



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 113th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 159

WASHINGTON, TUESDAY, MARCH 5, 2013

No. 31

House of Representatives

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

DESIGNATION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

WASHINGTON, DC,
March 5, 2013.

I hereby appoint the Honorable RON DESANTIS 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.

WELCOMING THE 14TH ANNUAL BIKE SUMMIT

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

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, as we wait for the Congress and administration to deal with how to do business differently for defense, for health care, for the Tax Code, we can take a break today as we welcome over 750 men and women from every State in the Union who are here for the 14th Annual Bike Summit. They represent, as you might expect, people from cycling clubs and

the mountain bike industry. There are also dedicated recreational cyclists, those who are involved with bike tourism, which has become very big business, by the way. And speaking of business, there are representatives of bicycle repair, bicycle manufacturers, and others who design, manufacture, and sell equipment and apparel. Bicycles mean business, in my hometown alone over \$150 million of economic activity in a year, employing over 1,000 people.

As the Bike Summit attendees visit Capitol Hill later this week, we will have an opportunity to hear from people of all ages, all walks of life, communities large and small. They are firm in the belief that the Federal Government should be a stronger partner in capitalizing on the most efficient form of urban transportation ever designed.

Bicycles burn calories, not fossil fuel, and take up a 10th of the space of a car. More importantly, for those who drive, every bicycle in the protected bike lane next to you is not a car in front of you or competing for a scarce parking space.

The goal here is to give Americans more choices about how they move, making it safe for children to walk or bike to school. It helps those children, it relieves stress on the family, and can cut 30 percent of the rush-hour congestion. Bicycling helps kids stay active at a time where we are obsessing about a lack of physical activity for our children, a level that is already too low and declining. Bicycling is a natural remedy.

Cities of all size are participating in the bicycle revolution. It would not be nearly as advanced as it is, but for \$8.9 billion of Federal investment since the original ISTEA reauthorization. It has accelerated programs, leveraged other investments and has increased transportation capacity for everybody, and done so more cost effectively than any other expenditure. By the way, \$1 mil-

lion invested in bicycle facilities creates more family-wage jobs than simply constructing more miles of highway.

It is also easier and faster to accomplish. At a time when America has an infrastructure deficit that is in the trillions of dollars, when that infrastructure is falling apart and unreliable, our coalition for policies and resources to rebuild and renew America will be stronger if it includes the millions of Americans who travel by bike.

I strongly urge my colleagues and their staff to take the time to visit with these advocates this week. Hear their stories about transforming communities of all sizes: rural, urban, suburban. Most important, learn how they are giving families safe transportation choices that they never had before. Visit with these cycling leaders. More important, at home, when you are back, get on a bike, walk a trail, join the volunteers, witness an event with your family and talk to the bike businesses and community partners. All of these stakeholders can help us visualize what the Federal partnership could mean in making communities across America more livable and our families safer, healthier, and more economically secure.

HONORING MRS. ANN MARIE KILCOURSE WILSON OF JOHNSTOWN, PENNSYLVANIA

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

Mr. ROTHFUS. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to recognize Ann Marie Kilcourse Wilson of Johnstown, Pennsylvania, an extraordinary woman. She passed away on February 19, 2013, at the all-too-young age of 47, following a brief and courageous battle with cancer.

Mrs. Wilson could have been anyone's daughter, anyone's wife, anyone's

☐ 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.

H953

mother, co-worker, employer, or fellow church member. She was extraordinary because she excelled in each of these roles. She was a woman for all seasons.

Ann Wilson was born in 1965 in the Bronx of Irish stock, the daughter of Thomas and Francis Kilcourse. She graduated from St. John the Baptist High School in West Islip, New York, and earned a degree in political science from the Catholic University of America. She worked in New York City before moving to Johnstown, the hometown of her husband, Bill.

In the mountains of western Pennsylvania, this daughter of the Bronx became an adopted daughter of Johnstown, and she has thrived there. She brought into the world three beautiful children: Katie, Billy, and Clara, whom she and Bill loved dearly. And while she was raising her family, Ann pursued her professional calling with excellence and determination as the marketing director of The Gleason Agency.

Her energy was incomparable. The energy of her professional work could also be seen in her commitment to public service. In 2005, Ann made her first attempt at public office and won a 4-year term on the Johnstown City Council. She took the oath of office in January 2006 and was the first Republican woman elected to the council. Notably, Ann was the top vote-getter on the ticket, beating out seven incumbents. In a city where Democrats outnumber Republicans 7-3, she was the top vote-getter, demonstrating her broad bipartisan appeal.

□ 1010

She was reelected in 2009 and appointed deputy mayor of Johnstown in January of 2010. She also served as executive director and later chairman of the Cambria County Republican Committee. In 2012, Governor Tom Corbett appointed her to the Pennsylvania Commission for Women, and she was elected as a delegate to the 2012 Republican National Convention.

While her energy and professional accomplishments were remarkable, the two things that mattered most to her were her family and her church. Mrs. Wilson lived for her husband and children, and she rarely missed a sporting or school event that involved the kids. She loved family time and family vacations, and she was deeply committed to her Catholic faith. She was also a strong advocate for the right to life and compassion for all.

In a world and time given to cynicism and doubt, Ann Wilson stands out in stark contrast. She is a role model for excellence in family life, professional work, and community engagement. Indeed, she was full of passion for the things of life that really mattered.

It is a privilege to stand here today to remember Mrs. Ann Wilson of Johnstown, Pennsylvania. Her family's and Johnstown's loss is Heaven's gain. May she rest in peace and may her family be comforted in their loss. She

will be missed not only by her husband and children, but by her community.

PROJECT EXILE

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

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, the talk around town is the paranoid gun control crowd that want more gun restrictions and more government control over guns.

If they had their way, some of them would actually outlaw the Second Amendment, and the result would be that the people would have no guns. The only ones that would have guns would be the government and, of course, criminals who ignore gun laws. I call it the "Mexico model."

Guns are outlawed in Mexico. The citizens cannot possess guns. There is no Second Amendment and so the government has guns and criminals have guns. Some of those criminals have guns thanks in part to the United States Government sending 2,000 assault weapons to them in *Fast and Furious*. But that's another story.

U.S. cities are moving toward the Mexico model. Chicago and Washington, D.C., have laws that make it very difficult for a citizen to exercise the Second Amendment. These cities make it difficult to even own a firearm. But all three places—Mexico, Chicago, Washington, D.C.—all have a reputation of being violent, unsafe places. Why? Because they are.

If D.C. was so safe, why are government guards everywhere in the city? Even here in this Capitol building, there are armed guards on the roof, at the doors, at the back doors, at the doors over to the east and to the west. It's hypocritical of the gun control crowd in this Chamber to say "more guns for me, but not for thee."

If these cities were safe, gun control laws would work, but they don't work. But there is a Federal law that the city of Richmond, Virginia, took advantage of, and it goes back to 1997. Richmond, Virginia, was one of the top five U.S. cities with the highest per capita murder rate in the United States. So the city used a Federal law to help them control the crime problem. Project Exile is the name. The local and State government voluntarily cooperated with the United States Attorney's Office in gun prosecutions.

Here's how it works: if a local or State law enforcement official arrested some criminal for a felony offense but the person also had a gun, the State official could voluntarily transfer the case to Federal court because in Federal court the person could be prosecuted by the U.S. Attorney's Office and get an additional 5 years in the Federal penitentiary because the criminal, the drug dealer, had a firearm in their possession.

It's a simple plan that worked quite well. In fact, it worked so well that in the first year Richmond, Virginia's

homicide rate was down 33 percent. By 1999, homicides in Richmond, Virginia, were down 97 percent—all because the criminal was prosecuted for unlawfully possessing a firearm and the government put their resources where they should: prosecuting criminals that use guns in the commission of their offense.

The law held the criminal accountable and exiled him out of the community. That's where the phrase "Project Exile" comes from. He was exiled from the community to the Federal penitentiary where other criminals were.

Lock the gun-toting crooks up and send them away. What a novel idea: a law that's already on the books. Maybe violent cities like Chicago and Washington, D.C., should look at Project Exile and hold criminals accountable for the violence that they commit and not be misguided by some who continue to assault the Second Amendment and not punish criminals.

Maybe our system should focus on the person who commits the crime with the weapon as opposed to trying to punish really good folks that own firearms and exercise their right under the Second Amendment to bear arms.

And that's just the way it is.

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 10 o'clock and 16 minutes a.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1200

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker at noon.

PRAYER

The Chaplain, the Reverend Patrick J. Conroy, offered the following prayer:

Gracious God, we give You thanks for giving us another day.

In this Chamber, where the people's House gathers, we pause to offer You gratitude for the gift of this good land on which we live and for this great Nation which You have inspired in developing over so many years. Continue to inspire the American people, that through the difficulties of these days, we might keep liberty and justice alive in our Nation and in the world.

Grant an extra measure of wisdom and perseverance to the Members of this House, that the difficulties facing our Nation might be addressed to the benefit of all.

Give to us and all people a vivid sense of Your presence, that we may learn to understand each other, to respect each other, to work with each other, to live with each other, and to do good to each other. So shall we

make our Nation great in goodness and good in its greatness.

May all that is done this day be for Your greater honor and glory.

Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER. 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.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER. Will the gentlewoman from California (Mrs. CAPPS) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mrs. CAPPS led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

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

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER

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

HEALTH CARE CONSCIENCE RIGHTS ACT

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

Mr. DAINES. Mr. Speaker, our Founders believed that conscience and religious rights occupied the highest rung on the civil liberty protection ladder. The Obama administration has fallen short of these expectations.

As a fifth-generation Montanan and a person of faith, I know that my faith does not begin and end at the doors of our church. Living the principles of what I believe is a key part of my faith.

But under the Affordable Care Act, religious institutions and employers, as well as health care providers who hold religious and moral convictions, are stripped of their religious freedoms. Religious institutions and employers are forced to pay for coverage of contraceptive methods. Health care providers do not have the protection to refuse to perform abortion services that they are morally opposed to. That is a violation of the First Amendment.

That is why I am proud to help introduce the Health Care Conscience Rights Act, which will uphold our constitutional rights of religious freedom and uphold our moral calling to practice life-affirming health care.

UPHOLDING VOTING RIGHTS ACT

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

Mr. HIGGINS. Mr. Speaker, this weekend I joined a trip led by Congressman JOHN LEWIS to some of the landmark sites of the civil rights struggle, culminating in a walk across the Edmund Pettus Bridge on the 48th anniversary of that historic march. The trip underscored the importance of the Voting Rights Act, which is responsible for much of the progress we have made toward eliminating voter discrimination, and the need for the Supreme Court to uphold section 5 of the law in the case pending before it.

Meanwhile, in Congress, we should be working to eliminate the inexcusably long lines at polling places across the country and ensure that every American who wants to cast a ballot is able to do so.

Decades ago, Congressman LEWIS helped lead the fight for the idea that all Americans should be able to participate in our democratic process. It is my hope that the Supreme Court and this Congress will honor that struggle in the years ahead.

SEQUESTER AND FEDERAL SPENDING

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

Mr. BENTIVOLIO. Mr. Speaker, before I came to Washington, I was a high school teacher. To be a good teacher, I had to make things understandable for my students in the classroom. With the budget, I knew that there had to be an easier way to explain the numbers I was looking at to the people who sent me to Washington. Thomas Jefferson once wrote that an informed public was vital to our continuing democracy. I would like to share with you how the sequester affects Federal spending.

Spending is expected to be around \$3.8 trillion; that's the number 38 followed by 11 zeros. The sequester is \$85 billion; that's the number 85 followed by nine zeros. That's a lot of money.

The best way to understand these numbers is to take eight zeros off of both of them. The President is complaining that we are taking an equivalent of \$850 from a budget of \$38,000. This is all pretty hypocritical after he forced hardworking Americans who actually have to live on \$38,000 a year to pay another \$760 or so in increased taxes as part of his fiscal cliff deal.

The people in my district want us to get serious about the enormous spending that's happening here in Congress. We should be able to have a reduction in the increase of spending without acting as if it will cause the end of the world.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HARRIS). The gentleman is reminded to avoid inappropriate references to the President.

SEQUESTRATION ISN'T A SOLUTION

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

Mr. CICILLINE. Mr. Speaker, yesterday I visited Core Composites, a company located in Bristol in my home State of Rhode Island. Because of sequestration, this small business has been notified that funding for a government contract will be reduced by hundreds of thousands of dollars.

I also recently met with Alexion, a pharmaceutical manufacturer in Rhode Island, whose FDA approval of a life-saving drug will likely be delayed because of sequestration. Countless other small businesses across our country are facing these same challenges today because Washington failed to take action to avoid sequestration.

Sequestration isn't a solution to our Federal deficit; it's a penalty that goes into effect because Republicans and Democrats failed to work together to responsibly reduce the deficit. And it's a penalty that will place a heavy toll on hardworking men and women across our country.

We spend a lot of time fighting in Washington. Now it's time for us to work together to reach a commonsense solution on this issue. Congressman CHRIS VAN HOLLEN has offered a very detailed alternative to sequestration that I'm proud to cosponsor that would cut spending responsibly, repeal subsidies to Big Oil, adopt the Buffett rule, and preserve the Medicare guarantee for seniors. Rather than pointing fingers, we should be looking at this and other reasonable alternatives that would provide critical relief for working families right now.

□ 1210

HONORING THE LIFE OF RALPH WALDO ELLISON

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

Mr. LANKFORD. Mr. Speaker, I rise to be able to pay honor to a man who deserves honor. March 1 would have been Ralph Waldo Ellison's—we know him as Ralph Ellison—100th birthday.

Ralph Ellison is a proud son of Oklahoma City. He's a graduate of Douglas High School in Oklahoma City. He hopped trains to Tuskegee to go to Tuskegee College on a music scholarship.

He's a musician, he's a sculptor, and he's the writer of the famous work, "Invisible Man." It was the defining work of African American literature in the 1950s, and still continues today as being one of the defining works to be able to point our culture to not ignore racial injustice, social injustice, and economic injustice that still occurs in our Nation today.

His work ethic, his passion for education, and his passion for justice is a

great example to all Americans. I rise to be able to honor a great Oklahoma citizen, Ralph Ellison, and begin a one-year celebration of his 100th birthday.

THE NAGORNO-KARABAKH REGION OF AZERBAIJAN

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

Ms. CHU. This year marks the 25th anniversary of a critical turning point in the political freedom of the Armenian people of Azerbaijan. Let us take this occasion to remember their struggle for self-determination and freedom.

In 1988, the Nagorno-Karabakh region of Azerbaijan petitioned to become part of Armenia. For the next 2 years, the Armenian population was the target of racially motivated pogroms. Hundreds of Armenians were murdered and more wounded during three violent attacks in Sumgait, Kirovabad, and Baku.

In 1991, Nagorno-Karabakh officially declared independence, becoming a democratic state committed to freedom and respect for human rights. But today, the people of Nagorno-Karabakh are still forced to live under authoritarian rule. As we commemorate their century-long struggle, let us not forget their quest for autonomy and justice.

WE MUST RESTRAIN SPENDING

(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, this year the United States Treasury received more revenue than any year in the history of our Nation, yet we will spend a third more than we take in. Clearly, we do not have a revenue problem. We have a spending problem.

The Budget Control Act signed into law last year was a good first step towards deficit reduction, half of which has already been put in motion. With the Supercommittee's failure to achieve the other half, those cuts are now going into effect under sequestration.

Can these cuts be made smartly, targeting waste and overspending? Absolutely, but only if the President stops playing scare politics and begins working with Congress to make these reductions in a manner that best protects national defense and domestic priorities.

If the sequester takes full effect, the Nation's budget is still on a path to grow exponentially over the next 10 years. Unless we continue to restrain spending, our \$17 trillion national debt will continue to grow, crowding out the Nation's ability to even provide for the most in need.

We have a spending problem, not a revenue problem. More taxes won't solve it, but a little more leadership sure would help.

NATIONAL SCHOOL BREAKFAST WEEK

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

Mrs. CAPPS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in honor of National School Breakfast Week. We know that the simple act of a child eating a healthy breakfast can have dramatic effects, not only on their health, but on their academic performance.

