic refurbishing to Army equipment. We're talking about command and computer and communications control to Army equipment that is refurbished right there in Tobyhanna, Pennsylvania, by as many as 5,400 dedicated, patriotic people supporting our warfighters for the last 60 years with this kind of electronic equipment.

□ 1740

We're talking about cuts to Tobyhanna Army Depot of \$309 million over 10 years as a result of this reckless and irresponsible sequester.

We're talking about teachers and schools. Pennsylvania is going to lose approximately \$26.4 million in funding for primary and secondary education, putting around 360 teacher and teachers' aide jobs at risk.

About 29,000 fewer students would be served and approximately 90 fewer schools would receive funding if this nonsensical sequester program goes through.

Head Start and Early Head Start services in Pennsylvania alone would be eliminated for approximately 2,300 children, reducing access to critical, critical early education.

And then children with disabilities on top. Education for children with disabilities: Pennsylvania will lose about \$21.4 million in funds for about 260 teachers, teachers' aides, and staff who help children with disabilities in school.

Even worse, protections for clean air and clean water. Pennsylvania would lose as much as \$5.7 million in environmental funding to ensure clean air and air quality, as well as prevent pollution from pesticides and hazardous waste.

In addition, Pennsylvania could lose another \$1.5 million in grants for fish and wildlife protection.

We're going to sacrifice our schools, we're going to sacrifice the environment, all in the name of stubbornness and wrongheadedness—mule headedness—on the part of the people who should be coming to the people, the Republicans, who refuse to engage in any sort of responsible revenue legislation whatsoever.

Finally, military readiness. In Pennsylvania, about 26,000 civilian Department of Defense employees would be furloughed, reducing gross pay in Pennsylvania alone by around \$150.1 million in total.

This isn't a joke. We talk about deadlines here in Congress; there are hard deadlines and there are soft deadlines.

We have seen Congress only moves when there's a hard deadline, when there's an actual cliff we're about to go over.

This is irresponsible in itself because I think—it is the case that many here in this Chamber believe that March 1 is a "soft deadline" because all that's happening are furlough notices are going out and people are not actually losing their jobs for another 30 days or so. For example, the Tobyhanna Army Depot, furlough notices are slated to go out in the middle of March for furloughs that actually take place at the end of April. There are those in this Chamber who think that's a soft deadline that doesn't really matter, it's just a furlough notice anyway.

Well, I'm here to tell you, Mr. Speaker, that furlough notices go to real families—real families who have to plan for their budgets, real families who have to plan on how they're going to feed their children and clothe them and pay the mortgage and keep the car running and keep gas in the car. They have to think about how they're going to do all these things when they're holding a piece of paper that says you're losing your job in 30 days. It's cold comfort for them, for those families, to hear that, well, this may not happen when they're holding it in black and white, a letter that tells them they're going to be out of work in 30 days.

This is no way to run a government; this is no way to make a budget; and this is no way to be responsible with the finances of the United States of America.

Mr. POCAN. Thank you, Mr. CARTWRIGHT, for continuing your fight for families in Pennsylvania and across the country.

When I listen to Mr. CARTWRIGHT and I listen to Mr. TAKANO and I listen to speakers throughout the day from the Democratic side of the aisle, I can't help but feel that there is an overwhelming—when you look at sequestration, you're really looking at what's happening right now in Europe, and it's called austerity. We know that right now, by doing these massive cuts in Europe like we're now trying to pattern right here in the United States, we know what the net effect is. Right now in England, they are facing a triple-dip recession—not just a double dip, a triple-dip recession. We look at where they are in unemployment; their unemployment is rising. We look at where their deficit is; it isn't going away. All they've done is taken away the very tools that stimulate our economy.

When you take away the jobs that Mr. CARTWRIGHT and Mr. TAKANO talked about, that means real people don't have money to spend and build the economy. When you take away the loan guarantees as this sequester will do, real small businesses don't have capital so they can grow and hire more workers. When you have the very effects that we are seeing done right now in Europe happen here, well, what ef-

fect do you think we're going to have? I can guarantee it's not going to be fixing that \$4 million TV station at the IRS that we heard about. Instead, it's going to have a real impact on every single family throughout the country that's not in the top 1 percent.

So at this point, I want to share a few statistics from the heartland, and then I've been joined by another colleague from Florida. We are literally going across the country and showing what these impacts have. But let me share some statistics from my State.

We know from a George Mason University study that over 2 million people in this country could lose their jobs because of the sequester. That's 36,000 jobs in Wisconsin, a State that, unfortunately, thanks to our Governor, we have not bounced back like other States in our region. It's those failed economic policies that we've had in Wisconsin by our Governor that have already held back our economic growth, and now we're going to jeopardize 36,000 more jobs in my home State.

Wisconsin is going to lose millions of dollars—\$19 million for education just for disadvantaged students and for special ed. That's going to affect tens of thousands of students in our State.

Head Start funding, while we know the impacts that are going to happen nationwide that Mr. CARTWRIGHT talked about, it's going to have hundreds of kids who are not going to have that funding in my State of Wisconsin.

The University of Wisconsin-Madison—which is one of the most important public universities in this country, it is a world-class institution for research, for stem cell research, for all sorts of biotech and high-tech innovations, one of the best graduate programs in almost every program in the entire country, and yet we know they're going to see about \$36 million lost that would go into research and development and financial aid and other programs that will affect real people and real jobs in my State.

I have had doctors come and medical schools come to us in the State of Wisconsin and say they are going to lose the ability, because of the sequester, to have people in residence programs. I think it was 900 or 1,000 people won't have positions. And one of the best ways we keep doctors in Wisconsin, in the rural parts of Wisconsin where it's tough sometimes to keep those doctors, is by having residency programs. That will be cut because of the sequester.

Nine hundred thousand fewer patients will be served as a result of \$120 million in cuts to community health centers that are vital in those rural communities in Wisconsin. In my district, in Dane County alone, we have an agricultural economy that's greater than 15 States in this country—that's just one county in my district—and yet we're going to see those programs hurt and cut, as well as programs like Meals on Wheels. Four million meals may not

happen in Wisconsin because of those cuts.

Finally, one of the areas that I think we hear lip service to from people on the other side of the aisle—and you see real action from people on this side of the aisle—is what are we doing for small businesses, not the big businesses, not those who outsource jobs overseas, not those who domicile in other countries so they don't have to pay taxes. I'm talking about the small businesses like mine that I deal with on a daily basis.

For 25 years I've had a small business. It's the people who pay their taxes and who hire the workers who are the real economic engines for our community.

□ 1750

Well, thanks to the sequester, we could see up to \$900 million less in loan guarantees to help stimulate the economy. So what sequester is is nothing more than an austerity policy that's going to provide so many cuts and damages to the economy that we will see, according to what we've been told by the experts, could cut our economic growth in half in the next year. And we can't afford to have a double-dip recession, much less a triple-dip recession, like we're seeing right now in Europe.

With that, I would like to yield to yet another great freshman colleague of mine. This is a woman from southern Florida. Like myself, we've spent time in our legislatures. She is an expert in many areas, and she was a legislative leader in the State of Florida. I could think of no one better to tell us about the potential cuts in her State than Ms. FRANKEL from south Florida.

Ms. FRANKEL of Florida. Thank you, Congressman, and thank you for inviting me to join you today. I don't want to go through all the statistics. I guess I could because sometimes we forget that we're talking about real people. Let me just keep it very, very simple.

First of all, in the State of Florida, the beautiful State of Florida—I tell people I live in paradise—we're finally turning the corner with the economy. Over the last several years, we literally lost millions of jobs. Our construction industry went bust. Of course, the whole country was hurting, so tourism got hurt. And now we're starting to turn things around. The value of our homes is going up, the tourists are coming back, and people are finding work.

The worst thing that could happen right now—the worst thing that we could do here in Congress to our economy back home—is to remove so much money in such a quick time from our economy that it would put our job market in a tailspin. Outside analysts say that just in the State of Florida, over the next year, we could lose 80,000 jobs. Now, we're not talking about 80,000 government jobs. We're talking about the removal of government spending—that horrible government

spending—from our economy. It will mean 80,000 Floridians, mom and pops are not going to be able to pay their mortgage or send their kids to college. And they could be a teacher, or they could be a bus driver, or they could be a manager in a hotel. It's going to affect all walks of life.

Just like your State—and I heard Mr. POCAN talk about the effects where he lives—we will lose money from education, our science programs, and our transportation infrastructure. But what I want to talk about is a couple people today. I want to talk about real people.

I talked earlier today about Ruth. I don't know if you heard me talk about Ruth, but if you didn't hear me talk about Ruth, I want you to know about Ruth, because Ruth is 91 years old. Congratulations, Ruth, for getting that far along in life.

But let me tell you what happens when you get to be 91. I know. I'm not 91 yet, but I have a lot of constituents in Florida who have retired to the area where I live. Do you know what happens when you get to be 91? So many of the people who you love, so many of the people who you grew up with, your children, your friends, your neighbors, they pass on. And by the time you get to be 91 and you've moved away from your family—in Florida it happens often—you are left alone. So when Ruth came home from a stay in the hospital, she was alone. She had no ability, by herself, to shop and to cook, and she could barely get out of bed. She had nobody to help her, except she had us. She had us, the safety net of the United States of America.

With the safety net of the United States of America, she had delivered to her, on a regular basis, meals from a program called Meals on Wheels, so she could eat every day. It astonishes me that on Friday—it's Friday, right? On Friday, we hit a phase of our history, what we call sequestration, which means that literally hundreds of thousands of our seniors like Ruth across this country face the prospect of not having a meal each day.

I'm going to tell you one more story, and then I'm going to yield back. This is a story of a young woman named Tanjee. And this is a good story, because Tanjee, when she was a young mother, a young single mother, when she was working really hard but not making a lot of money—a lot of people in this country work really hard but they don't make a lot of money—and she has four children. And in order for her to go to work every day to provide for those children, she needed to leave them in a safe, nurturing environment, and she did so in a location in my town called the YWCA. They had a Head Start program. And today, her children, one has become a teacher, one is in the military, and two are in high school. What would have happened to her children had the United States of America not been there for her?

I want everybody to know that it's not just about numbers. There's lots of

numbers. This is about flesh-and-blood people who are going to be hurt by our inaction.

So, with that, Congressman, I want to yield my time back to you and thank you for inviting me to participate today. Let's keep fighting to stop the sequestration, and let's get our fiscal house in order in this country in a balanced way and not in a way to kick people out of jobs and take food from seniors and quality child care from children.

Mr. POCAN. Mr. Speaker, can I inquire how much time remains?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Wisconsin has 25 minutes remaining.

Mr. POCAN. Mr. Speaker, the gentlewoman from Florida hit it exactly on the head. This is about real people. This is about the effects that sequestration will have on real people, the kind of people who, when they hear "sequestration," they think it's a medieval torture. Average people don't come up with a term that only Washington could devise, which is what we've done with the sequester.

Let me tell a real story from my district. There's a woman in Marshall, Wisconsin, who sent me an email. I'd like to share that with the American people.

Here's what she says:

It's being reported that the effect of the sequester on average Americans will be minimal. In the case of our family, this is not true. My son is a civilian firefighter at Offutt Air Force Base in Omaha. Today, he gave me a call to tell me that all the firefighters would be getting a letter Friday explaining that their shift crew size will go from 19 to seven immediately. As a firefighter, he must work 106 hours—versus 80 for the rest of us—to receive overtime. In addition, their overtime will be eliminated. That will result in a 40 percent reduction in pay for my son's family. His wife is in graduate school, and they had their first child in December 2012. There is a real face to the reductions. Please use your energy and Wisconsin progressive common sense to put a stop to this across-the-board reduction.

That's another real story of someone being affected. It's not about a \$4 million TV station at the IRS. It's about the real people in this country who will see the impact in the next month and the next month and the next month.

□ 1800

And as much as the Republicans tell us that they'll try to fix it a month from now—again, I don't know why you wouldn't just fix it instead of letting these devastating cuts come in.

I want to share another story that came in from Oregon, Wisconsin. This is from a case manager who works with seniors at Meals on Wheels. Let me read their story. They said:

I work in Beaverton, Oregon, as a case manager for seniors and people with disabilities. I work with seniors who live on \$700 a month. That's all they have to pay for rent, utilities, food, and medication. If Congress cuts funding for the programs that my department administers, the seniors I work with could end up in the hospital, sick, or just living on the streets.

Budget cuts also affect our jobs. I'm a single parent with a child who goes to school. So if there are cuts, I might need assistance myself.

We see the faces of our seniors, we see their homes, and we see how they live on a very limited income. Some legislators say it's too much money and we can't afford it. But if we don't provide services, these people could literally die if we take away their life support. That's what our services represent to the seniors who I work with: life support.

Look, this isn't about pointing fingers and assessing blame on whose idea this was. Let's figure out how to get it done, how to fix this.

I can tell you, when I served on our finance committee in the State legislature in Wisconsin, I had the opportunity to serve on that for 6 years. I served on that 16-member committee when there were 12 Republicans and 4 Democrats; I served on that committee when there were eight Republicans and eight Democrats; and I served on that committee and chaired it when there were 12 Democrats and 4 Republicans. I've been on pretty much every configuration you can have. The way we did our budgeting was we would literally spend 3 days a week, 8 hours a day for 3 or 4 months just agonizing over every detail of the budget because it was important. Every single program we had, every single dollar we spent meant something to someone. We had to make sure that we were spending it in the most wise and efficient way possible.

I've heard a lot about how Federal Government spends too much, how there's waste, fraud, and abuse, but the sequester doesn't address that. The sequester addresses these across-the-board, indiscriminate, irresponsible cuts we would never do when we were actually laying out the budgets we did back in our State of Wisconsin.

I feel that these real cuts, these real effects that we're going to see could be stopped, but the only way we can do that is to actually have that impact right here in this House of Representatives. We need to get people to come back to the table. Stop the finger-pointing, stop the blaming, stop saying you'll fix something a month later, maybe.

I'll tell you, last week when I was back in Wisconsin, I have heard more than 10 or 20 times that people have no confidence in Washington. How many times have we just kicked the can on the debt ceiling? How many times have we faced a deadline and the days before maybe started talking? Here we are 2 days before these meat-ax cuts will take effect, and this House has done nothing.

We need to take a much wiser approach to this. We need to make sure that we stop these cuts that are going to have real impacts to small business owners, to seniors, to parents with children who go to school, to health care for so many hundreds of thousands of people across this country, to the people who are going to medical school, to the people going to our uni-

versities, to the researchers, to everything that we've heard of just in the last 45 minutes. From California, to Pennsylvania, to Florida, to Wisconsin, you've heard the real impacts of the sequester. Now it's up to us, the House of Representatives, to act. Yet we haven't.