I am cochair of the Congressional School Health and Safety Caucus, and I was honored to join the Share Our Strength's No Kid Hungry Campaign discussing last week, in a briefing, the importance of the School Breakfast Program.

I was proud to vote for the bipartisan Healthy, Hunger-Free Kids Act of 2010 that helped to expand the School Breakfast Program, but I'm disheartened that only about half of eligible students are participating in the program. We can do better.

I spent years as a school nurse, and I saw, firsthand, how hunger can cause children to lack focus in school, often get sick, and eventually fall behind. And that's why students are encouraged to eat, and often provided with a breakfast on the day of a big test. But we need to make sure they eat breakfast every day.

We've put the School Breakfast Program in place, and now we need to increase awareness and ensure access for all eligible students. That's why I encourage my colleagues to join me in recognizing National School Breakfast Week because, after all, breakfast is the most important meal of the day.

SEQUESTRATION IS AFFECTING US ALL

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

Mr. WEBER of Texas. Mr. Speaker, it doesn't seem like good leadership practice for the President to be going around the country reminding Americans that he failed to prevent his own sequestration, but to each his own.

Unfortunately, the President's sequestration is affecting us all. Why should he have shackled us all with the sequestration?

The truth is, the President's inability to lead has shackled us. The truth is, the President has not only a spending problem but a denial problem.

Well, make no mistake, Mr. Speaker. Sequestration is here. I implore the President to come back, work with Congress, and quit campaigning in the media.

SEQUESTRATION HAS BEGUN

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

Ms. HAHN. Mr. Speaker, Congress' failure to avert the sequestration with a balanced and responsible plan before the March 1 deadline is not just sad, it's inexcusable. The ramifications of failure are anything but artificial. They are real and they are severe. While the sequestration process has begun, it is not too late to work together to put us back on the right path.

Funny enough, Democrats and Republicans actually agree on one thing: that we can and must adjust the way we spend money. But we have dramatically different ideas about the best approach.

Democrats in Congress have a balanced approach, which includes spending cuts and revenue through closing tax loopholes to reduce our debt. This sequestration plan is not the answer to dealing with our deficits, and neither is another eleventh-hour temporary solution.

We owe it to the American people to move the needle forward and come to a compromise on a real plan that will increase revenue from sources other than just slashing critical programs.

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

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

GOVERNMENT SPENDING IS THE PROBLEM

(Mrs. McMORRIS RODGERS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. McMORRIS RODGERS. Mr. Speaker, last week I sat around the table with a group of young people, Millennials, who wanted to talk with me about solving our Nation's spending problem. These Millennials want all the same thing: a solution to Washington's spending problem today to stop hurting America's youth tomorrow.

I heard from one young college student who had just recently graduated, and she said, you know, I was excited to embrace all the opportunities that America had to offer, only to have many people tell me to expect 5 years of unemployment.

Unfortunately, these challenges are not unique, and their experiences are not uncommon. The national debt is more than a \$16 trillion pricetag. It's more than just a number.

Washington's out-of-control spending threatens the next generation of America's leaders from finding jobs after they graduate and having the tools they need to keep America competitive. Why?

Because spending is the problem. So we will continue to urge the Democrats

who run Washington to work with us to cut spending in a responsible way.

Republicans keep fighting for smarter spending cuts and, most of all, for an economy in which young people are afforded the opportunities they deserve.

SEQUESTRATION CUTS ARE TAKING EFFECT

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

Mr. KILDEE. Mr. Speaker, it's now March 5, and sequestration cuts are starting to take effect. Instead of working together to find a compromise that would avoid these automatic spending cuts, House Republicans stood by and watched the March 1 deadline come and go.

Now, \$85 billion in deep, indiscriminate cuts that will eliminate 31,000 Michigan jobs are upon us. These cuts will harm Michigan families and slash programs that my constituents rely on every day. And many of the most dire consequences of the sequester won't be felt immediately. The truth is, due to Republican inaction, the wheels are now in motion, and we are on a course that has real negative impacts on millions of Americans.

Congress should be working to find a bipartisan solution to avoid these indiscriminate cuts. Democrats put forth a plan to stop the sequester. I know, I cosponsored it. House Republicans would not even let it come to the floor for a vote.

Mr. Speaker, we need to work on an approach that will fix sequestration while reducing the deficit responsibly. I stand ready to act. So do my Democratic colleagues. Let's get to work.

□ 1220

CHEN GUANGCHENG

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

Mr. PITTS. Mr. Speaker, today, Capitol Hill is hosting a great Chinese defender of human rights, blind lawyer Chen Guangcheng. A few moments ago, I had the honor of again meeting with Chen as he continues to advocate for the freedom of the Chinese people. His amazing story of escape from house arrest is a great encouragement for all in China suffering under political persecution. The authorities could not silence him as he sought justice for victims of forced abortions and environmental abuse.

The story of China's rise is not about the success of an autocratic government. It is instead the story of a people whose ingenuity and vigor have finally been unleashed after decades of repression. China has developed not because of smart planning, but because the people have used a relatively small amount of economic freedom to transform their nation. Given more freedom,

I believe there's no limit to how China will grow and how her people will impact the world. We must support Chen and other human rights defenders as they seek justice for their people.

GUN VIOLENCE

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

Mr. RICHMOND. Mr. Speaker, as a resident of Louisiana, the sportsman's paradise, I'm a strong supporter of the Second Amendment. However, I do not subscribe to the belief that Congress has no role in responding to the gun violence epidemic plaguing communities like New Orleans, Chicago, and Detroit.

According to the FBI, 1,464 people were killed by a firearm in New Orleans between 2008 and 2011. That's 1,464 families who will never see their loved ones again. We can't afford to do nothing. We can no longer be the do-nothing Congress. We have a moral obligation to reduce the broad epidemic of gun violence in this country.

So I urge my colleagues in Congress to join with me in standing with the victims and families of gun violence to approve legislation that invests in our mental health system, institute more rigorous background checks, and place a ban on assault rifles and high-capacity magazines. Even incremental progress means fewer heart-broken families. I don't want to see another child fall victim to our selfish efforts to preserve what obviously needs to change. I would remind my colleagues that the life we save may be our own.

SPENDING PROBLEM IN THIS COUNTRY

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

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, in January, the President asked hardworking taxpayers to contribute 2 percent more of their hard-earned paychecks to the Federal Government in the form of a payroll tax increase. They had to cut their household budgets by 2 percent. The President's sequester that went into effect last Friday called for a less-than-2-percent decrease in government spending, but the President now thinks that 2 percent is too much to cut from each Federal dollar. We all know the President's sequester is probably not the right way to control spending because it cuts programs across the board without any prioritization. But we all know this country has a spending problem, and we need to get it under control.

I can't help but think if the American people had to just cut 2 percent from their budgets, why can't the Federal Government? If hardworking taxpayers had to figure out how to manage with 2 percent less, can't the Federal Government figure out how to

spend two less pennies out of every Federal dollar?

SEQUESTRATION IN NEW HAMPSHIRE

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

Ms. KUSTER. Mr. Speaker, because the Congress refuses to compromise, across-the-board spending cuts known as the sequester—and uncertainty around the Federal economy and the budget—are casting a cloud over our entire economy. In New Hampshire, we are already seeing the impacts of these cuts.

Right now, there's a Federal prison in Berlin, New Hampshire, with over 100 open jobs, but funding fights in Washington are preventing Granite Staters from filling them.

There's a Salem company, Micro-Precision Technologies, that wants to hire more workers; but sequestration is creating uncertainty and standing in the way.

There are technicians in New Hampshire's National Guard who want to do their jobs, but deep cuts to defense means they're facing the possibility of furloughs.

These are all examples of businesses that will have to delay hiring and people who will lose their jobs simply because Democrats and Republicans will not compromise. This is not what responsible governing looks like. We owe it to New Hampshire families to work across the aisle, responsibly reduce the deficit, and stop these mindless cuts.

CRYING WOLF

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

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, Republicans cry that the President and Democrats are crying wolf about sequester cuts and furloughs. But, the wolf is already biting. In my hand is a furlough notice from the U.S. Attorney for the District of Columbia. In D.C., the U.S. Attorney still handles major local crimes for this big city as well as some of the most important Federal matters, including terrorism suspects.

The U.S. Attorney's notice says there will be up to 14 days—that's 2 weeks—of furlough days for Assistant U.S. Attorneys and other personnel. On furlough days, the notice says, Assistant U.S. Attorneys and other staff are not permitted to even come to the office to volunteer.

Mr. Speaker, the problem with making sequester a budget rather than a prod, as intended, is not the 2 percent sequester cut. It's the compression upfront in a short period of time. The American people who depend on U.S. Attorneys deserve better than a deliberate and avoidable public safety furlough.

SEQUESTRATION WILL KILL JOBS

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

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I enthusiastically rise to support JOHN CONYERS' H.R. 900, of which I'm an original cosponsor, which is a thoughtful response to legislation that was really hostage-taking, and that is the passage of sequestration almost 2 years ago. Everyone knows it was the need for the debt ceiling to be raised that generated it. But I'm not about excuses. H.R. 900 simply eliminates the sequester provision in the Budget Reconciliation Act. It is thoughtful and allows us to proceed.

However, we will not be able to pass it because our friends on the other side of the aisle are celebrating about the \$85 billion in cuts across the board, hurting seniors, children, and families. And then they want to acknowledge this is the President's fault. Well, the President is willing to not look at poll numbers to be able to fight, to support, and enhance revenues and spending cuts. Thank you, Mr. President, for leading.

For those who say nothing has happened, it's because it has not happened yet, but I will tell you the continuation of sequester is going to hurt the American people and kill jobs. The continuing resolution that devastates those nondiscretionary projects of Head Start and education will also hurt the American people. Let's pass H.R. 900 and begin a process that the American people can buy into and a budget that is fair, with taxes and spending cuts that work on behalf of the American people.

SEQUESTRATION IS WRONG

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

Mr. GARCIA. Let me begin by saying that the district I have the honor to represent in south Florida is made up of middle class families in neighborhoods like Kendall, Westchester, and the Florida Keys. The families who live in this region don't care about ideological debates of the left or right. They simply know the difference between right and wrong. And, ladies and gentlemen, the sequestration is wrong.

The Keys Reporter reported that over 600 civilian workers at Key West Naval Base will be furloughed. This will hurt small businesses and families. Reports also say funding for work-study programs at schools like Miami Dade College, Florida International University, and Florida Keys Community College will be cut. The Miami Herald reported that air traffic control workers at Opa Locka Airport will be furloughed as of the beginning of April.

I respectfully ask my colleagues to put their differences aside and get to work. I urge the Speaker to bring up

H.R. 699, a balanced bill to replace the sequester with spending cuts and revenues.

□ 1230

MARY LOU STOTT'S 80TH BIRTHDAY, VISIT TO U.S. CAPITOL

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

Ms. GABBARD. Mr. Speaker, I'm very proud to rise today to recognize a very special guest from Hawaii who is here visiting us in Washington this week.

One of my constituents, Tracey Stott Kelly, contacted me recently to set up a United States Capitol tour for her mother's 80th birthday. This wasn't like most other requests that we receive. Her mother Mary Lou's birthday wish was to visit the Capitol to see the work of her great-great-grandfather, who was an assistant to Constantino Brumidi. Mr. Brumidi was best known for the murals he painted in the Capitol over a 25-year period, including "The Apotheosis of Washington," the "Frieze of American History," and the walls of the Brumidi Corridors.

So this Friday, Mary Lou and her 'ohana will receive a very unique tour with Dr. Barbara Wolanin, the curator for the Architect of the Capitol, to highlight the beautiful paintings by Brumidi and to bring Mary Lou closer to her very talented great-great-grandfather.

Happy 80th birthday, Mary Lou. And thank you to Dr. Wolanin for helping to make this very special day a reality.

SEQUESTER

(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, the bill before us is a joke. It is only a few sentences, and all it does is ask the President to include in his budget a simple equation that divides the projected deficit by the number of taxpayers. It doesn't take a bill to do this; it just takes a calculator.

If the House Republican Conference wants us to do a math problem for the American people, I can save everyone some time and money. \$845 billion, which is the estimated deficit projected by the CBO, divided by 158 million, which is the number of taxpayers, equals \$5,300. Done.

Can't they do this arithmetic problem on their own? Why are we wasting taxpayers' money to operate this institution as we speak when we can solve this very simple math problem by just doing it. This is all an exercise in political theater.

I shouldn't have to come to the floor to do this. Any of my Republican friends could have called me, and I would have gladly walked them through that simple equation.

Mr. Speaker, my constituents in California's 41st District face an unemployment rate of 11 percent—higher than the national average. They need leadership from Congress to help them find jobs, not gimmicks disguised as legislation.

Our Founders didn't envision Congress assigning math homework. This is not elementary school. If my friends on the other side of the aisle want to talk about numbers, I would be happy to.

Zero, Mr. Speaker: that's the number of jobs this bill creates. Zero: the number or jobs bills the House Republican leadership has brought to the floor in the last 2 months. 750,000: the number of potential job losses if the Republicans refuse to stop the sequester.

APPOINTMENT OF MEMBER TO CONGRESSIONAL-EXECUTIVE COMMISSION ON PEOPLE'S REPUBLIC OF CHINA

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair announces the Speaker's appointment, pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 6913 and the order of the House of January 3, 2013, of the following Member on the part of the House to the Congressional-Executive Commission on the People's Republic of China:

Mr. WALZ, Minnesota.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the Chair will postpone further proceedings today on motions to suspend the rules on which a recorded vote or the yeas and nays are ordered, or on which the vote incurs objection under clause 6 of rule XX.

Record votes on postponed questions will be taken later.

REQUIREMENT IN BUDGET SUBMISSION WITH RESPECT TO THE COST PER TAXPAYER OF THE DEFICIT

Mr. MESSER. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 668) to amend section 1105(a) of title 31, United States Code, to require that annual budget submissions of the President to Congress provide an estimate of the cost per taxpayer of the deficit, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 668

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. REQUIREMENT IN BUDGET SUBMISSION WITH RESPECT TO THE COST PER TAXPAYER OF THE DEFICIT.

Section 1105(a) of title 31, United States Code, is amended—

(1) redesignating paragraph (37) (relating to the list of outdated or duplicative plans and reports) as paragraph (39); and

(2) by adding at the end the following:

“(40) in the case of a fiscal year in which the budget is projected to result in a deficit, an estimate of the pro rata cost of such deficit for taxpayers who will file individual income tax returns for taxable years ending during such fiscal year.”.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. MESSER) and the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. VAN HOLLEN) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Indiana.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. MESSER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on H.R. 668, currently under consideration.

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

There was no objection.

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

First, I want to thank Budget Committee Chairman PAUL RYAN and Ranking Member CHRIS VAN HOLLEN for allowing the House to consider this measure, which will require the President's annual budget submission to Congress to include the cost per taxpayer of the deficit for each year the budget is projected to result in a deficit.

This bill is based on one simple principle: that each hardworking American taxpayer deserves to know how much the deficit costs them each year. This requirement would be a powerful reminder to the President and Congress that our decisions have real-world consequences for hardworking taxpayers.

It's long past time to hold Washington accountable for its wasteful spending. The massive national debt has ballooned to an unsustainable level because Washington has refused to make tough choices, instead, simply spending money we don't have and ignoring the explosive growth of entitlements. This abdication of responsibility is delaying the inevitable until there may not be any good choices left.

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

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

As one of the earlier speakers said during the 1 minutes, this bill simply requires a math calculation, and we have absolutely no objection to doing that. As the gentleman may know, about a month ago we passed an amendment that did virtually the same thing.

I do wonder why it is we think the President is better with a calculator than Congress. Because what this does require simply is that you take the deficit and you divide it by the number of taxpayers. But we're certainly fine to have transparency and have the President put that in his budget as part of his submission as well.

Our concern is that this really doesn't address the fundamental question that we're facing here in the Congress: number one, making sure we get the economy kicked into full gear, and jobs; and, number two, reducing the deficit in a smart and balanced way over a period of time so that we're not balancing the budget on the backs of our seniors, that we're not violating commitments we've made to our seniors, that we're not cutting into education funding for our kids—which is important to making sure that the economy grows and that they have opportunities in their lives—and that we do that in a smart way that doesn't, in the process, result in fewer American jobs.

So the real number we should be focused on here today is 750,000, because 750,000 is the number of jobs that the independent, nonpartisan Congressional Budget Office says will be lost so long as the sequester that began March 1 remains in place through the end of this year.

So let me say that again. So long as the sequester that started on March 1 remains in place through the end of the calendar year, the independent, nonpartisan Congressional Budget Office says that we will have 750,000 fewer American jobs. That's not President Obama's number; it's not my number; it's an independent number.

The Chairman of the Federal Reserve, Ben Bernanke, was on the Hill testifying just last week and made similar predictions. They have both—both the Chairman of the Federal Reserve, Ben Bernanke, as well as the Congressional Budget Office—said that our economic growth between now and the end of the year will be reduced by a full one-third if the sequester remains in place. So that's what this House should be doing.

Today, a little later today, for the fourth time this year—for the fourth time this year, Mr. Speaker—I will go, on behalf of my colleagues in the Democratic Caucus, to the Rules Committee and ask for the opportunity to vote on a piece of legislation that would replace that sequester in a smart and balanced way and in a way that doesn't result in 750,000 fewer American jobs.

□ 1240

Now, you would think our colleagues would want to vote on something like that instead of voting on a bill that just requires a math calculation—which is fine—but it doesn't do anything about jobs, and it doesn't actually do anything to reduce the deficit. But we've not been given that opportunity.

So I would just ask my colleagues: Why is it so important to bring a bill to the floor that asks the President to do another math calculation—which we all can support—and not bring to the floor of the House a bill that actually would prevent the loss of 750,000 jobs and present a balanced plan to reduc-

ing the deficit in a way that doesn't harm the economy?

That really is the question here today, Mr. Speaker, and maybe at some point we'll get an answer. And maybe this House will live up to its promise of being the people's House and a transparent House, and we'll actually get a vote on our fourth request. I'm not holding my breath, but it would be nice if those commitments would be kept, as well.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MESSER. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate Representative VAN HOLLEN and his comments. As he well knows, this Chamber has twice considered sequester replacement bills put forward by the House Republican leadership, voted on and passed out of this Chamber.

The alternatives are clear. I appreciate his recognition that this simple little calculation, while admittedly not going to change the planet Earth, it is important in providing budget transparency and helping the American taxpayer understand how much money we're spending here.

We often hear, as you're out in town-hall meetings, How much is \$1 trillion? And what this bill simply shows is that if you take \$1 trillion, if that's the deficit in a given year, and divide it by 145 million taxpayers we have, it adds up to about \$6,800 per taxpayer that we are adding to our debt every year.

Back where I come from in Indiana's Sixth Congressional District, that's a lot of money. He cited the number 750,000, and I would concede that \$85 billion is a lot of money; but it represents about 2 percent of what we spend as a Nation every year in our \$3.6 billion budget.

I came to the House floor yesterday and held up two pennies representing the two cents—the two percent—the two cents out of every dollar that we're asking Congress to trim out of our Federal budget. Does anybody in America really believe that our Federal Government is so efficient and so effective that we can't afford to trim two cents out of every dollar?

Now, clearly, we can do this in a more sensible way. I know of no one in either Chamber who is not arguing that we ought to find a more sensible way to bring these reductions forward, but bring them forward we must.

Now, with that, Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. GARRETT).

Mr. GARRETT. I thank the gentleman.

Right now, as we stand here, the national debt in this country stands over \$16 trillion, and one-third of that was rung up just during this President Obama's administration. And some outside expert says, what does that translate to you and me? Well, the average taxpayer may be in debt of \$111,000 to the U.S. Government because of that.

On top of that, do you know that this is the fourth time that this White

House, that this President, has failed to follow the law and to submit a budget to the House on time? But when he finally does, I really do hope that this budget differs from his other ones which were riddled with red ink and absolutely had no intent to balance, not in 5 years, 10 years, or 15 years. They never balanced. In short, his budgets have been an economic disaster. Maybe that's why there has been bipartisan opposition to these budgets.

In the Senate, which is Democratically controlled, he got absolutely zero support for his budgets in the past. So it's high time that this President gets serious about the deficits, acknowledges that frivolous spending is part of the problem, and addresses the issues with appropriate budgets.

I support this legislation before us.

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

The floor manager mentioned that two times our Republican colleagues had put forth an alternative to the sequester. I know the gentleman knows well that we're in a new Congress, and starting in January, all the bills that were put forward in the last Congress were wiped off the books. They don't have any meaning at this point in time. And this year, since we've been in a new Congress, since the election, the number of times our Republican colleagues have put forth a proposal to prevent that sequester to replace it is zero—zero times in this Congress—when it could actually make a difference. Yet, today, for the fourth time, we're going to go and ask for a vote on our proposal.

Now, we're not asking our colleagues to vote for a proposal, although I think that public surveys show the overwhelming majority of the American people would think that our alternative to replacing the sequester is a lot better than the sequester. We're not even asking our colleagues to vote for it. We're just asking for a vote on it. Let's let the people's House do its work.

Now, we talked about the deficit. There's no argument about the need to reduce our deficits. We just need to do it in a smart way and in a way that doesn't hurt the economy and doesn't cost jobs; and our proposal does have a balanced way. It combines additional, targeted cuts over a period of time with cutting tax loopholes that are in the Tax Code over a period of time.

Our Republican colleagues keep talking about how bad the deficit is. We say we agree with you on that, but it apparently isn't bad enough that you would close one single tax loophole in order to reduce the deficit. In fact, that Grover Norquist pledge that's been signed by over 90 percent of our House colleagues says that you promise not to close a single tax loophole for the purpose of reducing the deficit. You can't get rid of a tax break for corporate jets. You can't get rid of the special treatment of hedge fund man-

agers under the Tax Code if it's part of an effort to reduce the deficit. How is that serious deficit reduction?

So what we've said is we need to do both. We need to eliminate a lot of those tax preferences and tax breaks for big oil companies and others; and we also need to make sensible, targeted cuts in other areas and reduce the deficit in a smart way. The alternative plan that we have proposed that we're asking for a vote on would accomplish the same amount of deficit reduction as the sequester through this calendar year, but do it in a way that does not cost 750,000 American jobs, because we don't do it so deeply, so quickly.

That's the difference, and that's why bipartisan commissions have recommended the balanced approach to reducing the deficit. So, again, the numbers for this year, which is the only thing that's relevant in terms of congressional action, is that there has been zero effort, zero times that our colleagues have brought to the floor a proposal to replace sequester. We're now asking our fourth time this afternoon simply to have a vote.

I hope that we can finally get one, Mr. Speaker.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MESSER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from Tennessee (Mrs. BLACK).

Mrs. BLACK. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I rise today to speak in support of Congressman MESSER's bill, H.R. 668. This requirement would be a powerful reminder to the President and Congress on how the decisions regarding our government's spending impact the constituents that we serve.

Despite the fact that on the President's watch we have had 4 straight years of deficits exceeding \$1 trillion and we still have nearly 23 million Americans who are struggling to find work, the President continues to champion more and more deficit spending as a cure to what ails our struggling economy.

But spending money we do not have is not an investment. It's a liability that limits the potential and the freedom of the American people and future generations. Every man, woman, and child in America currently owes \$52,000 as their share of the national debt. It's time that the President and Congress level with the public about the burden of debt that's being placed on the American taxpayer each and every year.

Mr. MESSER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Indiana (Mr. ROKITA).

Mr. ROKITA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of this important legislation offered by my good friend from Indiana.

For more than 2 years now, my colleagues and I have led a family discussion across this country about our debt and deficits. Our current national debt stands at over \$16.5 trillion and increases by \$4 billion per day. We have

\$100 trillion, Mr. Speaker, in unfunded promises coming down the pike.

What many Americans, including some Members of this distinguished body, fail to understand is that these numbers have consequences. Our debt and deficits are not simply a series of numbers. They are a reflection of our morality as a people. And what our debt and deficits reveal is that, for the first time in the history of our country, this generation is preparing to leave the next worse off.

□ 1250

I always seem to be able to talk about, at least on one side of this body, how many times something was introduced last year versus this year, and somehow expecting a difference. Einstein had something to say about repeating something and expecting a different result.

Would anyone in this room be able to stand here and argue that this choice, leaving the next generation worse off, is morally correct? Of course not. The out-of-control spending coming from Washington will have a devastating impact on future generations, our children and grandchildren.

I recently received a letter from a Boy Scout in my district by the name of Michael Krane, who said he is "concerned and disappointed in the job Congress has been doing in the handling of the budget." Unfortunately, Michael does not have a voice in this conversation. He is too young to vote. And, of course, his children that he will one day have have no voice, yet they will be paying this bill.

That is why I support LUKE MESSER's bill, to continue this conversation with the American people by simply saying, to those of us who are taxpayers, what we bear in terms of the cost for the government that we now have, as inefficient and ineffective as it is.

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

As I pointed out earlier, but I think it bears emphasis, about 1 month ago we passed a virtually identical provision. So why are we back here on the floor of this House, again without opposition? I think everybody in this House voted to do this calculation and have it put on the books. So why we are here one month later when the sequester just kicked in, doing something that we already did, rather than focusing on the issue at hand, I think is a mystery to the American people. Folks who just read from letters they got and from constituents, I think those constituents are going to be asking, why are you doing now what you did 30 days ago when we have got all these other burning issues on our plate right now, and at a time when we are asking for a vote on a plan to replace the sequester in a balanced way for the fourth time.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MESSER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished

gentlelady from Tennessee (Mrs. BLACKBURN).

Mrs. BLACKBURN. I thank the gentleman for the time.

Mr. Speaker, talking about burning issues, I don't know of anything that is more pressing than dealing with this Nation's debt. You can go back through the pages and look at what Admiral Mullen had to say on July 6, 2010:

The greatest threat to our Nation's security is our Nation's debt.

That is the reason we are here. We are not here for ourselves. We are here for our children and our grandchildren, and making certain that the America that they have, the future that they have, hope and opportunity that they have, is going to be greater than anything that we ever possibly could have imagined for ourselves.

Isn't that what preserving freedom for prosperity is all about? It is about making certain that we hand over freedom in good shape for another generation.

I will tell you, if you are looking at the debt clock, it's a pretty telling story—over \$16.5 trillion. And yesterday, the per citizen share of that debt was \$52,818. The per taxpayer share was \$147,238.

I know there are some in this body who would like to turn the debt clocks off in the hearing rooms. They just want to ignore it, and supposedly it would go away and we wouldn't have to talk about it. We could just pretend that we do not have a spending problem in Washington, D.C.

Mr. Speaker, that is not reality. That is being completely divorced from reality. In order to defeat a problem, you have to admit that there is a problem. There is a problem with spending in Washington. There is a problem with our Nation's debt.

I support the good work that has been done by my friend from Indiana and encourage all to vote for H.R. 668.

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

Listening to this debate on the floor you might think that this bill did something to reduce the deficit and the debt. Just in case anyone is confused, it does nothing to reduce the deficit and debt. It does ask for a calculation, which we agree with.

In fact, the gentlelady just did the calculation herself, which begs the question why you need to go through a bill to get somebody to do the calculation. In fact, this calculation changes, because as the gentleman and all of us have said, the deficit goes up. That number changes every day, and so you have got to do it every day.

The point is, we passed this a month ago. There is no objection to doing a calculation. But this bill does nothing, nothing to reduce the deficit. In fact, it is running up the deficit as we spend time, taxpayer time, right here on the floor of the House while we continue to ask for a vote, up or down vote, on our

plan to replace the sequester so that we don't lose 750,000 American jobs.

Today will be the fourth time we have asked for this. Our Republican colleagues have not taken any action in this Congress, not one step, nothing, to replace the sequester.

That is what we should be dealing with. Not a bill that we passed a month ago, not a bill that the gentlelady did a calculation on the floor to achieve the result. Let's focus on jobs and reducing the deficit in a smart way, by targeting spending cuts in a smart way, but also getting rid of all those tax breaks that our colleagues seem so wedded to keeping in place.

With that, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished Democratic leader, the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI).

Ms. PELOSI. I thank the gentleman for yielding and for giving me this opportunity to support his proposal, the CHRIS VAN HOLLEN proposal, as our ranking member on the Budget Committee, a proposal that is fair, responsible, and balanced.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN has put forth an initiative that cuts spending responsibly, ends unnecessary and wasteful tax breaks for special interests, and advances the Buffett rule, ensuring that millionaires pay their fair share.

I think it is really important to note, as he did, that this will be yet another time we are coming to the floor asking for the Republican leadership to allow a vote in what they boast of as an open Congress, open to other ideas, that has blocked over and over again the mere consideration of Mr. VAN HOLLEN's proposal on the floor.

Instead, today, we are engaged in subterfuge. What can we do instead of doing what we really need to do and make it look as if we are doing something responsible? Yes, okay, let's get the calculation. But let's reduce that deficit. Let's reduce that deficit.

And it is important to note that this debate happens in a week that we will be taking up the continuing resolution. It has been 4 days since the sequester went into effect. The continuing resolution that the Republicans are putting forth is a bill that reinforces the sequestration.

So what does that do? The Federal Reserve chairman, Ben Bernanke, told Congress last week that cuts of this size, made this quickly, would hurt hiring and incomes, slow the recovery, cost the economy 750,000 jobs this year, and keep deficits larger than otherwise.

So we are not reducing the deficit by what is really happening on the major legislation coming to this floor last week and this week in terms of sequester and continuing resolution. That is what we should be doing—figuring out a way to get rid of the sequestration.

What does sequestration mean? Whatever its Latin roots, it equals job loss—750,000 by the estimate of the chairman of the Fed.

And what is the point of all of this? There is an answer. We already have

agreed in the continuing resolution—the President and the Congress have agreed to \$1.2 trillion in spending cuts. We all recognize we must reduce the deficit. We have all agreed to spending cuts of that magnitude. That was in addition to \$400 billion of other spending cuts in the last term of Congress. So \$1.6 trillion in spending cuts, which dwarfs the \$600 billion, as significant as that is, in the expiration of the Bush tax cuts at the end of last year.

□ 1300

But we need more revenue, and there is a place to get it.

Our distinguished Speaker said there is \$100 billion in tax loopholes that could be closed. I think there is more than that, but many of the deductions that we would want people to take to strengthen the middle class I think we should separate out from what the Republicans want to do. The Republicans in Congress are protecting tax loopholes and wasteful spending in the Tax Code, which increases the deficit instead of solving problems.

Instead of closing tax loopholes for Big Oil, the Republicans want cuts for little children in Head Start—Big Oil over little children. Instead of closing tax loopholes for corporations that ship jobs overseas, 750,000 jobs will be lost here because of the sequester and the continuing resolution that contains the sequester, which is a fix that we're in because of the refusal of the Republican leadership to close those loopholes. Instead of ensuring millionaires pay their fair share, our military readiness will be impaired. We have kids who won't get the proper training when they're put into harm's way unless the Defense Department can reprogram the money; and health care for America's military families will be cut.

So there is an answer to all of this, and that is that we need to stop the spending in our Tax Code. Everybody talks about reducing spending, as our colleagues on the other side of the aisle do, and we all agree that we need to reduce it. That's why the \$1.6 trillion in spending cuts, and we can try to find more. But why can't we stop the spending on the Tax Code, the spending of tax giveaways? They're called "tax expenditures." They cost the taxpayer.

If you are so concerned about how much the deficit is costing every individual American, why don't we calculate how much the tax break is for Big Oil, corporations sending jobs overseas—the list goes on and on—and how much those tax expenditures cost America's working families. They do so by increasing the deficit and by not creating jobs in our own country.