We've had our opportunities, and the Progressive Caucus and the Democrats have put forth real alternatives that will provide both cuts and revenue that will really deal with the amount of money that we have to face in the next 2 days to take care of, and yet no one has come to the table. There's no other plan in this room right now offered to deal with the sequester that we're going to face in the next 48 hours.

On behalf of the Progressive Caucus and our ability to talk today to the public, I hope you've heard the real impact of the sequester. I hope you'll contact your Representatives, no matter where they are across the country. Email them, call them and tell them, Go get the job done. You've got 48 hours to do that. I don't want cuts to the schools that my kids go to. I don't want my grandparent or my parent or my neighbor to lose their ability to get that Meals on Wheels. I don't want my neighbor who is a small business owner who is trying to jump-start the economy to lose access to capital.

You have to make that call because you're our bosses. So, please, in the next 24 hours, reach out to us and tell your Member of Congress to get to work. Our job is to end the sequester. If we don't, you'll be watching, and you expect more of us.

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

COMMUNICATION FROM THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Clerk of the House of Representatives:

OFFICE OF THE CLERK,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, February 27, 2013.

Hon. JOHN A. BOEHNER,
The Speaker, House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Pursuant to the permission granted in Clause 2(h) of Rule II of the Rules of the U.S. House of Representatives, the Clerk received the following message from the Secretary of the Senate on February 27, 2013 at 1:57 p.m.:

Appointments:
Joint Committee on Taxation.
With best wishes, I am
Sincerely,

KAREN L. HAAS.

GUN VIOLENCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2013, the Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from California (Ms. SPEIER) for 30 minutes.

Ms. SPEIER. Mr. Speaker, I'd like to compliment the gentleman from Wis-

consin and the freshman Members who participated in the last hour for a job well done in underscoring what the sequester means to Americans across the country.

I'm going to shift gears now as I'm joined by my good colleague from Virginia (Mr. MORAN). We're going to talk about gun violence.

Those of us who've been victims of gun violence see horrific pictures in our minds over and over again. Mine was over 30 years ago, but I am still haunted by visuals of that day: my leg being blown up, my arm being blown up, and really thinking that I was going to die.

When you look death in the eye, there's a certain clarity that comes to you, a certain clarity about what's important, a certain fearlessness to deal with issues that maybe you wouldn't have dealt with under other circumstances.

Now I am haunted by more recent events in Newtown. I'm haunted by the story told by Veronique Pozner about little Noah, her son.

Little Noah was shot 11 times. A little child was shot 11 times. She made a point of having an open casket at his funeral for one reason, because this is not just about numbers. This is about human beings. This is about visualizing what happens when someone is gunned down.

She had an open casket, and she invited the Governor of Connecticut to the funeral because she wanted the Governor to see this little cherub face. She said it's not little angels going to Heaven. This little boy had his mouth blown off and his jaw gone and his hand gone. She wanted the Governor to remember that little face when legislation came to his desk.

It's time for all of us here in this House to stop thinking about numbers and start thinking about people. Yes, over 1,800 people have died since Newtown, and over 500 of them have been children. If we do nothing else but focus on the children in this country, that should call us to action.

I'm going to talk about a child, a child from my district, an infant, a 3-month-old infant. This infant was named Izak Jimenez. He was just a little tyke. His parents had come from the baby shower, had put him in his car seat, and the mother and the father with the 4-year-old child were in the front seat.

□ 1810

It was mistaken identity. Gang members—two young kids, 16 and 17 years of age—came and shot up their truck. They killed this little baby. They killed him. The parents were shot. The 4-year-old was spared. They were 16- and 17-year-old kids. When they were found, they had extra handguns. They're not legally allowed to have those handguns, but somehow they got them into their hands.

We are not debating the Second Amendment when we talk about gun

violence prevention. The Second Amendment is secure. It's even more secure since the Heller decision, when the Heller Court said:

The Second Amendment guarantees every American the opportunity to have a gun for recreational purposes and to protect themselves in their homes, but having said that, it also provides government with the right to provide certain levels of regulation.

So what are those certain levels of regulation?

Why don't we start with something really simple, really straightforward, and that is universal background checks. Don't we want to make sure that people who go to gun dealers to buy guns legally have the right to buy the guns? That they're not felons? That they're not ex-felons? That they haven't been charged and convicted of drug trafficking? That they haven't been convicted of misdemeanor domestic violence, or that they haven't been adjudicated by a court as being mentally incompetent? Of course we do, and this number says it all. A Quinnipiac poll this month said that 92 percent of Americans believe that we should have universal background checks.

Why can't we come together—Republicans and Democrats, parents of small children and older children, people who have encountered on one level or another gun violence—and say, certainly, we can do this; certainly, we can have universal background checks so that guns don't get in the wrong hands, so that 16- and 17-year-old kids don't get a hold of a gun and then shoot up an innocent family?

So what does Wayne LaPierre say about that? This is pretty interesting.

Back in 1999, after Columbine, Wayne LaPierre was really clear about universal background checks. He said:

On behalf of the NRA, we think it's reasonable to provide mandatory instant criminal background checks for every sale at every gun show—no loopholes anywhere for anyone.

That's what he said in 1999.

Now, mind you, a recent poll by Frank Luntz—a Republican pollster—of just NRA members and non-NRA gun members, found that 74 percent of NRA members and 83 percent of gun owners support a universal background check. So did Wayne LaPierre in 1999.

What is he saying today?

Today, before Senator LEAHY, when asked, "You don't support background checks in all instances at gun shows?" Mr. LaPierre responds, "We do not because the fact is the law right now is a failure the way it is working. None of it makes any sense in the real world."

I would submit to my good friend Mr. MORAN that this is the real world and that we are dealing with real people. I know that you would like to comment, from your perspective, on the state of gun violence and the lack of gun violence prevention in this country.

Mr. MORAN. I thank the very distinguished gentlelady from California.

Thank you for heroically sharing with us the horrific experience that

you went through in your very early adulthood. That, understandably, continues to shape your view of gun violence. Hopefully, others will share that view without having to go through such a horrific experience, but thank you particularly for putting a face on the tragedy at Newtown and on the gun violence that we have experienced all too often in this country.

I do think that the tragedy of 20 tiny, little children being blown to bits has changed the conversation and has changed the attitude of the American people, as evidenced by the 92 percent who understand that universal background checks are appropriate. In fact, more than three-quarters of NRA members believe that to be the case, despite what Mr. LaPierre's official position is. It would seem that, perhaps, he is more interested in representing the gun manufacturers than the members of the association.

I also learned today, as many of us did, that the chair of our Judiciary Committee, out of concern for the inconvenience that it may cause gun purchasers, has decided that the Judiciary Committee is not going to be considering universal background checks.

Ms. SPEIER. Will the gentleman yield on that point?

Mr. MORAN. I yield to the gentlelady from California.

Ms. SPEIER. I was unaware that he had made that statement today.

In California, we have universal background checks. We have a universal background check for private sales in which you have to do it through a local gun dealer. Even with all of that burden, you might argue—if that's what the Judiciary chairman is arguing—that 600,000 guns were purchased last year in the State of California.

Mr. MORAN. I thank the gentlelady.

I believe that California's laws are far more sane than the laws of many other States, particularly the laws of my own State of Virginia.

The situation we have today is that over 40 percent—almost half—of the guns purchased in this country don't have to go through a background check; 6.6 million firearm sales occurred at gun shows and through private arrangements that didn't have to go through a background check. That's not even fair to the retail sellers, who have to require the background check and comply with the law.

It's almost as though you have two security lines at an airport—one in which you're going to have to stand and have the machine go around and check for metal and so on and then another line that you can just walk through without being checked. So which line would criminals choose?

Ms. SPEIER. And how is that equal protection under the law?

Mr. MORAN. It just doesn't seem to make sense.

This is a democracy. It would seem that we have some responsibility, regardless of our own views, to be respon-

sive to the overwhelming opinion of the American people.

I'd like to share with my dear friend and colleague another interesting fact, and that is that auto deaths fell to 32,000 and that deaths from firearms, including suicides and accidents, are over 30,000. So they are roughly the same. The Centers for Disease Control estimates that by 2015 there will be significantly more deaths from firearms than deaths from motor vehicles. It has already occurred in Virginia. We had 875 reported firearm deaths in the last year compared to 728 motor vehicle deaths.

Now, with regard to motor vehicles, we have acted proactively in the form of seatbelt laws; we have improved safety standards for the manufacturers of the vehicles that are made in this country and for the vehicles that are sold in this country; we have harsher penalties for drunk driving, as well as having mandatory driver training classes. They've worked, and they've saved lives.

□ 1820

Why can't we do it with firearms? It seems wholly consistent with the appropriate way, the way that the American people want us to respond to a problem, and this is more than a problem. This is an extraordinary situation that demands action by this body.

So I would hope that regardless of the views of the chair of the Judiciary Committee, even of many of the Members, some of whom have an A rating from the NRA, that we would be responsive to the overwhelming majority of the American people, and even NRA members, and act responsibly.

In Virginia, we are one of the three States that are the principal source for trafficking of guns. Florida and Georgia are the other two. People go in oftentimes with straw purchasers, and they buy large quantities of guns. They put them in the trunk of their car and drive to a street corner in an urban area, and they sell them. And invariably they end up in criminal activity, oftentimes causing the deaths of people, many innocent people such as you observed earlier, Ms. SPEIER.

I want to thank the Congresswoman. She is a leader on this fight. It is a terribly important battle. We can't let it go. Time is not on our side. Time is on the side of the NRA. That's why invariably they have prevailed previously. We can't let that happen today. We can't let that happen now. The American people deserve more, and certainly the families of those very young victims at Newtown, Connecticut, deserve action on our part. I thank the gentlelady from California. You're a wonderful leader. Thank you for your courage and your leadership.

Ms. SPEIER. I thank the gentleman from Virginia for his articulate commentary about this issue.

You know, the time has come for all of us to stop quaking in our boots because the NRA leadership has spoken.

You know, I've spoken to a number of my Republican colleagues over the last few weeks, and they are without any kind of rational reason for why they can't support one thing or another. Their beliefs have become so molded by what the leadership of the NRA says. Now the NRA leadership isn't reflecting the NRA membership, and that's what we've got to remember. The NRA membership supports universal background checks.

Let me share with you what Wayne LaPierre recently said, actually in a speech over the weekend, to continue to promote what I would call paranoia and fearmongering. He was talking about universal background checks, and he said:

It's aimed at registering your guns. And when another tragic opportunity presents itself, that registry will be used to confiscate your guns.

The American people know that's not true. A tragic opportunity, that's what he calls that horrific incident in Newtown, Connecticut. Opportunity? He has lost all sense of reality.

We owe it to every American to do something rational around gun violence prevention. And I am not going to stand here and be cowed by NRA leadership and not do what's right. And oh, yes, I have already gotten plenty of threatening Facebook pronouncements. I don't care. I owe it to Noah Pozner. I owe it to little Izak. I owe it to Gabby Giffords. I owe it to 32 Americans every day who get killed because of gun violence.

So let's move on and talk a little bit about an internal NRA memo. This memo lists national organizations with supposed antigun policies. Well, it's really kind of interesting when you look at this. This is the enemies list that the NRA has developed. There are lots of organizations and people's names on it. We just highlighted a few here.

The American Association of Retired Persons is on their enemies list. You've got to be kidding me.

Hallmark Cards. Now, I had to look long and hard to find out why Hallmark Cards would be on the enemies list for the National Rifle Association. I guess 20 years ago they contributed to an initiative to try and prevent a mandatory conceal and carry in a State, and that put them on the enemies list.

The YWCA, the Young Women's Christian Association; the Anti-Defamation League, and many other Jewish organizations, I might add; the League of Women Voters, the organization promoting all of the smart voting that goes on in this country, all of the opportunities for all of us to be able to access our legislators. And then the American Federation of Teachers and the National Education Association. These people, these organizations, can't all be wrong. But the NRA has put them on their enemies list.

Let me give you some other names you might find kind of interesting.

These are celebrities, not organizations, but they include the likes of actress Lauren Bacall, Tony Bennett. Tony Bennett is on their enemies list. Is this taking us back to the McCarthy era? Sean Connery is on the enemies list. Michael Douglas, Billy Crystal, Kathie Lee Gifford, Leonard Nimoy, Mary Tyler Moore, John McEnroe, and Barry Manilow.

Now, come on. In this country, we would create a list, an organization would create a list of enemies because they support gun violence prevention?

Mr. Speaker, I'm dumbfounded by what goes on here from time to time. I'm particularly dumbfounded by the inability of this Congress and this House to stand up to the NRA leadership and stand up for America.

I'm going to close, Mr. Speaker, by memorializing two people in California that died yesterday, two Santa Cruz police officers in the line of duty, doing their job, going to a home to determine whether or not there had been some domestic altercation. Elizabeth Butler was a 10-year veteran with the Santa Cruz Police Department. Loran Baker, known as Butch, was a 28-year veteran of the Santa Cruz Police Department. It's a small town. It's a comfortable town. It's a loving town. It's an easy-going town. There are only 90 officers on their police force. They have never had a shooting death of a police officer in the history of that city. But yesterday, they lost two of them, by a man who had body armor on, loaded down with guns, who had been convicted in Oregon of a sex offense of sorts, and who had a gun and did not have a conceal permit. He comes down to California with his gun—shouldn't have had a gun because at that point he was an ex-felon—shoots two Santa Cruz police officers. Between them, they have five children.

Let's do it for the children of this country. Let's do it for law enforcement in this country. Let's do it for all of us so we can go to the mall and we can go to church and we can go to school and not be in fear of being mowed down by violence

I yield back the balance of my time.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. CULBERSON (at the request of Mr. CANTOR) for today on account of illness.

ADJOURNMENT

Ms. SPEIER. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 6 o'clock and 30 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, February 28, 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:

533. A letter from the Under Secretary, Department of Defense, transmitting the Strategic and Critical Materials 2013 Report on Stockpile Requirements; to the Committee on Armed Services.

534. A letter from the Chief Counsel, FEMA, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Final Flood Elevation Determinations (Wayne County, PA, et al.) [Docket ID: FEMA-2013-0002] received February 20, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Financial Services.

535. A letter from the Chief Counsel, FEMA, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Final Flood Elevation Determinations (Halifax County, NC, et al.) [Docket ID: FEMA-2013-0002] received February 20, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Financial Services.

536. A letter from the Chief Counsel, FEMA, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Final Flood Elevation Determinations (Duval County, FL, et al.) [Docket ID: FEMA-2013-0002] received February 20, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Financial Services.