Again, there is an answer here. To be hopeful, we can come together to say, okay, we all agree: let's reduce the deficit, cut spending, make some changes—those that we can—without hurting beneficiaries in mandatory spending. But why are these tax loopholes for special interests such sacred cows for the Republicans, such sacred

cows that they will not even allow Mr. VAN HOLLEN's bill to come to the floor? Are they afraid of the debate? Are they afraid of the outcome of their vote?

With that, I thank the gentleman again for his leadership and for putting forth a balanced, fair proposal to reduce the deficit in order to avoid sequestration, which we didn't, and as a counter to what the Republicans are putting forth. It's more than a counter. It's about leadership. It's about what is possible if we can work together in a bipartisan way to get the job done for the American people.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman from California is reminded to address her remarks to the Chair.

Mr. MESSER. I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, let me make three quick points: first, as to the underlying merits of the bill, transparency matters. It matters that we let the American people know what is happening here. This calculation called for under the bill shows that in recent years we've been racking up \$6,800 in debt for every American taxpayer each year. That's a lot of money; secondly, we've heard from folks on the other side of the aisle about the need to close loopholes. I would submit that there is broad consensus that we need major tax reform. There is broad consensus that the loopholes that our Tax Code is riddled with should go away. The question is: Then what do you do with the money that comes from those reductions? Do you put it back in the American economy to help grow the economy? The best way to balance our budget and get this House back in fiscal order is to have a growing economy with more taxpayers who can therefore pay additional tax revenue because they have a job.

There has been a lot of talk on the other side of the aisle about the need for a balanced approach, but that balanced approach seems to ignore the fact that we had a \$600 billion tax increase that passed this body on January 1. The President promised in his campaign 4-1 spending reductions to tax increases. We're not yet even to 1-1, and we talk in this Chamber about balance.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Florida (Mr. BILIRAKIS).

Mr. BILIRAKIS. Thank you, Mr. MESSER, and I appreciate you introducing this very good bill.

Mr. Speaker, Washington continues to spend money we don't have. As we all know, the Federal Government borrows nearly 46 cents on the dollar, much of it from China, and we are sending the tab to our children and our grandchildren. What a shame. Across America, working families have had to tighten their belts, and it is past time for Washington to do the same.

That's the bottom line.

Ignoring runaway deficits and out-of-control spending is not an option. With

a national debt of more than \$16 trillion, Mr. Speaker, every American now has a \$52,000 share. We must control spending so Washington will not saddle future generations with burdensome debts that crowd out the private sector and lead to increased taxes and higher interest rates. The lack of fiscal discipline and the rising costs of the Federal debt have created a dangerous combination, necessitating action to prevent Washington from dipping into the bottomless cookie jar.

This legislation before us would simply require the President's budget submission to provide an estimate of the cost per taxpayer of the deficit the budget would run. This commonsense legislation forces us to face this fiscal danger with eyes wide open. I support this good bill, this effort by my colleague, and I urge my colleagues to do the same.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Speaker, may I ask how much time remains on both sides.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Maryland has 9 minutes, and the gentleman from Indiana has 8 minutes.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Again, I have to remind people as they listen to this debate that this bill does nothing—zero—to reduce the deficit—nothing. All it does is ask for a calculation, which we've said we welcome and which one of our Members actually did on the floor of the House here as she gave her presentation, and it's that which we can all do. But by all means, let's say to the President, Put that calculation in your budget—even though that calculation is out of date 3 days after the budget is submitted if we don't get control of the deficit and do it in a smart way.

I agree with the gentleman when he says the best way to deal with the deficit is to grow the economy. That's what we should be focused on, which is why we're asking today—for the fourth time—for a vote on our proposal to replace the sequester so that we don't lose 750,000 jobs; 750,000 jobs is the number of jobs that were created between October of last year and January of this year. According to the Chairman of the Federal Reserve, if we continue to allow that sequester to remain in place, we will see one-third less economic growth.

Now, if you don't believe the non-partisan, independent head of the Congressional Budget Office, who does professional work, and if you don't believe the Chairman of the Federal Reserve, who is not a partisan, maybe our Republican colleagues will believe the House Republican leader, Mr. CANTOR. Here is what he said on the floor of this House, not that long ago, with respect to the sequester:

"Under the sequester, unemployment would soar from its current level . . ." He goes on to say that it would set back "any progress the economy has made." He then referred to a study

that said, ". . . the jobs of more than 200,000 Virginians, in my home State, are on the line." That's Mr. CANTOR.

Here is what the Republican chairman of the Armed Services Committee said about a month ago. This is what Mr. MCKEON said when we got the numbers from the last quarter showing the economy was slowing, in part, in anticipation of these cuts.

□ 1310

Mr. MCKEON said:

This is just the first indicator of the extraordinary economic damage defense cuts will do.

And that's just the defense cuts. You've also got these across-the-board cuts in important investments in biomedical research to try and find treatments and cures to diseases that hit families throughout this country. You're going to be putting people out of work who do that important research for our country. And at the end of the day, in addition to the furloughs and the disruption that will cause in the economy, throughout the entire economy, 750,000 fewer jobs will result at the end of the calendar year.

So why in the world are we debating a bill that we've already passed—I believe unanimously—1 month ago that does nothing about jobs, nothing about the deficit, rather than take up the proposal that we put forward to replace the sequester in a smart and balanced way, through targeted cuts, but also the elimination of these tax breaks. And the answer is, unfortunately, that our Republican colleagues, many of whom have signed that Grover Norquist pledge, have said that they're not willing to close one tax loophole for the purpose of reducing the deficit. Not one penny.

We hear all of the talk about reducing the deficit, but no, you can't take away one tax break for a corporate jet to reduce the deficit. You can't say to a hedge fund manager: you're no longer going to get a special tax preference if it means we're going to take that away so we can reduce the deficit. So if we're really concerned about the deficit, as we should be, let's get at it in a balanced way, and not in the sequester way, which will result in 750,000 fewer American jobs. That's what we should be focused on today, Mr. Speaker.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MESSER. Mr. Speaker, I think in this debate today, you're seeing two very different philosophies of how we move forward as a country: one side of the aisle, who believes that the key to America's future is raising taxes and growing government; and our side, who believes that the key to America's future is controlling spending and giving families tax relief now. Let's use tax reform to put more money in the pocket of the American taxpayer so they can spend it out in the economy.

The gentleman mentions the CBO many, many times over and over again and fails to mention that the leadership of CBO has said that a balanced

budget in the long term will help grow our economy by as much as 1.7 percent each year annually if we balance this budget. He cites Majority Leader CANTOR's statements on the sequester. We have virtual unanimity in this caucus that we need to replace the structure of those \$85 billion in cuts, but our side of the aisle believes we need to replace them with other, more sensible budget reductions that get this government under control.

Mr. Speaker, with those comments, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. DUFFY).

Mr. DUFFY. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the gentleman for yielding.

My good friends across the aisle talk about loopholes and tax reform. They might forget that over the last 2 years, this House and this party have put forward legislation that does away with the loopholes as part of a larger tax reform proposal.

My friend across the aisle continually talks about a smart and balanced way to balance the budget. He talks about responsibility. But if you ask him, Mr. Speaker, for his legislation, when does the Democrat bill balance? When does their budget balance? It never does. Ask him: does it balance in 10, 20, 50 years? How about 100 years? Does your budget balance in 100 years? Never does it balance. That is not a balanced approach.

The Senate hasn't put forward a budget in 4 years. The President's budget, not one Democrat in this Chamber or the Senate voted for the President's budget. And that one, too, never, never balances. That's not a balanced approach. America deserves better.

But on this current legislation, America and Americans have a right to know how much their government is accumulating in debt in their name. Grandparents and parents, they have a right to know how much debt is going to be passed on to their grandchildren and their children. Those little preschoolers, those toddlers, those infants that are going to inherit this massive debt, they have a right to know. How about those young adults that are getting out of high school and tech school and out of college? They have a right to know as they look at their car loans, at their student loans, at that new house loan. They have a right to know how much they're going to inherit and pay back over the course of their working years for this irresponsible debt. Americans have a right to know.

This legislation is important because this is the first step to making sure that America knows the fiscal trouble we're in, and to encourage our friends across the aisle to get together and not use terminology of a balanced approach but actually give us a balanced budget.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Speaker, the American public does have a right to know. I don't know how many times we have to say this on the floor of this

House: We passed virtually the identical bill 30 days ago, approximately, and I'm not objecting to this bill. People have a right to know. We should have transparency. We should reduce the deficit, and this bill does nothing to reduce the deficit.

What we need to do is make sure that we get our deficits under control, that we stabilize the debt, and that we make smart choices for the people in this country.

Yes, there is a difference of opinion. We believe that as part of reducing the deficit, we should make targeted smart cuts, but we should also cut some of those tax loopholes. Now the gentleman mentioned that we passed a tax increase on \$600 billion over the next 10 years. That's right; we finally said, for higher income earners, you're going to go back to paying the same rates as you were during the Clinton administration.

But the gentleman suggested that budget history began on January 1 of this year. We were all here—not everybody, but most of us—when we passed the Budget Control Act in the summer of 2011. What did we do in that act? We capped spending—\$1.5 trillion in spending reductions. That was the right thing to do. Now we've done \$600 billion in revenue. So I think most people can do the math on this. We're not nearly close to the kind of ratios that the bipartisan commission, the bipartisan fiscal commission, Simpson-Bowles, we're not close to the balance that they talked about in terms of revenue and cuts, not even in the ballpark.

So let's focus on the fundamental question, which is, number one, getting the economy moving again, not losing 750,000 jobs this year, and then reducing our deficits in a smart and balanced way over a period of time. But yes, by all means, let's have the President do a calculation, which one of the earlier Republican speakers did on the floor of the House. We can all do that. Of course as indicated, that calculation changes day to day. But by all means, let's get it. But let's not pretend that this piece of legislation does one thing to create one job or reduce the deficit by one penny.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MESSER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Indiana (Mr. YOUNG).

Mr. YOUNG of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of my friend, neighbor, colleague, and fellow Hoosier, Mr. MESSER, and his bill, H.R. 668.

This legislation would require the President's budget proposal to make clear the per-taxpayer cost of any budget deficits. We have repeatedly heard President Obama proclaim his desire to have the most transparent administration in history. In furtherance of that objective then, this should be welcome legislation to all parties.

To many Americans and to many of my colleagues, Federal budgeting might seem like an abstraction, and thus unimportant because dollar

amounts in terms of billions and trillions of dollars are beyond normal human comprehension. Most people just don't think in those terms. In fairness, most of us don't think in those terms, so let's clarify this process by bringing these numbers down to the individual level. Let's tell the American people, for example, under the President's last budget, you owe \$7,000 just to cover the deficit. That resonates. Folks get that. The math is pretty simple. The median income in Indiana is around \$45,000. Income and payroll taxes will eat up about \$9,000 of that.

□ 1320

People will understand what it means when you tell them that, under the President's budget, you need almost 20 percent more per year per Hoosier just to balance the budget.

Now, this is important. Contrary to some of the things we heard earlier, maybe this bill will even help incentivize those who are drafting budgets in the future to put together budgets that actually balance at some point in the distant future so that we don't have to rely on these suboptimal cutting gimmicks, like the President's sequester, to, in some way, get spending under control.

We know revenue will double over the next 10 years. We know we have a spending problem, not a revenue problem in this country, so it's time the Federal Government—and the White House, in particular—comes clean about the direct impact of our Federal deficits on our Nation's families.

So I urge my colleagues to support this measure of good government by voting "yea" for H.R. 668.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Speaker, may I ask how much time remains on each side?

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. STUTZMAN). The gentleman from Maryland has 2 minutes, and the gentleman from Indiana has 3 minutes.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Does the gentleman have any other speakers?

Mr. MESSER. I think we've got one more.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MESSER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Indiana (Mr. STUTZMAN), another very good friend of mine, the third Hoosier speaking on this bill today.

Mr. STUTZMAN. Thank you to my friend from Indiana. This is, I believe, the fifth speaker from Indiana. Maybe we're getting something right in Indiana—I don't know what it is—but thank you for sharing this bill.

We do have a balanced budget in Indiana. We have made sure that we have taken care of the children in education, we've made sure that our law enforcement is taken care of, but we've also made those difficult choices early on that Washington could really learn from in budgeting.

So I appreciate Congressman MESSER for bringing this particular bill. It's a good government bill.

And I know the other side of the aisle is talking about the sequester. I find it ironic that the Washington Times today has a headline that says 400 more jobs are created, in spite of the sequester. So I don't believe that the sky is falling here.

This legislation requires the President to do some simple math and include with his budget, should he choose to submit one, an estimate of the cost of the deficit per taxpayer. Taxpayers just simply deserve to know how much they owe for Washington's out-of-control spending. After all, every dime that the Federal Government borrows is saddled on this generation and the next generation and generations to follow.

Right now, the cost of Washington's \$16 trillion of national debt totals more than \$147,000 per taxpayer. In fact, approximately every minute, Mr. Speaker, the Federal Government borrows another \$4 million per minute, leaving this generation empty promises and massive debt.

This is no way to run a government. If the President refuses to break the cycle of bailouts, borrowing, and tax hikes, taxpayers deserve to know the true cost of the President's irresponsible decisions. The American taxpayers deserve transparency, and that's exactly what this bill does.

Mr. Speaker, I applaud my colleague from Indiana, and I thank him for bringing this bill to the floor. I urge the support of all of my colleagues here in the House of Representatives.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Speaker, it's always good to see a show of Hoosier unity on the floor of the House, and I look forward to joining my colleagues in voting for this bill.

The State of Maryland also has a balanced budget, but we also have a capital budget and other parts that we do differently.

Look, Mr. Speaker, I'm going to support this bill. I support transparency. I supported virtually the identical provision 30 days ago. That's really not the issue. Yes, we want more information, and we'll get it.

But the real issue here is the loss of jobs. Now, the previous gentleman mentioned that the Washington Times has an article saying more jobs were created. Thank goodness we are finally seeing more and more jobs created.

We will have economic growth. There will be jobs created. The question is how many fewer jobs we will have as a result of the sequester. The CBO hasn't said it will stop every job from being created.

What the Chairman of the Federal Reserve has said, and what the non-partisan Congressional Budget Office has said, is that this sequester, if it remains in place through the end of the year, will be a drag on growth, so we will have fewer jobs created. In fact, they estimate we will have 750,000 fewer American jobs by the end of the year if we don't do something about the sequester.

So, Mr. Speaker, I'd just go back to the original question: Why take up something we've already done, already passed virtually unanimously, when we have a much more pressing issue and when we, today, will ask for the fourth time this year, when it counts, to vote on a bill that would replace the sequester in a smart and balanced way without the loss of jobs? That's the fundamental question. And why this House is shirking that responsibility and refusing to hold a vote on a proposal that would prevent the loss of 750,000 jobs is a question I think the American people are asking themselves.

So, Mr. Speaker, let's get on to the pressing business. Let's focus on jobs and really reducing the deficit and not playing these kind of games on the floor of the House.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. MESSER. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the gentleman's help and comments on this bill. It's a good government bill. It's transparency. It makes sure that taxpayers know how much the Federal Government is racking up on their dime, and I'm hopeful that it will pass.

The gentleman makes a very important point, that this bill is not the cure-all of the world, and we have lots of work to do. Far too many families in this economy have had to come home and deal with a job loss.

I remind everybody in this Chamber that the \$85 billion that we're talking about in this sequester, while a lot of money, is 2 percent of our total Federal Government \$3.6 trillion budget. It's two pennies on every dollar.

We agree that this sequester should be replaced; we disagree on how. Surely we can find two pennies to save instead of raising taxes and taking more money out of the pocket of the American taxpayer.

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

Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise to question H.R. 668, a bill to amend section 1105(a) of title 31, United States Code, to require that annual budget submissions of the President to Congress provide an estimate of the cost per taxpayer of the deficit. What does this bill accomplish—very little.

More specifically, H.R. 668 requires the President to submit the pro rata cost for taxpayers for any deficit projected in the President's budget for a given fiscal year.

While I support genuine bipartisan efforts to resolve our fiscal and budgetary issues, it is difficult to see how this bill proposes a productive use of the House's time and taxpayer dollars.

H.R. 668 appears to be a politically motivated bill aimed at placing blame on the President for our deficit issues rather than proposing a sound, bipartisan solution that would provide a balanced approach to turning our annual budget deficits into surpluses.

This Congress cannot absolve itself of the duty to reach a bipartisan deal to mitigate the devastating effects of the sequester now imposed on the federal government.

We must remember that this sequester was intended to be harmful to our nation's

progress in the eyes of both parties, in order to incentivize this Congress to make the difficult choices necessary to forge a sustainable economic future.

The cuts are arbitrary and are no substitute for sound policy: \$42.7 billion in defense cuts (a 7.9 percent cut); \$28.7 billion in domestic discretionary cuts (a 5.3 percent cut); \$9.9 billion in Medicare cuts (a 2 percent cut); and \$4 billion in other mandatory cuts (a 5.8 percent cut to nondefense programs, and a 7.8 percent cut to mandatory defense programs).

Each day that passes under the sequester, it imperils our security, our economic recovery, and our families across this nation.

From military readiness, to disaster and terrorism preparedness, to law enforcement and emergency responders, to education, to small business, to veterans care, to travel, to food safety, to vital research and innovation; there is virtually no facet of our way of life that will avoid being negatively impacted by the sequester.

Aircraft purchases by the Air Force and Navy are cut by \$3.5 billion.

Military operations across the services are cut by about \$13.5 billion.

Military research is cut by \$6.3 billion.

The National Institutes of Health get cut by \$1.6 billion.

The Centers for Disease Control and Prevention are cut by about \$323 million.

Border security is cut by about \$581 million.

Immigration enforcement is cut by about \$323 million.

Airport security is cut by about \$323 million.

Head Start gets cut by \$406 million, kicking 70,000 kids out of the program.

FEMA's disaster relief budget is cut by \$375 million.

Public housing support is cut by about \$1.94 billion.

The FDA is cut by \$206 million.

NASA gets cut by \$970 million.

Special education is cut by \$840 million.

The Energy Department's program for securing our nuclear materials is cut by \$650 million.

The National Science Foundation gets cut by about \$388 million.

The FBI gets cut by \$480 million.

The federal prison system gets cut by \$355 million.

State Department diplomatic functions are cut by \$650 million.

Global health programs are cut by \$433 million; the Millennium Challenge Corp. sees a \$46 million cut, and USAID a cut of about \$291 million.

The Nuclear Regulatory Commission is cut by \$55 million.

The SEC is cut by \$75.6 million.

The United States Holocaust Memorial Museum is cut by \$2.6 million.

The Library of Congress is cut by \$31 million.

The Patent and Trademark office is cut by \$156 million.

This is neither the way to govern, nor is it a permissible path forward. We cannot continue along this path of perpetual, self-imposed destruction—moving from manufactured crisis to manufactured crisis without providing the American people with certainty and clarity as to the future.

In just three short weeks, the federal government faces another manufactured crisis; a shutdown that threatens to compound the effects of the sequester and further damage our

economy, making it harder for families to endure.

We must focus our efforts on working together to enact a continuing resolution in order to avoid a government shutdown, and to enact a plan that provides a healthy balance of revenues and spending cuts that will move us forward without devastating the middle class.

Bills that do not serve any ostensible practical purpose and are simply meant to advance an ideological position should not occupy the House's time, and the American people expect more of their elected representatives.

We must remember that the faces of those who are negatively impacted by the sequester are not of millionaires or billionaires; they are of average Americans who, through no fault of their own, have struggled through a tough economy and fiscal adversity.

As we work together to get our Nation's fiscal house in order, we should strive to carefully consider the impact of decisions—or in this case, the lack of decisions—on the millions of middle and low-income Americans who are counting on us to come to an agreement.

I look forward to working with my colleagues in Congress on both sides of the aisle on a long-term debt and deficit solution, and am confident that we can reach an agreement that will work for the benefit of all Americans.

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of this legislation and I thank the gentleman from Indiana for his continued leadership on this issue.

Last month, this administration stated that it was the most transparent in history. According to recent polls, only 26 percent of Americans agree.

H.R. 668 requires this administration, and future administrations, to include a cost-per-taxpayer calculation of the Federal deficit in their annual budget submission.

Transparency is not a political issue. Regardless of which side of the aisle we sit on, our constituents deserve to know how they are impacted by the decisions we make here in Washington.

This legislation removes the excuses from those who wish to pretend that our country is not facing a fiscal crisis. It replaces rhetoric with fact.

Hard-working men and women in my district, and across America, should know what our out-of-control spending here in Washington is costing them.

The administration recently released their budget for Fiscal Year 2013. It forecasts a \$901 billion deficit this year alone.

My friends in the other body, on the other side of the aisle recently proposed a sequester replacement bill that would add \$41.5 billion to the deficit in 2013. Over 10 years, the bill would add another \$7.2 billion to the deficit.

Taxpayers deserve to know what such proposals would cost them individually. This is a commonsense bill that already passed the House in the form of an amendment. This isn't a political issue, it is reasonable and rational legislation that lets the American people know we can be serious about their financial future, and the financial future of the country.

I urge my colleagues to support this legislation.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by

the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. MESSER) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 668.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds being in the affirmative, the yeas have it.

Mr. MESSER. 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 motion will be postponed.

STOP TOBACCO SMUGGLING IN THE TERRITORIES ACT OF 2013

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 338) to amend title 18, United States Code, to include certain territories and possessions of the United States in the definition of State for the purposes of chapter 114, relating to trafficking in contraband cigarettes and smokeless tobacco.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 338

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Stop Tobacco Smuggling in the Territories Act of 2013".

SEC. 2. TERRITORIES AND POSSESSIONS OF THE UNITED STATES INCLUDED IN THE DEFINITION OF STATE FOR THE PURPOSES OF THE PROHIBITION AGAINST TRAFFICKING IN CONTRABAND CIGARETTES AND SMOKELESS TOBACCO.

Paragraph (4) of section 2341 of title 18, United States Code, is amended by striking "or the Virgin Islands" and inserting "the Virgin Islands, American Samoa, the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands, or Guam".

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MESSER). Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. GOODLATTE) and the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. SCOTT) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. GOODLATTE).

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous materials on H.R. 338, currently under consideration.

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

There was no objection.

□ 1330

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

Cigarette trafficking is a very lucrative crime both here in the United States and abroad. It is estimated that illicit cigarettes account for over 10 percent of the more than 5.7 trillion cigarettes sold globally each year. Here

in the United States alone, approximately 4 billion of the cigarettes sold each year are illicit.

Cigarette smuggling is generally carried out by large criminal organizations that take advantage of the significant disparity between the taxes levied on cigarettes across the States. These differences create a highly lucrative market for individuals to evade State and local sales taxes by purchasing cigarettes in one locality and transporting them to another for resale below market value. It is estimated that criminals can make a profit of as much as \$1 million on just a single truckload of illicit cigarettes.

Cigarette smuggling is not just profitable for criminal networks; this crime also harms State and Federal revenues. According to the Justice Department, this illicit activity costs the States and the Federal Government an estimated \$5 billion each year. This is money that could and should be put to better use.

In 2009, Congress took steps to curb contraband cigarettes with the Prevent All Cigarette Trafficking, or PACT, Act. The PACT Act prohibits the sale of cigarettes and other tobacco products over the Internet and made changes to the criminal anticigarette smuggling statutes.

H.R. 338, the Stop Tobacco Smuggling in the Territories Act of 2013, provides a technical correction to ensure that the criminal prohibitions against cigarette smuggling apply to the U.S. territories of American Samoa, Guam, and the Northern Mariana Islands just as they do in the rest of the country. Without this fix, cigarettes sold in these territories without evidence that taxes were paid do not fall within the definition of "contraband cigarettes." This is a modest but important change that will help to discourage crime and increase tax revenues in these United States territories.

I want to thank Mr. FALBOMAVEGA for his work on this issue, as well as the ranking member on the full committee and the subcommittee for their support of this effort, and the chairman of the Crime Subcommittee, Mr. SENSENBRENNER, as well, and I urge my colleagues to join me in support of this bill.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 338, the Stop Tobacco Smuggling in the Territories Act of 2013. This bill is simple and straightforward. It amends the Contraband Cigarette Trafficking Act by including American Samoa, the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands, and Guam in this act.

Currently, the Contraband Cigarette Trafficking Act makes it illegal to knowingly ship, transport, receive, possess, sell, distribute, or purchase 10,000 or more contraband cigarettes that do not have a State or territorial tax stamp. The act similarly applies to the sale of contraband smokeless tobacco

in excess of certain specified quantities. With respect to both activities, the act authorizes the imposition of criminal penalties and fines.

As drafted, however, the bill does not apply to American Samoa, the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands, and Guam. Thus, the Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco, Firearms, and Explosives is prohibited from investigating Contraband Cigarette Trafficking Act violations in those territories. H.R. 338 will cure this obvious oversight.

Mr. Speaker, cigarettes are believed to be the most illegally trafficked product in the world. In 2006 alone, more than 10 percent of worldwide sales, or 600 billion cigarettes, were counterfeited.

Contraband cigarettes actually present numerous issues. Legally manufactured cigarettes are diverted from legal trade channels in the underworld for resale, evading the imposition of appropriate taxes, costing territorial governments a significant amount of cigarette excess tax revenue each year. They also facilitate unfair competition that hurts the bottom line of legitimate businesses.

Counterfeit cigarettes are also not subjected to any manufacturing safeguards, therefore presenting the potential for products containing toxic ingredients that can seriously jeopardize the health and safety of the smoker.

The lower price also facilitates easier affordability for our youth, resulting in addiction at earlier ages. The illicit trade therefore adds steadily to the health care costs of worker productivity losses and the growing death from tobacco use. Currently, the use of tobacco claims 5.4 million lives a year. This number is projected to rise to 8 million by 2013.

For these reasons, I strongly support H.R. 338 and thank our colleague from American Samoa, Delegate FALEOMAVAEGA, for his leadership in spearheading this issue.

Accordingly, Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support the legislation, and I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the delegate from American Samoa (Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA).

Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA. I thank the gentleman for yielding, Mr. Speaker, and I especially want to thank my good friend, the chairman of the House Judiciary committee, Mr. GOODLATTE, and Mr. JOHN CONYERS, the senior ranking member, for their support of this proposed bill. I would especially also like to thank JIM SENSENBRENNER, the chairman of the subcommittee, and the gentleman from Virginia, my good friend, for their support in the subcommittee. I also want to acknowledge Speaker JOHN BOEHNER, Majority Leader CANTOR, and our Democratic leader, NANCY PELOSI, for their support.

Mr. Speaker, my district faces a serious problem with tobacco smuggling.

According to a recent study, in 2010 alone, as many as 5.8 million cigarettes were smuggled into the territory. The study found that tobacco smuggling resulted in the loss of about \$725,000 in revenues to the territory. If continued undeterred, tobacco smuggling in the territory will lead to heavier losses in local tax revenues, especially if the cigarette excise tax rate were to be increased. Mr. Speaker, securing and sustaining stable sources of local revenue stream is essential and must be encouraged for the territories, as it has already done for the States.

It was for this reason I began to look into this important issue. I was disappointed, however, to find that under the current law prohibiting cigarette smuggling, not all the territories were included. Under the Contraband Cigarette Trafficking Act that Congress passed in 1978, it is illegal to ship, sell, transport, or possess more than 10,000 cigarettes per month not bearing the tax stamp of the jurisdiction in which they are found. Violation is a felony punishable by up to 5 years in prison and seizure of the contraband cigarettes and/or both.

The Contraband Cigarette Trafficking Act currently, however, does not apply to American Samoa, the territory of Guam, and the Northern Mariana Islands. Historically, when Congress considered the bill in 1978, the Senate version defined "State" to include the 50 States, the District of Columbia, Puerto Rico, or a territory or possession of the United States; however, the House provision excluded the smaller territories. For some reason unbeknownst to me, the conference substitute adopted the House provision. The conference report describes the House provision as "more accurately delineating the practical scope of the legislation."

Mr. Speaker, the bill before us today will correct this oversight under the current law. This important piece of legislation will amend the Contraband Cigarette Trafficking Act to include these territories.

I urge my colleagues to support this bill.

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

Mr. GOODLATTE. I will close simply by saying cigarette smuggling is a serious problem and revenues lost to the territories that Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA and others represent are lost revenues that they can use to meet legitimate obligations, and we want to help them combat that. So I strongly support the legislation and urge my colleagues to do the same, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to support H.R. 338, the "Stop Tobacco Smuggling in the Territories Act of 2013," which adds previously uncovered American territories to the Contraband Cigarette Trafficking Act.

Specifically, H.R. 338 provides that American Samoa, the Commonwealth of the Northern Marianas and Guam will be covered by

the current Contraband Cigarette Trafficking Act, which makes it illegal to knowingly ship, transport, receive, possess, sell, distribute, or purchase 10,000 or more contraband cigarettes that do not have a state or territorial tax stamp.

Currently, only the 50 states, Washington, DC, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands are covered by the Contraband Cigarette Trafficking Act.

We all understand the dangers associated with cigarette smoking and its prevalence in the United States. This bill seeks to treat the aforementioned territories like any other state when it comes to trafficking.

Roughly 23 percent of American adults and 30 percent of adolescents are current smokers. Every day, 3,500 minors try smoking for the first time, one thousand of whom go on to become regular, daily smokers. Moreover, more than 15.5 million children are exposed to secondhand smoke at home.

Smoking kills more people than alcohol, AIDS, car accidents, illegal drugs, murders, and suicides combined, with thousands more dying from spit tobacco use.

About one of every five American deaths is related to smoking, or about 400,000 Americans each year. Tragically, about 50,000 adult nonsmokers in the nation die each year from exposure to secondhand smoke.

More deaths are caused each year by tobacco use than by all deaths from HIV, illegal drug use, alcohol use, car accidents, suicides, and murders combined.

More than 8.6 million Americans currently suffer from smoking-caused illness, and over six million Americans under the age of 18 who are alive today are estimated to ultimately die from smoking. In addition, smokers lose an average of 13 to 14 years of life because of their smoking.

We must do more to dissuade people from smoking.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. GOODLATTE) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 338.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds being in the affirmative, the ayes have it.

Mr. GOODLATTE. 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 motion 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 39 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1400

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. ROONEY) at 2 p.m.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER
PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, proceedings will resume on motions to suspend the rules previously postponed.