537. A letter from the President and CEO, Corporation for Public Broadcasting, transmitting the Corporation's 2011 annual report regarding the activities and expenditures of the independent production service; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

538. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting a report on the Developmental Disabilities Programs for Fiscal Years 2009-2010, pursuant to 42 U.S.C. 15005 Public Law 106-402, section 105; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

539. A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting an extension of the waiver of the restrictions contained in Section 907 of the FREEDOM Support Act of 1992, pursuant to Public Law 107-115; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

540. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting Transmittal of D.C. ACT 19-647, "Consumer Protection Act of 2012"; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

541. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting Transmittal of D.C. ACT 19-643, "Autonomous Vehicle Act of 2012"; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

542. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting Transmittal of D.C. ACT 19-644, "New and Used Tire Dealer License Act of 2012"; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

543. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting Transmittal of D.C. ACT 19-645, "Department of Parks and Recreation Fee-based Use Permit Authority Amendment Act of 2012"; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

544. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting Transmittal of D.C. ACT 19-646, "Pre-litigation Discovery of Insurance Coverage Amendment Act of 2012"; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

545. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting Transmittal of D.C. ACT 19-631, "Public Vehicle-for-Hire Innovation Amendment Act of

2012", pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

546. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting Transmittal of D.C. ACT 19-637, "Affordable Dwelling Unit Hardship Waiver Temporary Act of 2012"; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

547. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting Transmittal of D.C. ACT 19-634, "Excise Tax Amendment Act of 2012"; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

548. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting Transmittal of D.C. ACT 19-638, "Pipefitting, Refrigeration and Air Conditioning Mechanic Occupations Equality Act of 2012"; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

549. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting Transmittal of D.C. ACT 19-639, "Department of Parks and Recreation Revenue Generation Clarification Amendment Act of 2012"; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

550. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting Transmittal of D.C. ACT 19-633, "Regulation of Body Artist and Body Art Establishments Clarifying Amendments Act of 2012"; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

551. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting Transmittal of D.C. ACT 19-640, "Foster Youth Statements of Rights and Responsibilities Amendment Act of 2012"; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

552. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting Transmittal of D.C. ACT 19-641, "Criminal Fine Proportionality Amendment Act of 2012"; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

553. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting Transmittal of D.C. ACT 19-642, "Basic Business License Renewal Amendment Act of 2012"; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

554. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting Transmittal of D.C. ACT 19-648, "Workforce Job Development Grant-Making Authority Act of 2012"; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

555. A letter from the Deputy Secretary, Department of Commerce, transmitting the Chesapeake Bay Office Biennial Report for fiscal years 2011 and 2012; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

556. A letter from the Federal Register Liaison Officer, Department of the Treasury, transmitting the Department's final rule — Establishment of the Elkton Oregon Viticultural Area [Docket No.: TTB-2012-0005; T.D. TTB-111; Ref: Notice No. 130] (RIN: 1513-AB88) received February 20, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

557. A letter from the Federal Register Liaison Officer, Department of the Treasury, transmitting the Department's final rule — Establishment of the Indiana Uplands Viticultural Area and Modification of the Ohio River Valley Viticultural Area [Docket No.: TTB-2012-0004; T.D. TTB-110; Re: Notice No. 129] (RIN: 1513-AB46) received February 20, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

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. DEFAZIO (for himself and Mr. CHAFFETZ):

H.R. 845. A bill to amend chapter 29 of title 35, United States Code, to provide for the recovery of patent litigation costs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. OLSON (for himself, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. ROSKAM, Mr. BARROW of Georgia, Mr. GUTHRIE, Mr. PALAZZO, Mr. ROE of Tennessee, Mrs. BLACK, Mr. COBLE, Mr. RIBBLE, Mr. HARPER, Mr. MCKINLEY, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. PASCRELL, Mr. RENACCI, Mrs. CAPITO, Mr. NUNES, Mr. TIBERI, Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mr. LOEBSACK, Mr. MULVANEY, Mr. CRENSHAW, Mr. BUCSHON, Mr. PRICE of Georgia, Ms. JENKINS, Mr. OWENS, Mr. REED, Mr. AMODEI, Mr. KINZINGER of Illinois, Mr. SCHOCK, Mr. BRALEY of Iowa, Mr. BURGESS, Mr. HARRIS, Mr. ROGERS of Michigan, Mr. HECK of Nevada, Mrs. CAPP, Mr. SHIMKUS, Mr. GRIFFIN of Arkansas, Mr. LATTA, Mr. WALDEN, Mr. BOUSTANY, Mr. MATHESON, and Mr. TERRY):

H.R. 846. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to ensure the continued access of Medicare beneficiaries to diagnostic imaging services; 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. GERLACH (for himself, Mr. FARR, Mr. YOUNG of Florida, and Mrs. CAPP):

H.R. 847. A bill to amend the Animal Welfare Act to provide further protection for puppies; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. THOMPSON of California (for himself and Ms. SPEIER):

H.R. 848. A bill to direct the Attorney General to make grants to States to develop systems to retrieve firearms from armed prohibited persons; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SMITH of Washington (for himself, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, and Mr. GALLEGO):

H.R. 849. A bill to amend the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 to eliminate the section 251A sequestrations and to reduce the security and non-security discretionary spending limits by \$320 billion from fiscal year 2014 through fiscal year 2021, and to suspend the statutory limit on the public debt until February 1, 2017; to the Committee on the Budget, 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. ROYCE (for himself, Mr. ENGEL, Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, Mr. DEUTCH, Mr. POE of Texas, Mr. SHERMAN, Mr. CHABOT, Mr. CONNOLLY, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. MEEKS, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Mr. KEATING, Mr. MCCAUL, Mr. CICILLINE, Mr. SALMON, Mr. SCHNEIDER, Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. KINZINGER of Illinois, Ms. MENG, Mr. COTTON, Ms. FRANKEL of Florida, Mr. COOK, Mr. HOLDING, Mr. WEBER of Texas, Mr. PERRY, Mr. RADEL, Mr. COLLINS of Georgia, Mr. MEADOWS, Mr. MESSER, Mr. MARINO, Mr. SIRE, Mr. HIGGINS, Mr. VARGAS, Mr. ROHR-ABACHER, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Mr. STOCKMAN, and Ms. GABBARD):

H.R. 850. A bill to impose additional human rights and economic and financial sanctions with respect to Iran, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and in addition to the Committees on the Judiciary, Financial Services, Oversight and Government Reform, and 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. PASCRELL (for himself, Ms. SCHWARTZ, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. LEWIS, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Mr. KIND, Mr. NEAL, Mr. BECERRA, Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. LEVIN, and Ms. LINDA T. SANCHEZ of California):

H.R. 851. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to encourage domestic insourcing and discourage foreign outsourcing; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. RANGEL (for himself, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Ms. BROWN of Florida, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, Ms. CLARKE, Mr. CLAY, Mr. COHEN, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. FATTAH, Ms. FUDGE, Mr. AL GREEN of Texas, Mr. GRJALVA, Ms. HAHN, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Mr. HOLT, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Ms. LEE of California, Mr. LEWIS, Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. MEEKS, Ms. MOORE, Ms. NORTON, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. RUSH, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Ms. SHEA-PORTER, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Mr. WATT, and Mr. VAN HOLLEN):