Votes will be taken in the following order:

- H.R. 668, by the yeas and nays;
- H.R. 338, by the yeas and nays;

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

REQUIREMENT IN BUDGET SUBMISSION WITH RESPECT TO THE COST PER TAXPAYER OF THE DEFICIT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 668) to amend section 1105(a) of title 31, United States Code, to require that annual budget submissions of the President to Congress provide an estimate of the cost per taxpayer of the deficit, and for other purposes, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. MESSER) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 28, answered “present” 1, not voting 10, as follows:

[Roll No. 57]
YEAS—392

Aderholt	Campbell	DeLauro
Alexander	Cantor	DelBene
Amash	Capito	Denham
Amodei	Capps	Dent
Andrews	Cárdenas	DeSantis
Bachmann	Carney	DesJarlais
Bachus	Carson (IN)	Deutch
Barber	Carter	Diaz-Balart
Barletta	Cassidy	Dingell
Barr	Castor (FL)	Doggett
Barrow (GA)	Castro (TX)	Doyle
Barton	Chabot	Duckworth
Bass	Chaffetz	Duffy
Beatty	Chu	Duncan (SC)
Becerra	Cicilline	Duncan (TN)
Benishkek	Clarke	Edwards
Bentivolio	Clay	Ellmers
Bera (CA)	Cleaver	Engel
Bilirakis	Clyburn	Enyart
Bishop (GA)	Coffman	Eshoo
Bishop (NY)	Cole	Esty
Bishop (UT)	Collins (GA)	Farenthold
Black	Collins (NY)	Fattah
Blackburn	Conaway	Fincher
Blumenauer	Connolly	Fitzpatrick
Bonamici	Conyers	Fleischmann
Bonner	Cook	Fleming
Boustany	Cooper	Flores
Brady (PA)	Costa	Forbes
Brady (TX)	Cotton	Fortenberry
Braley (IA)	Courtney	Foster
Bridenstine	Cramer	Foxx
Brooks (AL)	Crawford	Frankel (FL)
Brooks (IN)	Crenshaw	Franks (AZ)
Broun (GA)	Crowley	Frelinghuysen
Brown (FL)	Cuellar	Gabbard
Brownley (CA)	Culberson	Gallego
Buchanan	Cummings	Garamendi
Bucshon	Daines	Garcia
Burgess	Davis, Danny	Garner
Bustos	Davis, Rodney	Garrett
Butterfield	DeFazio	Gerlach
Calvert	DeGette	Gibbs
Camp	Delaney	Gibson

Gingrey (GA)	Lummis	Ros-Lehtinen
Gohmert	Maffei	Roskam
Goodlatte	Maloney, Sean	Ross
Gosar	Marchant	Rothfus
Gowdy	Marino	Roybal-Allard
Granger	Markey	Royce
Graves (GA)	Massie	Ruiz
Graves (MO)	Matheson	Runyan
Grayson	Matsui	Ruppersberger
Green, Al	McCarthy (CA)	Ryan (OH)
Green, Gene	McCarthy (NY)	Ryan (WI)
Griffin (AR)	McCaul	Salmon
Griffith (VA)	McClintock	Sánchez, Linda
Grimm	McCollum	T.
Guthrie	McHenry	Sarbanes
Hahn	McKeon	Scalise
Hall	McKinley	Schiff
Hanabusa	McMorris	Schneider
Hanna	Rodgers	Schock
Harper	McNerney	Schrader
Harris	Meadows	Schwartz
Hartzler	Meehan	Schweikert
Hastings (FL)	Meng	Scott (VA)
Hastings (WA)	Messer	Scott, Austin
Heck (NV)	Mica	Scott, David
Heck (WA)	Michaud	Sensenbrenner
Hensarling	Miller (FL)	Sessions
Herrera Beutler	Miller (MI)	Sewell (AL)
Higgins	Miller, Gary	Shea-Porter
Himes	Miller, George	Sherman
Holding	Moore	Shimkus
Holt	Moran	Shuster
Honda	Mullin	Simpson
Horsford	Mulvaney	Sinema
Hoyer	Murphy (FL)	Slaughter
Hudson	Murphy (PA)	Smith (NE)
Huelskamp	Napolitano	Smith (NJ)
Huffman	Neal	Smith (TX)
Huizenga (MI)	Neugebauer	Smith (WA)
Hultgren	Noem	Southerland
Hunter	Nolan	Speier
Hurt	Nugent	Stewart
Israel	Nunes	Stivers
Issa	Nunnelee	Stockman
Jeffries	O'Rourke	Stutzman
Jenkins	Olson	Terry
Johnson (OH)	Owens	Thompson (CA)
Johnson, Sam	Palazzo	Thompson (PA)
Jones	Pallone	Thornberry
Jordan	Pascrell	Tiberi
Joyce	Pastor (AZ)	Tierney
Kaptur	Paulsen	Tipton
Keating	Payne	Titus
Kelly	Pearce	Tonko
Kennedy	Pelosi	Tsongas
Kildee	Perlmutter	Turner
Kilmer	Perry	Upton
Kind	Peters (CA)	Valadao
King (IA)	Peters (MI)	Van Hollen
King (NY)	Peterson	Veasey
Kingston	Petri	Vela
Kinzinger (IL)	Pingree (ME)	Visclosky
Kirkpatrick	Pittenger	Wagner
Kline	Pitts	Walberg
Kuster	Poe (TX)	Walden
Labrador	Polis	Walorski
LaMalfa	Pompeo	Walz
Lamborn	Posey	Wasserman
Lance	Price (GA)	Schultz
Langevin	Price (NC)	Waxman
Lankford	Quigley	Weber (TX)
Larson (CT)	Radel	Webster (FL)
Latham	Rahall	Welch
Latta	Rangel	Wenstrup
Levin	Reed	Westmoreland
Lewis	Reichert	Whitfield
Lipinski	Renacci	Williams
LoBiondo	Ribble	Wilson (SC)
Loeb sack	Rice (SC)	Wittman
Lofgren	Richmond	Wolf
Long	Rigell	Womack
Lowenthal	Roby	Woodall
Lowe y	Roe (TN)	Yarmuth
Lucas	Rogers (AL)	Yoder
Luetkemeyer	Rogers (KY)	Yoho
Lujan Grisham	Rogers (MI)	Young (FL)
(NM)	Rohrabacher	Young (IN)
Lujan, Ben Ray	Rokita	
(NM)	Rooney	

NAYS—28

Johnson, E. B.	Pocan
Larsen (WA)	Sanchez, Loretta
Lee (CA)	Schakowsky
McDermott	Serrano
McGovern	Swalwell (CA)
Meeks	Takano
Nadler	
Negrete McLeod	

Thompson (MS)	Velázquez	Watt
Vargas	Waters	Wilson (FL)

ANSWERED “PRESENT”—1
Johnson (GA)
NOT VOTING—10
Coble
Davis (CA)
Grijalva
Hinojosa

ANSWERED “PRESENT”—1
Johnson (GA)
NOT VOTING—10
Lynch
Maloney,
Carolyn
McIntyre
□ 1428

Messrs. GUTIERREZ and COHEN changed their vote from “yea” to “nay.”

So (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated for:

Mrs. DAVIS of California. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 57, had I been present, I would have voted “yea.”

Mr. HINOJOSA. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 57, had I been present, I would have voted “yea.”

STOP TOBACCO SMUGGLING IN THE TERRITORIES ACT OF 2013

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. WOMACK). The unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 338) to amend title 18, United States Code, to include certain territories and possessions of the United States in the definition of State for the purposes of chapter 114, relating to trafficking in contraband cigarettes and smokeless tobacco, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. GOODLATTE) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill.

This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 421, nays 5, not voting 5, as follows:

[Roll No. 58]
YEAS—421

Aderholt	Brady (PA)	Castor (FL)
Alexander	Brady (TX)	Castro (TX)
Amodei	Braley (IA)	Chabot
Andrews	Bridenstine	Chaffetz
Bachmann	Brooks (AL)	Chu
Bachus	Brooks (IN)	Cicilline
Barber	Broun (GA)	Clarke
Barletta	Brown (FL)	Clay
Barr	Brownley (CA)	Cleaver
Barrow (GA)	Buchanan	Clyburn
Barton	Bucshon	Coffman
Bass	Burgess	Cohen
Beatty	Bustos	Cole
Becerra	Butterfield	Collins (GA)
Benishkek	Calvert	Collins (NY)
Bentivolio	Camp	Conaway
Bera (CA)	Campbell	Connolly
Bilirakis	Cantor	Conyers
Bishop (GA)	Capito	Cook
Bishop (NY)	Capps	Cooper
Bishop (UT)	Capuano	Costa
Black	Cárdenas	Cotton
Blackburn	Carney	Courtney
Blumenauer	Carson (IN)	Cramer
Bonamici	Carter	Crawford
Bonner	Cartwright	Crenshaw
Boustany	Cassidy	Crowley

Cuellar
Culberson
Cummings
Daines
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
Davis, Rodney
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Deutch
Diaz-Balart
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle
Duckworth
Duffy
Duncan (TN)
Edwards
Ellison
Ellmers
Engel
Enyart
Eshoo
Esty
Farenthold
Farr
Pattah
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foster
Foxo
Frankel (FL)
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Garcia
Gardner
Garrett
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gibson
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Grijalva
Grimm
Guthrie
Gutierrez
Hahn
Hall
Hanabusa
Hanna
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Heck (NV)
Heck (WA)
Hensarling
Herrera Beutler
Higgins
Himes
Hinojosa
Holding
Holt
Honda
Horsford
Hoyer
Hudson
Huelskamp
Huffman
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren

Hunter
Hurt
Israel
Issa
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Jenkins
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Jordan
Joyce
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kinzinger (IL)
Kirkpatrick
Kline
Kuster
Labrador
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Langevin
Lankford
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latham
Latta
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loebsock
Lofgren
Long
Lowenthal
Lowe
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Lujan, Ben Ray (NM)
Lummis
Maffei
Maloney
Maloney, Carolyn
Maloney, Sean
Marchant
Marino
Markey
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (CA)
McCarthy (NY)
McCaul
McClintock
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McHenry
McKeon
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
Pastorel
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
Rahall
Rangel
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Rice (SC)
Richmond
Rigell
Lipinski
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)
Salmon
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Scalise
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Schock
Schradler
Schwartz
Schweikert
Scott (VA)
Scott, Austin
Scott, David
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sessions
Sewell (AL)
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Sinema
Slaughter
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Southerland
Speier
Stewart
Stivers
Stockman
Stutzman
Swalwell (CA)

Takano
Terry
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tierney
Tipton
Titus
Tonko
Tsongas
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Van Hollen
Vargas

Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walorski
Walz
Wasserman
Schultz
Waters
Watt
Waxman
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Welch

Wenstrup
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (FL)
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Woodall
Yarmuth
Yoder
Yoho
Young (FL)
Young (IN)

wage over 3 years to \$10.10 per hour and then index the wage to inflation. It is long past time to get this done.

The minimum wage in America used to be equal to about half of average wages. Today, at \$7.25 an hour, it is barely a third. The purchasing power of the minimum wage has been dropping steadily since 1968. If the minimum wage kept up with inflation over the last 40 years, it would be at \$10.55 an hour.

This failure to keep pace particularly hurts women, who make up nearly two out of three workers making the minimum wage. At that rate, a year of full-time work comes out to \$14,500 a year. For a mom with two kids, it's over \$3,000 below the poverty line. For tipped workers, the situation is even worse. They make only \$2.13 an hour.

Low minimum wage is not just bad for workers. It's bad for business and the economy. Low wages limit consumer demand, which stalls our country's economic growth. It hurts everyone. Raising the minimum wage would not just mean a raise for 21 million workers, it would create 140,000 new jobs and boost our GDP by \$33 billion.

We've waited long enough. It's time to make sure all our workers make a decent pay for a hard day's work. I urge my colleagues to pass this legislation.

NAYS—5

Amash
Duncan (SC)

NOT VOTING—5

Coble
Lynch

Massie
Radel
McIntyre
Sires
Young (AK)

□ 1436

So (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

□ 1440

MORE MONEY FOR PAKISTAN, LESS FOR SCHOOLS

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

Mr. POE of Texas. Madam Speaker, the President's sequester has gone into effect and, according to the White House, the sky is falling. The administration is on a tour de fear with the American people, yet it has the power to prioritize spending.

Who made the priority list? Pakistan. That's right, Madam Speaker. In the midst of doom and gloom of sequestration, the administration is quietly shelling out an additional \$37 million to Pakistan. That's over half of the \$67 million being cut from public education in Texas.

Pakistan is the Benedict Arnold nation in the list of countries we call allies. Pakistani leaders are continuing to vilify the United States on one hand and, with the sleight of hand, take our money—money I believe ends up in the hands of radical extremists. Pakistan plays the game of dangerous, dishonest deceit by pretending to be our ally in the war on terror while simultaneously giving a wink and a nod to extremism.

Mr. President, fund our schools, not a disloyal ally.

And that's just the way it is.

MINIMUM WAGE

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

Ms. DELAURO. I rise in strong support of the Fair Minimum Wage Act, introduced by Congressman GEORGE MILLER, which will raise the minimum

MINNETONKA GIRLS HOCKEY WINS STATE TITLE

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

Mr. PAULSEN. Madam Speaker, I want to congratulate the Minnetonka High School girls hockey team who recently won the Minnesota State High School Hockey Tournament, the first girls hockey team to win three consecutive State championships.

The path to achieving greatness is never uncontested, as the girls found out. The night before the championship, Madam Speaker, the Minnetonka girls played Lakeville North in a 4-hour, 17-minute marathon semifinal game that finally ended in a Minnetonka win after a goal from Amy Peterson in the sixth overtime period.

The hard work of this impressive team exemplifies what it means to be great student athletes who excel both on the ice and in the classroom. All the players and their coaches deserve great praise for their determination this season. It's an honor to represent, and recognize, such all-star athletes.

Congratulations, and go Skippers.

RETHINK THE SEQUESTER

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

Mr. BUTTERFIELD. Madam Speaker, we are merely 5 days into the sequester, this totally engineered crisis that did not need to happen. We're already beginning to feel the impacts of sequestration.

□ 1450

HOUSE GOP DOCTORS CAUCUS

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

Mr. GINGREY of Georgia. Madam Speaker, I thank the majority leader for yielding this time to discuss an extremely important issue facing the patients in this great country of ours that are going to have a very difficult time in finding a physician.

Madam Speaker, in March of 2010, when the so-called Affordable Care Act, or PPACA, was passed into law, the purpose, of course, was to increase access to physicians for all patients across this country and also to bring down the cost of health care. Well, we're 2 years into this bill—which will become fully effective in January 2014—and what are we seeing?

Madam Speaker, the CBO reported just recently that some 7 million people have actually lost their health insurance, the health insurance provided by their employer. For those who do still have health insurance—particularly those who get it maybe not from their employer but from the individual market, a small group policy—the cost has actually increased some \$2,500 a year instead of coming down, as anticipated and predicted and promised, in fact, by President Obama, but that just absolutely is not happening.

So what we're going to be talking about, Madam Speaker, is, again, what needs to be done to correct this situation. Because the thing that was never really discussed to my satisfaction when this bill was crafted was, how are you going to get the best and the brightest young men and women in this country to continue to go into the field of medicine, to become the doctors—particularly in primary care, internal medicine, and the pediatricians—to provide that care when the reimbursement system under Medicare, called the sustainable growth rate, year after year after year for the last 6 or 8 years we have actually cut the income to the providers, to the point, Madam Speaker, where they can't provide this care, they can't even break even? So this is what we're going to be talking about, this flawed sustainable growth system. It has certainly contributed to the physician shortage crisis that we see today.

Now, I have a number of slides that I want to present to my colleagues, and we'll go with some specifics on that. But I'm very pleased to be joined today in this House with the cochair of the House GOP Doctors Caucus, my good friend and fellow physician Member from Tennessee, Dr. PHIL ROE, and I yield to Dr. ROE at this point.

Mr. ROE of Tennessee. Dr. GINGREY, thank you, and it's good to see you moving your arm well and recovering from your surgery so well.

My home State of North Carolina hosts the third largest military population in the country. Coast Guard Station Elizabeth City, Seymour Johnson Air Force Base, and Cherry Point Marine Corps Air Station are integral parts of their local communities and also help to form the backbone of our national defense.

The sequester has already impacted the Coast Guard, with air operations being cut by 11 percent and maritime operations cut by 24 percent. These cuts have reduced maritime safety and security in the waters off of our coastline.

Furlough notices have already gone out to thousands of civilian employees at Fleet Readiness Center, where maintenance is conducted on Navy and Marine Corps aircraft. The furlough amounts to a loss of \$81 million.

The 848 employees at Butner Federal Correctional Center, located in my district, received furlough notices and will lose up to 10 percent of their salaries because of sequestration.

The impacts of the sequester are already being felt in Martin County, where the public school system has lost \$400,000. This means that teachers are stretched even thinner and are forced to do more with significantly less.

Madam Speaker, we need to rethink the sequester.

TIME TO GET SERIOUS ABOUT CLIMATE CHANGE

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

Mr. HUFFMAN. Madam Speaker, last week, in a Friday afternoon announcement designed to bury the news, the State Department released a very troubling supplemental environmental document regarding the Keystone XL pipeline, a project that would undo the progress our country has been making in recent years in showing leadership on climate change, in reducing gas emissions and transitioning to a clean energy economy.

Unfortunately, environmental protection seems to be a "foreign" policy to our State Department. But even this pro-industry report cannot gloss over the fact that Keystone XL would unlock development of some of the dirtiest, most climate-damaging fuel on Earth, and it would lock the United States into deeper dependence on expensive tar sands fuel that would take this country in the wrong direction for our environment and our economy.

Just this morning in the Subcommittee on Energy and Mineral Resources, we heard about the enormous potential for wind energy to generate jobs and also cost-effectively improve energy independence. Other forms of clean energy hold the same promise.

Madam Speaker, it's time to get serious about climate change and clean energy job creation. Importing dirty, expensive tar sands fuel is the wrong way to do that.

I think the question that comes up, and Dr. GINGREY and other Members and I have discussed this, when I got here—and I've been here 4 years, and Dr. GINGREY came a couple terms before I did—we did this for a reason because we wanted to impact the health care system in our country. The problem with the health care system in our country was that costs were exploding.

If you look, as he pointed out, the Affordable Care Act has been anything but affordable. It's suggested that by 2016 the average family of four, when you have to buy an essential benefits package—which the government will determine what that is—will cost a family of four \$20,000. That's unbelievable when you think that the per capita income in my district is \$33,000. So I think we're at a point or we're going to be at a point where no one can afford it.

Well, what Dr. GINGREY is mentioning in the SGR, sustainable growth rate, what is that? What does that mean, and why should I care if I'm a senior? And Dr. GINGREY and I both have Medicare as our primary source of insurance. Well, Medicare started back in 1965, a great program for seniors who did not have access to care. It met a great need there and has met a great need since then. It started as a \$3 billion program. The estimates were from the government estimators that in 25 years this program would be a \$12 billion program—we don't do millions here, billions—and the real number in 1990, Madam Speaker, was \$110 billion instead of \$12 billion. They missed it almost 10 times.

So there have been various schemes throughout this time in which to control the cost, always by reducing the payments to providers. And who are providers? Well, those are the folks who take care of us when we go to the doctor's office—nurse practitioners, it may be a chiropractor, it could be a podiatrist, and it can be your hospital. So when you say providers, those are the folks and institutions that care for us when we're ill.

So in 1997, the Ways and Means Committee brought together something called the Budget Control Act. This is a very complex formula based on how you're going to pay doctors—their zip code, where they live, the cost of an office, the humidity in the air—I know it's an incredibly complicated scheme to pay doctors. The idea is this: We have this much money to spend in Medicare, and so we've put a formula together to only spend this much money. If we spend less than that money, that will go as a savings. If we spend more than that much money, then we will cut the doctors and the providers that amount of money to make that line balance.

Mr. GINGREY of Georgia. Dr. ROE, if you would yield just for a second, I wanted to point out to my colleagues and to Dr. ROE the poster that we have before us. Because this is exactly what the good doctor is talking about right

now in regard to what's been going on since the year 2000. Dr. ROE, you may want to refer to this slide.

I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. ROE of Tennessee. Well, the particular slide that Dr. GINGREY has down there is very telling. Basically what it says is that each year that we've recalculated what our physicians will be paid, we haven't met those metrics, which means that we have to cut.

Well, what has Congress done? Well, Congress has realized that what we're talking about is not payments to doctors; what we're talking about is access to care for patients. What happens is if you go back to 2003—I think it was 2003—when there was a 5 percent cut in Medicare payments, we realized at that point right there that if you continue to do that, that access would be lost.

So let's fast forward to 2013, what we're just facing. Doctors were facing a 26.5 percent cut, the providers were.

Mr. GINGREY of Georgia. Dr. ROE, that would be right here.

Mr. ROE of Tennessee. That's correct, that number right there. That was avoided by a 1-year so-called "do fix."

What has happened over the last 15 or so, 16 now, years is that the Ways and Means Committee line—now law—says we have to spend this much money, but we've actually spent this much. That is a deficit in spending that we've got to make up somewhere in our budget or add it to the budget deficit.

Now, I go back to when I was in practice just 5 years ago now in Johnson City, Tennessee. Dr. GINGREY, I don't know about you, but I was having a harder and harder time finding primary care access for my patients that I had operated on, or maybe someone who had been my patient for 30 years—if she was 40 years old when I started taking care of her, in 30 years she's 70 years old and needed a primary care doctor. That was getting harder and harder and harder to do.

Now, when you look at today's young medical students, we're having a much harder time convincing these young people to go into primary care. What is primary care? Well, it's pediatrics. If you want someone to take care of your baby, it's family medicine. It's also internal medicine and also OB/GYN. I certainly served as a primary care doctor, as Dr. GINGREY did for his patients, for many, many years. That would be the only doctor that they would see. But that's getting harder for our patients to do. And Dr. GINGREY, that's my primary concern—access for seniors to their doctors.

Mr. GINGREY of Georgia. Dr. ROE, if you will yield for just a second and then I will return to you, again, I wanted to point out to our colleagues that this poster, this slide that's on the easel before us is exactly what the gentleman from Tennessee is talking about in regard to shortage of primary care physicians. And as he pointed out, primary care is a family practitioner,

is a general internist—of course pediatricians provide primary care to our children. But so many of these doctors are the very ones that take the Medicare, take the Medicaid, take the SCHIP, the State Health Insurance Program for children. They see them.

□ 1500

And what Dr. ROE is referring to, before I yield back to him, on this poster it shows in the dark blue the areas of these States, several States, including my own of Georgia—Tennessee is not quite as bad—but in my State of Georgia, there are anywhere from 145 to 508 areas of the State of Georgia where there are an insufficient number of doctors to take care of these folks. Tennessee is a little bit better. There are only 67 to 99 areas. But all of this blue are critical areas, are they not, Dr. ROE? And I yield back to you.

Mr. ROE of Tennessee. That is correct. And so much so that in California, what they're recommending, I don't know whether they've carried it out or not, but they've recommended expanding the definition of "primary care" to a lower-level provider, that would be a nurse or nurse practitioner or PA or this sort of thing, this sort of designation.

I think the other thing, Dr. GINGREY, that we haven't talked about, and we probably should spend some time on, is the age of our practitioners. In our State of Tennessee—where you see that we're not quite as dire in need as Georgia, our friends to the south—the problem with it is that 45 percent of our practicing physicians in the State of Tennessee are over 50 years of age. I'm concerned that with the advent of the Affordable Care Act, the complexity of that, the frustration that I see when I go out and talk to our providers is that I'm afraid that many of them are going to punch the button for the door.

I know in my own practice, where we have now about 100 primary care providers in my program, in my OB/GYN group, in the last several years we've had over 120 years of experience walk out the door and retire. That's not a good thing for the American health care system that just lost access. Quite frankly, the crux of it all is that access. If you do not have access, you will decrease quality, and you will increase cost. That is our concern. Ultimately, the cost will go up if our patients can't get in to see us.

Mr. GINGREY of Georgia. I thank the gentleman, because what the gentleman from Tennessee is talking about is having an insurance card, a health insurance card—and indeed even having a Medicare card—does you very little good if you have to spend 2 hours going through the Yellow Pages trying to find some physician, primary care doctor in your area that you wouldn't have to get in your car and drive 50 miles—if you could even drive. If you don't have that access, then you don't have anything.

So here again, this bill, this massive bill was passed 2 years ago at the cost

of almost \$1 trillion. Unfortunately, a lot of that money was taken out of Medicare to create this new entitlement program, if you will, for younger people so that they can have health insurance. But what we've done is we've just made the crisis in the Medicare system that much more difficult.

What Dr. ROE was talking about, colleagues, is in regard to not just a shortage of the physicians, but what happens in the waiting rooms all across our country. This slide shows the number of primary care physicians per 1,000 population, the number of primary care physicians per 1,000 population.

Now, we've already gone over, we're talking about, again, general internists and family practitioners, primarily, and pediatricians for SCHIP and Medicaid. If you look at that map across the country, again, look at my State of Georgia in the deep red, and there are several States, Texas, Oklahoma, Mississippi, Alabama, Utah, Nevada and Idaho in the West where the number of primary care physicians per 1,000 of the population is fewer than one. So less than one doctor per 1,000 people that need that care. Many other States, including Tennessee, it is somewhere between one and 1.2. Now, I don't know how you get 1.2 physicians. I don't know exactly what that provider looks like. But you know how that math is calculated. Clearly, the shortage is acute, and it's only going to get worse and worse.

With that, I want to yield to one of my good colleagues, good friends on the Energy and Commerce Committee whose father actually was the chairman of the Health Subcommittee of the Energy and Commerce Committee for many, many years before he retired and his son took his place, and now the gentleman from Florida, GUS BILIRAKIS, is serving on that Health Subcommittee with me on Energy and Commerce.

I yield to Representative BILIRAKIS.

Mr. BILIRAKIS. Thank you, I appreciate it, Dr. GINGREY. Thank you, Dr. ROE, I appreciate it. Thanks for bringing up and sponsoring this Special Order that is so very important to our constituents. Thank you for informing them.

This is a very, very serious issue. We must repeal this SGR and replace it. Again, since coming to Congress more than 6 years ago, doctors in my district have consistently stressed the unsustainability of the SGR and how it impedes them from developing long-term business models.

Each year, Congress has implemented, of course, a temporary stopgap measure to avert the payment cliff, but the doctors have to have certainty. Again, we have a shortage of doctors in the State of Florida, and it's only going to get worse. We must repeal this SGR and replace it. It has led to uncertainty for medical providers, again, as I said, which threatens patient care. Again, access to care is what it's all about. I'm glad that the chairman of

the Energy and Commerce Committee, of course, Chairman UPTON, has made this a top priority in fixing, again, the SGR.

Again, not only is the uncertainty associated with reimbursement rates impacting physician practices; it also impacts how the Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services plans to update Medicare Advantage rates for 2014. That's a huge issue. I know that the seniors in my district love their Medicare Advantage. Even though, year after year, Congress has not only allowed the devastating SGR cuts to take effect, CMS is assuming these cuts will take place as it determines the Medicare Advantage adjustment. So in other words, we always fix it at the end of the year, but they're assuming that the cuts will take place. I worry this will result in reduced benefits and increased premiums for the many seniors who like—really love—their Medicare Advantage.

Mr. GINGREY of Georgia. If the gentleman would yield, I want to thank the gentleman from Florida because what he is addressing right now goes back to the creation of this law, the Affordable Care Act, PPACA—sometimes referred to as ObamaCare—where money was taken out of the Medicare program, the existing Medicare program, which is already strained almost to the bursting point, and the Medicare Advantage program. Probably 20 percent of Medicare recipients select that model because it gives them more bang for the buck. It gives them more coverage, and it includes things—and the gentleman from Florida knows this, and this is what he is referencing—it includes more than just an annual physical when you turn 65. It includes more than being able to go to see a doctor and have it reimbursed under Medicare when you have an episode of illness.

There is a strong emphasis on Medicare Advantage to wellness. Let's say you do go and see the doctor because of an episode of illness, and maybe several prescriptions were written. It's very important that the patient take the medication on a regular basis and not run out of medication. So under Medicare Advantage, there would be a nurse maybe in the doctor's office who within just a few days of that encounter would call the patient to make sure that he or she could afford to get those prescriptions filled and they were taking them in the right way. That's what the word "Advantage" was all about, Medicare Advantage, rather than just a traditional fee-for-service Medicare.

But this new law created 2 years ago, and will go into full effect in January, 2014, literally gutted that Medicare Advantage part, did it not, Representative BILIRAKIS? It cut that program 12 to 14 percent. I mean, it's just literally gutted. I'm talking about \$130 billion was taken out of that one program.

□ 1510

So now seniors that were on Medicare Advantage are having to look for

new doctors, look for new programs, try to again go through those Yellow Pages and find somebody that will see their momma who's been going to this other group for years and is totally satisfied.

When the President said to the American public, If you like the health insurance plan you have, don't worry, you can keep it; you will not lose it, that just wasn't true. I don't think he deliberately told an untruth, but it clearly is not true. And as I said at the outset of this hour, some 7 million people have already lost insurance provided by their employer, and many more of these people that were getting their Medicare through the Advantage program, they have lost that through no choice, Madam Speaker, of their own. They have been forced out of those programs.

I yield back to my colleague, and we will continue this colloquy.

Mr. BILIRAKIS. I couldn't have said it better myself, Dr. GINGREY.

Again, I have constituents in Florida, and it's above 20 percent in my district and closer to 40 percent, who have chosen Medicare Advantage.

It's all about choices, as far as I'm concerned. If I want to get hearing aids, if I want to get a gym membership or eyeglasses, I should have the choice to choose my plan. It works so very well in our area, and we want to continue to give seniors that choice.

I want to thank you guys.

My father, as you referenced, worked so many years to fix this SGR, and I'm very proud now to serve on the Health Committee to contribute.

But I appreciate the two doctors here and all the doctors who have really sacrificed to run for Congress and do what's good for our people, patients. Treating patients is what it's all about. So thank you very much for allowing me to participate.

Mr. GINGREY of Georgia. I thank the gentleman from Florida and I thank his dad, Representative Mike Bilirakis, Madam Speaker, who served in this body for so many years with distinction. I hope that he is enjoying a happy and healthy retirement in the Sunshine State. And I hope he's able to find care, but I bet you it's not under Medicare Advantage, as his son just told us.

At this point, I would like to yield back to the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. ROE).

Mr. ROE of Tennessee. I thank you.

And thank you, Mr. BILIRAKIS, for being here. I appreciate your leadership on the committee, too.

Why should I be concerned about this, and what experience do I have to say that if this is not fixed it will affect access and quality? I've had, I guess I could say, the misfortune in Tennessee of going through health care reform 20 years ago.

What happened? What happened was we had a large group of people in our State who didn't have access to quality, affordable health care. We re-

formed our Medicaid program and opened it up. We had an open enrollment time where we were going to have these various plans compete against each other. It was very much like the public option I heard discussed during the debates 4 years ago.

What happened? What happened to us was that our costs tripled in 10 years in that plan. It went up three times. And you can already see in the Affordable Care Act, even before it's been fully implemented, the estimates of costs have already doubled. The costs to patients are going up and the costs to businesses are going up. It didn't do what it had to do to really help solve the problem, which is lower the cost, bend the cost curve down. It did not do that.

When we saw those costs go up, what did we do? We started cutting our providers, and we cut our providers and we cut our hospitals and our doctors and our nurse anesthetists and our nurse practitioners and PAs and so forth. Guess what happened? Access got cut off. They stopped seeing those patients.

Now, our practice where we were, we, as an obstetrician as you were, we took everyone, because pregnancy is one of those conditions where you either are or you're not. We felt like if those folks needed care, we kept seeing those critical-care patients like that. But many elective-type things—orthopedics and dermatology and those kinds of things—got cut off, and people would have to drive hours to see a specialist.

So I saw access get denied in that system when the cost of the whole system went up to where no longer the State could afford it. I've seen that happen. That's why patients should be worried.

Dr. GINGREY, you and I know these numbers. We have 10,000 people a day hitting Medicare age. That's 3½ million people this year that are going to be Medicare age. These are new people on the plan with less money. And if we have more people and we're not producing more doctors, do the math. In 10 years, we're going to have 35-plus more people on Medicare, and who is going to care for those people?

Another thing I want to bring up is that we're not just talking about how doctors are paid. We're talking about increasing quality. One of the measures we're going to look at when we look at the new payment formula—right now the way you and I were paid when we were in practice was a patient came in and you got a fee for that visit. That's called fee-for-service medicine. That's going to change. We're going to look at quality outcomes and measures. I'll give you an example about why that's important.

One percent of our Medicare recipients use 20 percent of all Medicare dollars, so we have to look at how we manage the care of those patients better. For instance, with congestive heart failure, when someone leaves the hospital, we know that certain metrics are taking place: weights are taken

every day, blood pressure and so on. If you check in with a provider, you can prevent rehospitalizations and save tremendous morbidity, mortality, and cost. It also increases the quality of life that patient has and the quality of care they receive. So doctors are going to be evaluated on the kind of outcomes we have and the quality of care we provide our patients, which we all agree should be done.

I think coordinating care, hopefully, with better electronic records—and I could spend an hour talking about that. If we have a coordinated electronic system where, when you order a test at your office or the hospital, we have access to it so that test is not repeated and duplicated, that will make a huge difference in cost.