H.R. 852. A bill to posthumously award a Congressional gold medal to Shirley Chisholm; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. BUCHANAN (for himself, Ms. BROWN of Florida, Ms. CASTOR of Florida, Mr. CRENSHAW, Mr. DEUTCH, Mr. DIAZ-BALART, Ms. FRANKEL of Florida, Mr. GARCIA, Mr. GRAYSON, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Mr. MILLER of Florida, Mr. MURPHY of Florida, Mr. NUGENT, Mr. POSEY, Mr. RADEL, Mr. ROONEY, Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, Mr. ROSS, Mr. SOUTHERLAND, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Mr. WEBSTER of Florida, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Mr. YOHO, Mr. YOUNG of Florida, Mr. HINOJOSA, Mr. CUELLAR, and Ms. BROWNLEY of California):

H.R. 853. A bill to create a Citrus Disease Research and Development Trust Fund to support research on diseases impacting the citrus industry, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means, 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. MCCAUL:

H.R. 854. A bill to direct the Secretary of State to designate Iran's Islamic Revolutionary Guard Corps Qods Force as a foreign terrorist organization, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary, and in addition to the Committee on Foreign 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. HALL (for himself, Ms. SCHA-KOWSKY, Mr. TERRY, Ms. LOFGREEN, Mr. LOEBSACK, Ms. BONAMICI, Mr. DOGGETT, Mr. ELLISON, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. CICILLINE, Ms. NORTON, Mr. KEATING, and Mr. WHITFIELD):

H.R. 855. A bill to amend title XIX of the Social Security Act to require Medicaid coverage of optometrists; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mrs. BLACK (for herself, Mr. SCHOCK, Mr. WESTMORELAND, and Mr. ROE of Tennessee):

H.R. 856. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to require the social security number of the student and the employer identification number of the educational institution for purposes of education tax credits; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. COOK:

H.R. 857. A bill to amend section 251A of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 to eliminate the Department of Defense sequestration for fiscal years 2013 and 2014 and sequester such eliminated sums over a period of fiscal years 2015 through 2021; to the Committee on the Budget, and in addition to the Committee on Appropriations, 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. FORTENBERRY (for himself, Mr. HINOJOSA, Mrs. CAPITO, Mr. WALZ, Mr. WOMACK, and Mr. COURTNEY):

H.R. 858. A bill to amend section 520 of the Housing Act of 1949 to revise the requirements for areas to be considered as rural areas for purposes of such Act; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. JORDAN (for himself and Ms. SPEIER):

H.R. 859. A bill to rescind certain excess conference costs from any agency that overpays on conferences, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Appropriations, 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. KIND (for himself and Mr. LEWIS):

H.R. 860. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to make qualified biogas property eligible for the energy credit and to permit new clean renewable energy bonds to finance qualified biogas property; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology, 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. KING of New York (for himself, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. OWENS, and Mr. ELLISON):

H.R. 861. A bill to better protect, serve, and advance the rights of victims of elder abuse and exploitation by establishing a program to encourage States and other qualified entities to create jobs designed to hold offenders accountable, enhance the capacity of the justice system to investigate, pursue, and prosecute elder abuse cases, identify existing resources to leverage to the extent possible, and assure data collection, research, and evaluation to promote the efficacy and efficiency of the activities described in this Act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. KIRKPATRICK (for herself and Mr. GOSAR):

H.R. 862. A bill to authorize the conveyance of two small parcels of land within the boundaries of the Coconino National Forest containing private improvements that were developed based upon the reliance of the landowners in an erroneous survey conducted in May 1960; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York (for herself, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Ms. NORTON, Mr. RANGEL, Ms. MOORE, Mr. MORAN, Mrs. DAVIS of California, Mr. HONDA, Mr. GRIJALVA, Ms. SPEIER, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. CICILLINE, Ms. MATSUI, Mr. ELLISON, Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California, Mr. PETERS of Michigan, Mrs. CAPPS, Ms. DELAURO, Mr. MCGOVERN, and Ms. BROWN of Florida):

H.R. 863. A bill to establish the Commission to Study the Potential Creation of a National Women's History Museum, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources, 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 Mr. MCINTYRE (for himself and Mr. JONES):

H.R. 864. A bill to direct the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to designate at least one city in the United States each year as an "American World War II City", and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. NADLER (for himself, Mr. MEEKS, and Mr. RANGEL):

H.R. 865. A bill to establish the African Burial Ground International Memorial Museum and Educational Center in New York, New York, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Ms. NORTON:

H.R. 866. A bill to establish a grant program to assist States to establish universal prekindergarten in public schools and public charter schools; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. PAULSEN (for himself and Mr. KLINE):

H.R. 867. A bill to prohibit and deter the theft of metal, and for other purposes; 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. PAYNE (for himself, Ms. NORTON, and Mr. CLAY):

H.R. 868. A bill to authorize the Director of the Bureau of Justice Assistance to make grants to States, units of local government, and gun dealers to conduct gun buyback programs; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PITTS (for himself and Mr. CARNEY):

H.R. 869. A bill to designate additional segments and tributaries of White Clay Creek, in the States of Delaware and Pennsylvania, as a component of the National Wild and Scenic Rivers System; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. CONYERS (for himself, Ms. CHU, Mr. CLAY, Mr. McDERMOTT, Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. ELLISON, Ms. BROWN of Florida, Mr. CUMMINGS, Ms. EDWARDS, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Ms. LEE of California, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Mr. HOLT, Mr. COHEN, and Ms. FUDGE):

H.R. 870. A bill to establish the National Full Employment Trust Fund to create employment opportunities for the unemployed; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce, 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. RANGEL:

H.R. 871. A bill to allow travel between the United States and Cuba; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. RANGEL:

H.R. 872. A bill to lift the trade embargo on Cuba, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and in addition to the Committees on Ways and Means, Energy and Commerce, the Judiciary, Financial Services, Oversight and Government Reform, 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. RANGEL:

H.R. 873. A bill to facilitate the export of United States agricultural products to Cuba as authorized by the Trade Sanctions Reform and Export Enhancement Act of 2000, to remove impediments to the export to Cuba of medical devices and medicines, to allow travel to Cuba by United States legal residents, to establish an agricultural export promotion program with respect to Cuba, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and in addition to the Committees on Ways and Means, the Judiciary, Agriculture, and Financial Services, 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. RUNYAN:

H.R. 874. A bill to award a Congressional Gold Medal in recognition of Alice Paul's role in the women's suffrage movement and in advancing equal rights for women; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. SENSENBRENNER (for himself, Mr. HALL, Mr. WESTMORELAND, Mr. BROUN of Georgia, Mr. SMITH of Texas, and Mr. GRIFFIN of Arkansas):

H.R. 875. A bill to provide for a comprehensive assessment of the scientific and technical research on the implications of the use of mid-level ethanol blends, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology, and in addition to the Committee on 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. SIMPSON:

H.R. 876. A bill to authorize the continued use of certain water diversions located on National Forest System land in the Frank Church-River of No Return Wilderness and the Selway-Bitterroot Wilderness in the State of Idaho, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. TURNER (for himself, Mr. HOLT, Mr. CICILLINE, Mr. LANGEVIN, Mr. HIGGINS, Mr. KEATING, Mr. BLUMENAUER, and Mr. STIVERS):

H.R. 877. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to expand the incentives for the rehabilitation of older buildings, including owner-occupied residences; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ROHRBACHER (for himself, Mr. SHERMAN, Mr. GERLACH, Mr. HIGGINS, Mr. POE of Texas, Mr. SALMON, Mr. STOCKMAN, Mr. HUNTER, Mr. GOHMERT, Mrs. BACHMANN, Mrs. LUMMIS, and Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California):

H. Res. 86. A resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives that Dr. Shakil Afridi is an American hero and that he should be immediately released from custody by Pakistan; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. GRIFFIN of Arkansas (for himself, Mr. WESTMORELAND, Mr.

BENTIVOLIO, Mr. HUIZENGA of Michigan, Mr. STIVERS, Mr. ROSS, Mr. BURGESS, Mr. LOBIONDO, and Mr. CRAWFORD):

H. Res. 87. A resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives that the President should suspend the delivery of F-16 fighter aircraft, M1 tanks, and other defense articles and defense services to the Government of Egypt; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. POE of Texas (for himself, Mr. MCCLINTOCK, Mr. WESTMORELAND, Mr. ROHRBACHER, Mr. COFFMAN, Mr. CLAY, Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. COHEN, Mr. DIAZ-BALART, Mr. SHERMAN, Mr. HIGGINS, Ms. ROSLEHTINEN, Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA, and Mr. COTTON):

H. Res. 88. A resolution amending the Rules of the House of Representatives to prohibit the consideration of any bill or joint resolution that appropriates foreign assistance for more than one country; to the Committee on Rules.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XII,

Mr. PASTOR of Arizona introduced a bill (H.R. 878) for the relief of Martha Palmillas de Morales; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

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.

By Mr. DEFAZIO:

H.R. 845.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8:

To promote the Progress of Science and useful Arts, by securing for limited Times to Authors and Inventors the exclusive Right to their respective Writings and Discoveries; To constitute Tribunals inferior to the Supreme Court;

By Mr. OLSON:

H.R. 846.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clause 3 of Section 8 of Article 1 of the Constitution. The Congress shall have power to regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian tribes.

By Mr. GERLACH:

H.R. 847.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The Congress enacts this bill pursuant to Clause 18 of Section 8 of Article I of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. THOMPSON of California:

H.R. 848.

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 laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into execution the foregoing powers, and all other powers vest by the constitution in the government of the United States, or in any department or officer thereof, as enumerated in Article I, Section 8, Clause 18.

By Mr. SMITH of Washington:

H.R. 849.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 1, 2, 14, 18

By Mr. ROYCE:

H.R. 850.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clauses 3 and 18 of Article I, Section 8 of the U.S. Constitution

By Mr. PASCRELL:

H.R. 851.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. RANGEL:

H.R. 852.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Constitutional Authority of Congress to enact this legislation is provided by Article 1, section 8, clause 1 (relating to the general welfare of the United States) and clause 5 (relating to the coinage of money)

By Mr. BUCHANAN:

H.R. 853.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The constitutional authority on which this joint resolution rests is the power of Congress as enumerated in Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. MCCAUL:

H.R. 854.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Sec. 8, Clause 3; and Article I, Sec. 8, Clause 18.

By Mr. HALL:

H.R. 855.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The reference to the Commerce Clause is applicable to this bill: "This bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 of the United States Constitution"

By Mrs. BLACK:

H.R. 856.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1

The Congress shall have the 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. COOK:

H.R. 857.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1 of the U.S. Constitution:

The Congress shall have the 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. FORTENBERRY:

H.R. 858.

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. JORDAN:

H.R. 859.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 9, Clause 7

"No Money shall be drawn from the Treasury but in Consequence of Appropriations

made by Law; and a regular Statement and Account of the Receipts and Expenditures of all public Money shall be published from time to time."

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"

By Mr. KIND:

H.R. 860.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I Section 8.

By Mr. KING of New York:

H.R. 861.

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 Defence and general Welfare of the United States; but all Duties, Imposts and Excises shall be uniform throughout the United States;

By Mrs. KIRKPATRICK:

H.R. 862.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Under Article I, Section 7 Congress has the authority to pass bills for the good of the nation.

By Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York:

H.R. 863.

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. MCINTYRE:

H.R. 864.

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, of the United States Constitution."

By Mr. NADLER:

H.R. 865.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, section 8, clauses 1, 17, and 18.

By Ms. NORTON:

H.R. 866.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clause 1 of section 8 of article I of the Constitution.

By Mr. PAULSEN:

H.R. 867.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1 Section 8

By Mr. PAYNE:

H.R. 868.

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, Clause 14 of the United States Constitution

By Mr. PITTS:

H.R. 869.

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 and Article IV, Section 3 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. CONYERS:

H.R. 870.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8

By Mr. RANGEL:

H.R. 871.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

To regulate Commerce with Foreign Nations

By Mr. RANGEL:

H.R. 872.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

To regulate Commerce with Foreign Nations

By Mr. RANGEL:

H.R. 873.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8

To regulate Commerce with Foreign Nations

By Mr. RUNYAN:

H.R. 874.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 18 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. SENSENBRENNER:

H.R. 875.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 of the United States Constitution

By Mr. SIMPSON:

H.R. 876.

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, specifically clause 1 (relating to the power of Congress to provide for the 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), and Article IV, section 3, clause 2 (relating to the power of Congress to dispose of and make all needful rules and regulations respecting the territory or other property belonging to the United States).”

By Mr. TURNER:

H.R. 877.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1 of the Constitution: The 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

Mr. PASTOR of Arizona:

H.R. 878.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, section 8, clause 4

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions as follows:

[Omitted from the Record of February 26, 2013]

H.R. 661: Ms. MOORE and Mr. CÁRDENAS.

H.R. 665: Mr. FALCOMA VAEGA.

H.R. 671: Mr. PAYNE.

H.R. 679: Ms. BORDALLO, Mr. CONNOLLY, Mr. COTTON, Mr. HANNA, Mr. KLINE, and Mr. LOEBSACK.

H.R. 683: Mr. TONKO, Ms. HAHN, Mr. CARTWRIGHT, and Mr. SWALWELL of California.

H.R. 684: Mr. QUIGLEY, Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California, and Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee.

H.R. 686: Mr. BRALEY of Iowa.

H.R. 688: Mr. HANNA, Mr. HUNTER, and Ms. LINDA T. SANCHEZ of California.

H.R. 695: Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio, Mr. STIVERS, Mr. BUCSHON, and Mr. LABRADOR.

H.R. 699: Ms. ESTY.

H.R. 712: Mr. GIBSON.

H.R. 719: Mr. MILLER of Florida.

H.R. 721: Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania.

H.R. 728: Mr. TAKANO, Mr. POCAN, and Ms. CHU.

H.R. 732: Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio, Mr. BURGESS, Mr. COLLINS of New York, Mr. RENACCI, Mr. SIMPSON, Mr. ROE of Tennessee, Mr. FORTENBERRY, Mr. KLINE, and Mr. SCHOCK.

H.R. 736: Mr. CAPUANO.

H.R. 749: Ms. PINGREE of Maine, Mr. HURT, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, Mr. LOEBSACK, and Mr. PAULSEN.

H.R. 755: Mr. PAULSEN, Mr. KLINE, Mr. OWENS, Mr. ELLISON, and Mr. STIVERS.

H.R. 769: Mr. KEATING and Mr. NOLAN.

H.R. 780: Mr. CALVERT and Mr. VALADAO.

H.R. 792: Mr. HECK of Nevada, Mr. JONES, Mr. COFFMAN, and Mr. PITTENGER.

H.R. 793: Mr. RANGEL, Ms. ESHOO, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Mr. FARR, and Mr. HASTINGS of Florida.

H.R. 794: Mr. CONNOLLY.

H.R. 795: Mr. GOODLATTE and Mr. THORNBERRY.

H.R. 811: Mr. SERRANO, Mr. MEEKS, and Mr. RANGEL.

H.R. 816: Mr. HECK of Nevada, Mr. SENSENBRENNER, Mr. FLORES, Mr. KELLY, Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. HUIZENGA of Michigan, and Mr. COLLINS of New York.

H.J. Res. 20: Mr. TIERNEY.

H.J. Res. 21: Mr. TIERNEY.

H.J. Res. 25: Mr. ELLISON and Mr. TIERNEY.

H.J. Res. 26: Mr. GOWDY.

H.J. Res. 31: Ms. TSONGAS and Ms. ESHOO.

H. Con. Res. 16: Mr. KIND, Mr. ROSKAM, Mrs. HARTZLER, Mr. CARNEY, Mrs. LUMMIS, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio, Ms. SCHWARTZ, Mr. GUTHRIE, Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee, and Mr. FARENTHOLD.

H. Con. Res. 17: Mr. RICHMOND and Mr. SERRANO.

H. Res. 19: Mr. MCNERNEY, Mr. DEUTCH, Mr. GARAMENDI, and Mr. CLAY.

H. Res. 36: Mr. MEADOWS, Mr. HUNTER, and Mr. MCCLINTOCK.

H. Res. 69: Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Mr. RAHALL, Mr. PETERS of California, and Mr. GRAVES of Missouri.

H. Res. 71: Mr. HUIZENGA of Michigan, Mrs. BUSTOS, and Mr. TERRY.

H. Res. 72: Mr. SMITH of Washington.

H. Res. 77: Ms. LOFGREN and Mr. HONDA.

[Submitted February 27, 2013]

H.R. 180: Mr. COOPER.

H.R. 183: Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York and Ms. SHEA-PORTER.

H.R. 281: Ms. MOORE.

H.R. 303: Mr. HUNTER, Mr. TIBERI, Mr. PIERLUISI, Mr. ELLISON, Mr. MICHAUD, Mr. SCHRADER, and Mr. KILMER.

H.R. 318: Mr. ROE of Tennessee and Mr. AL GREEN of Texas.

H.R. 322: Mrs. NOEM.

H.R. 324: Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. PETRI, and Mrs. HARTZLER.

H.R. 335: Mr. MILLER of Florida, Mr. HUFFMAN, and Mr. TIBERI.

H.R. 351: Mrs. MCMORRIS RODGERS and Mrs. NOEM.

H.R. 354: Mr. DIAZ-BALART, Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. CARTER, and Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ.

H.R. 375: Mr. OWENS.

H.R. 377: Mr. VEASEY, Mr. BERA, Mr. FALCOMA VAEGA, Mrs. KIRKPATRICK, Ms. DUCKWORTH, and Mr. HORSFORD.

H.R. 445: Mr. CICILLINE, Mr. DINGELL, and Mr. PETERS of Michigan.

H.R. 508: Mr. FINCHER.

H.R. 523: Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas and Mr. PETRI.

H.R. 525: Mr. WELCH and Mr. YOUNG of Indiana.

H.R. 530: Mr. LOEBSACK, Mr. HIGGINS, Mr. GRAYSON, and Mr. CROWLEY.

H.R. 537: Mr. BLUMENAUER.

H.R. 539: Mr. BARTON.

H.R. 571: Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Mr. STIVERS, Mr. GIBBS, and Mr. PASCRELL.

H.R. 572: Mr. GIBBS, Mr. STIVERS, Mr. PASCRELL, and Mr. ROONEY.

H.R. 582: Mr. LAMALFA, Mr. PETRI, and Mr. CARTER.

H.R. 593: Mr. WENSTRUP, Mrs. ROBY, and Mrs. BLACKBURN.

H.R. 596: Mr. DAINES, Ms. TITUS, Mr. GARDNER, Mr. PERLMUTTER, Mr. PEARCE, and Mr. HUFFMAN.

H.R. 621: Mr. GRAVES of Georgia and Mr. REED.

H.R. 627: Mr. ELLISON.

H.R. 629: Mr. AL GREEN of Texas.

H.R. 634: Mr. OWENS and Mr. FINCHER.

H.R. 635: Mr. WALDEN.

H.R. 641: Mr. PIERLUISI.

H.R. 649: Ms. CHU, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Mr. VARGAS, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mr. GRIMALVA, and Mr. MCDERMOTT.

H.R. 661: Mr. ELLISON.

H.R. 664: Mr. OWENS, Mr. VARGAS, and Mr. ISRAEL.

H.R. 670: Mr. ANDREWS.

H.R. 671: Ms. TITUS.

H.R. 684: Mr. GRIMALVA and Ms. SCHAKOWSKY.

H.R. 688: Mr. BRALEY of Iowa, Mr. MILLER of Florida, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Mr. MAFFEI, Mr. DENHAM, Mr. HUIZENGA of Michigan, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. ROHRBACHER, and Mr. DINGELL.

H.R. 693: Mr. SENSENBRENNER.

H.R. 699: Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania.

H.R. 719: Mr. MAFFEI.

H.R. 730: Mr. GRAVES of Georgia.

H.R. 749: Mrs. HARTZLER, Mr. WALBERG, and Mr. PERLMUTTER.

H.R. 755: Mr. TERRY, Mr. HALL, Mr. CALVERT, and Mr. VAN HOLLEN.

H.R. 756: Mr. THORNBERRY and Mr. STEWARD.

H.R. 762: Mr. WESTMORELAND, Mr. STIVERS, and Mr. ROGERS of Michigan.

H.R. 763: Mr. DESJARLAIS, Mr. GIBBS, Mr. RIBBLE, Mr. LONG, Mr. JONES, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Mr. SCALISE, Mr. GRIMM, Mr. POE of Texas, and Mr. PETRI.

H.R. 766: Mr. CONYERS, Mr. WELCH, Ms. SHEA-PORTER, Mr. ENYART, Ms. CHU, and Mr. DOGGETT.

H.R. 780: Mr. HUDSON.

H.R. 782: Mr. WESTMORELAND and Mr. BENTIVOLIO.

H.R. 792: Mrs. BLACKBURN and Mr. GRIFFITH of Virginia.

H.R. 811: Mr. MAFFEI and Mr. CROWLEY.

H.R. 816: Mr. POE of Texas, Mr. SOUTHERLAND, Mr. SCHRADER, Mr. YOHO, Mr. STEWART, and Mr. GOHMERT.

H.R. 828: Mr. MCKINLEY, Mrs. BLACK, and Mr. RENACCI.

H.R. 833: Mr. COFFMAN, Mr. PALAZZO, Mr. GRIMM, Mr. YOUNG of Florida, and Mr. CALVERT.

H.R. 840: Mr. FALCOMA VAEGA.

H.J. Res. 20: Mr. LYNCH and Mr. RYAN of Ohio.

H.J. Res. 31: Mr. KEATING.

H. Res. 30: Mr. GARAMENDI, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. MORAN, Mr. COOK, Mr. QUIGLEY, Mr. RICHMOND, Ms. BROWNLEY of California, and Mr. CROWLEY.

H. Res. 35: Mr. YOUNG of Florida.

H. Res. 36: Mr. WHITFIELD and Mr. GRAVES of Georgia.