I just had a duplicated test, myself, done. You may have, too, when you had your procedure. I had a surgical procedure done 2 weeks ago this last Monday, and there was some testing on myself that really didn't have to be done. But because of various rules and regulations and the inability to get that information easily, it was easier to repeat it and pay for it than it was to go find it. I think that happens to 300 million people. Actually, it is 47 million of us who get Medicare now. We need to do that, better coordinate that information with sharing and transparency.

Mr. GINGREY of Georgia. If the gentleman will yield for just a second, I want to weigh in on that issue of electronic medical records.

I'm normally, as the good doctor from Tennessee knows, walking around here in a sling, as I have been for the last couple of weeks. Madam Speaker, I probably should have it on right now, but I'm resting my arm on the podium.

But I just recently had rotator cuff surgery back home in Marietta, Georgia. Madam Speaker, I was blessed with a great physician who did a wonderful job and has a fabulous staff, but going through the process of doing the paperwork, I bet I filled out the exact same form four different times. That was wasting my time and that was wasting their time. Of course, what they want to make sure is that no mistakes are made. Obviously, they want to make sure they operate on the correct arm. So I understand why, and I'm sure many of you, your parents, your grandparents, and you yourselves, my colleagues, as patients have gone through all of that.

But what Dr. ROE is talking about—and I will yield back to him—electronic records are indeed, in my opinion, the wave of the future. Honestly, I believe if we had concentrated on that 2 years ago to make sure that it was fully implemented so that duplication of testing, unnecessary procedures, maybe medications prescribed to which the patient had a dangerous allergy, you really do ultimately save lives and save money by having an electronic medical record system.

The other thing is if we had had medical liability reform. The President

promised that before this ObamaCare bill of 2,700 pages was put into law, but there was nothing in there about medical liability reform.

Here again, those were two things, and I think the gentleman from Tennessee would agree with me on that.

I just wanted to interject my thoughts about electronic medical records, and I yield back to the gentleman.

Mr. ROE of Tennessee. I had the misfortune of going from paper to an electronic record. I was in the process, at our practice, of converting. It's a very difficult conversion. I think if you started with just an electronic medical record, it would be much easier than transferring tens of thousands of patient charts to an EMR. But when you start from scratch, it's a little easier.

Certainly I think the electronic ePrescribe, which I like, I didn't have the pharmacist call me and tell—I can't believe he couldn't read my prescription. Anyway, they claimed they couldn't, and this solves that problem.

□ 1520

I think there are some disadvantages to it, but overall, I think it is the wave of the future. I think you are correct.

I'm going to bring up something now about: let's say we go ahead and we do fix the SGR payment that's based on quality and that's based on outcomes and transparency, on hospital re-admissions, and so forth—on all those metrics we've talked about to better serve our patients. There will still be fee-for-service. I'm sure, Dr. GINGREY, you're a rural Georgia Representative as I'm a rural east Tennessee Representative. I have counties that have one doctor, and you can't do an accountable care organization—or all of these things—in a small, rural county. So fee-for-service medicine will still be there for those patients so they can have access in small, rural counties and don't have to drive long distances.

Let's say we do all of this wonderful stuff and that we fix this payment model and that it all looks good. The Affordable Care Act has in it one little thing called the Independent Payment Advisory Board. This Independent Payment Advisory Board trumps what we just did—all of the things that you're going to do in your Energy and Commerce. Also, thank you very much for what you're doing on that. As to all of these cuts that you see right here, let me just give you the data.

Mr. GINGREY of Georgia. The top of the green line is where we in the Congress mitigated these cuts because we can do that. That's what it says in the Constitution, that we're in charge of the purse strings. So, when there is a recommendation, as Dr. ROE is referring to, Madam Speaker, of the cuts in the pink—below the line, from 2001 to 2012, there is almost every year a 5 percent, 3 percent, 4 percent, 10 percent—then in the aggregate, that number just keeps getting bigger and bigger.

What Dr. ROE is about to explain to us is how we were heretofore able to

mitigate, which is by making these changes above the line and by saying, no, we're not going to cut the doctors because we know, if we do that, they won't be there, that they won't be there for our parents and our grandparents and ourselves and our children.

Mr. ROE of Tennessee. I think correctly the Congress, in its constitutional authority, has overridden the SGR 15 times since 2002. I think that's the correct data.

What this IPAB does in the Affordable Care Act—it sets the same metric. It has a very complicated formula, which is the same as SGR, and if you have expenditures above those projections, cuts will be made. There is no judicial review, no administrative review, and it takes a 60-vote margin in the Senate to override this. Let me tell you how important this is, what Dr. GINGREY just pointed out.

Whether you agree with the plan or don't agree with the plan, there was a great article in the New England Journal of Medicine, one of our premier medical journals, that was published in June of 2011. I would recommend this for anyone to read as it will take you 30 minutes or less. They went back with the CMS and looked at the last 25 years and said, What if we had IPAB then? What would it do? In 21 of the 25 years, cuts would have occurred to providers—and I know exactly. Because of what I have seen in Tennessee, I know exactly what would happen. What would happen is you cut those providers right there. As you're seeing up there, Dr. GINGREY, I can tell you that, as to the access to care, that entire map of the United States right there would be a bright red because you would not have the providers to take care of those patients.

That is a tremendous concern for me because it is current law. This year, those 15 bureaucrats are supposed to be nominated by the President. What happens if he doesn't nominate those 15 people? One person—that's the HHS Secretary, Secretary Sebelius—makes those decisions and recommendations. I hear it all the time. I go on the talk shows like you do, and they say, Well, in the bill right here, it says that you cannot ration care. That's true. This board can't ration care. What they can do is just not pay the providers. In 2017, I think, or in 2018, the hospitals are included in this. They're not included first, but they will be in 5 short years.

Mr. GINGREY of Georgia. Dr. ROE, what will happen in reference to this slide right here—if you look at these blue areas, these States that have the acute shortage areas, like Georgia and Florida—is that this whole map of the United States will be blue.

Mr. ROE of Tennessee. That is correct, Dr. GINGREY.

Unless you are very deeply buried into this—meaning, if you're a Medicare recipient out there today—you don't see this. I go home, and I see my physician friends and talk to my friends who are on Medicare. They

don't know this has happened or that it could potentially happen to them, but it can and it will, and it is the law right now unless we change the law.

I would strongly encourage my colleagues on both sides of the aisle—and we have bipartisan support for the appeal of the IPAB—to put that constitutional authority back in the hands of the people who are directly responsible and responsive to the American people—us, the Representatives. Let us make those changes and, the Senate, the same thing.

Mr. GINGREY of Georgia. I thank the gentleman, and I want to continue a colloquy with him and maybe even ask a question of him. Dr. ROE, Madam Speaker, explained very clearly how that is a section of ObamaCare, a very important section of a group of 15 bureaucrats appointed by the President.

In regard to the IPAB, they basically can now say from year to year, Well, the doctors and the hospitals are going to be cut so much reimbursement. These cuts are going to occur.

We showed in the first slide how over the years Congress has been able to mitigate. Read the Constitution. We, the Members of the Congress, control the purse strings. So, fortunately, we were able to make these changes into what was suggested; but this IPAB board of 15 bureaucrats, they're not making a suggestion. They're telling us what has to be done.

The question I wanted to ask of Dr. ROE, Madam Speaker, was: when this case went before the Supreme Court, questioning the constitutionality of the law and saying that if a Governor of a State, like the Governor of Georgia, Governor Nathan Deal—an 18-year Member of this body, by the way—makes a decision not to expand Medicaid because the State can't afford it as the State's already going broke on the current Medicaid program, is it constitutional for the Federal Government to say, If you won't expand the Medicaid program, we're going to make sure that you can't participate at all and that all of your current recipients of Medicaid in the State of Georgia are out on the street?

That was a question that was asked of the Supreme Court as well as: was it constitutional to force people to engage in health care if they didn't want to, if they did not want to purchase health insurance? Now, I'm not recommending that they don't; but the question before the Supremes was: is it constitutional under the Commerce Clause to make people engage in commerce if they don't want to do it? The Supremes said, in a very pained, strained, pretzel-like decision, that that was constitutional.

Dr. ROE, do you know whether or not this question about IPAB was addressed by the Supremes: is it constitutional or not? I'm not sure. I'm thinking it wasn't addressed. Would you speak to that.

Mr. ROE of Tennessee. That's correct.

I had the privilege of being in the chambers when a good part of this health care debate was going on in front of the Supreme Court. It was the first time I'd ever been there. Fascinating. I'd totally misread it.

As you pointed out, it was the first time in American history that the Supreme Court said that you had to purchase a good or service—even if it's good for you, that you had to purchase it. We've never forced anybody into commerce before like this. As an individual, I think you have a right to make good decisions and bad decisions. I agree with you. I think a good decision is, if you can afford health insurance coverage, you should purchase it. I think there is no question. I have for my family my entire life, and I would recommend it strongly and encourage people to protect themselves in that way.

But does the government have the right to do it?

This Court said 5–4 that they did. The Court also said that they did not have the right to force States into expanding their Medicaid if they did not want to, and the IPAB specifically was not brought up.

I believe it will be challenged and should be. No one has standing yet because it hasn't gone into effect. In other words, they haven't issued any rulings—or the Secretary hasn't—to say that I've been harmed by that ruling so that, therefore, now I have standing in the Court and that I can bring a case.

□ 1530

Mr. GINGREY of Georgia. So you're saying that it's in the law, but because it hasn't been applied yet. And, in fact, indeed, as Dr. ROE pointed out, Madam Speaker, the board, the IPAB board, 15 bureaucrats, have not even—not even one of them, their salary has been set, I think they're scheduled to make \$150,000 a year and probably have a car and a driver and health insurance and retirement plan, and not too bad a gig if you can get it, but not so far I don't think any have been appointed. And so that's what Dr. ROE, Madam Speaker, was referring to when he said there's not standing yet. If you went to the Supreme Court, they would say the case is not ripe. I'm standing here as a physician trying to sound like an attorney, and I'm going to get myself in a lot of trouble here in a minute, Madam Speaker, and Dr. ROE explained that very well, but I do agree with him, colleagues. I do agree with Dr. ROE that that will be challenged and certainly should be struck down. You look at the Constitution, our fifth and sixth graders probably could make that decision, and it wouldn't be a 5–4 split decision; it would be 9–0.

Mr. ROE of Tennessee. Actually, the IPAB board of 15 bureaucrats will make \$165,000 a year with a 6-year term, and they can be appointed twice to that term. And it's something, and what bothers me about it is, no, it says

in the bill you can't ration care, but we are the elected representatives. We should be able to go back home, as Congressman BILLIRAKIS said, we should be able to go back home and face our constituents, and they're going to say: Dr. ROE, we have a situation where I can't go see my doctor. I can't go in and see them because they aren't accepting patients, and they aren't accepting patients because of this particular board that's cut their reimbursements enough to where they can't afford to see patients.

Now, another couple of things I want to talk about in the Affordable Care Act, not just SGR formula effects, but there is a tax out there in the Affordable Care Act that hasn't been very well discussed, and that tax is on individual insurance accounts. For instance, there are companies out there that are self-insured, and they're going to get a bill for each person that has insurance. Let's say a family of four or five, they'll get a bill for four or five people, and one company in particular, this will add—and they have no reinsurance. They cover everything. They're totally self-insured, but this basically is a tax that will go into a fund to indemnify insurance companies so that they won't have a loss of more than \$60,000 a year, and this is billions of dollars when you stretch it across the country.

And these insurance companies are going to not have the loss to encourage them to accept patients on the exchange. That's as wrong as it gets to take a company that is doing everything right, they're going ahead and providing the health insurance coverage for their employees, and to penalize them for that.

So there are many, many issues in the Affordable Care Act we could talk about, but I want to basically finish my comments on the sustainable growth rate by saying in the past, since 2001, just so that our viewers out there will understand this, since 2001, your Medicare doctor at home has gotten an average increase in his or her payments when you come see them of 0.29 percent per year, 0.29 percent per year. When you look at all that graph that Dr. GINGREY has down there and you do all the math, that's how much of an increase. It's a very minimal increase. It hasn't even come near to covering the cost of inflation.

So again, Dr. GINGREY, I want to conclude by saying that the major concern I have, and I saw it in my practice, is the cost of care, and, number two, access to care. I'm concerned as our patients age and our population ages—and look, a good thing is happening in America: almost every 10 years we live, we're adding 3 years to our life expectancy. In 1908, the life expectancy in America was 48 years old, 47–48. In 1922 when my mother was born—and she's still living, I might add. She's living alone, by herself, doing great. She has Medicare. And I'm going to tell my mother now that later today I'm going

to call her prescription in. She notified me today that she needed some medicine called in, and so I will do that for her today. I look at her and I think about her need for access to care, and if it's cut off, what does she do.

Mr. GINGREY of Georgia. I thank the gentleman, Madam Speaker. And as he talked about his mom, I stand here thinking about my own mom, who's 95 years old. Her body is getting a little frail, but Mom's mind is perfect. Perfect, Madam Speaker. She has enjoyed the benefit of Medicare and Social Security for many years. Many years. So these legacy programs are hugely important. They're hugely important to our side of the aisle.

Madam Speaker and my colleagues, all of this Mediscare stuff, and things that you get all of this rhetoric about, they don't care about seniors and they're going to push somebody's grandmother over the cliff in a wheelchair, that's just a bunch of bull. I think every Member of this body and every Member of Congress cares about seniors and cares about these programs.

But I also, Madam Speaker, have 13 grandchildren. I have 13 grandchildren, and I want this Medicare program to be there for them some day, just like it has been there for Mom all these years.

So as we talk about these issues, we would do nothing to harm current recipients of Medicare and Social Security. We used the term, the phrase I guess you'd say, "hold harmless." Hold harmless. Any changes that we would make, whether it is the payment system to our doctors and our hospitals for providing the care, it would not take away any benefit. It would not cause our current seniors to have to pay a higher premium or copay or deductible. All we're doing is trying to come up with something that would save the program for them, but, most importantly, for these youngsters that are coming behind us, the next two generations. So that's what we're all about.

My colleague, if he has some more comments, I would like to refer back to him, the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. ROE of Tennessee. Dr. GINGREY, I think one of the things I know you did and I know one of the things that I did was to come here to this body, this great body, to work on the repair of our health care system and improve on it.

One of the major pieces of our health care system is our Medicare system. I cannot tell you the patients I have seen in my career that have benefited, whose lives have been helped and saved by the Medicare system and by the doctors and nurses and hospitals and other providers who've cared for them. You have, too. I've operated on them, and I've seen them get cardiac care, renal, whatever it may be, that has improved the quality, improved and lengthened the quality of their life, not just to live longer, but to live better.

My goodness, look at the number of patients that we see of our orthopedic

friends that we have that are mobile, that are active who've had joint replacements and so forth. Look, if you're 80 years old, 75 or 80 years old, you understand that your life is not going to be that much longer, but you also want the quality of that life to be the absolute best it can be. And it cannot be if you can't get your knee fixed if you're in pain, or your hip fixed if you're in pain. One of the things that I think our side of the aisle is committed to, I believe the other side, we may have differences of opinion, but one of the things I want to do is to be sure that we shore up and save this great system of Medicare.

I had a meeting today just after lunch about the Medicare part D program that was passed by the Republicans at some political risk for them. That's been a plan that has actually come in under-budget. It came in under-budget because seniors are able to go shop and purchase exactly what they want that meets their needs. That is exactly what we want to do in the Medicare system.

And when our budget is published next week, we are going to look at a system where we help fix and save and sustain Medicare, as you pointed out, not only for your mother, who's 95, and my mother who is 90, but for my two grandchildren who are 7 and 9. They also deserve the same great system, and we're going to have to change it; but I think we can make it better. I really believe it can be more responsive. You see what patients do when they get Medicare Advantage. You saw what they did. There was a little confusion, I admit, when Medicare part D first came out. There is no confusion now. People shop for the best value that meets their needs, and that's exactly what we should do.

Let me give you an example, Dr. GINGREY. I turned 65 a very short time ago. What happened to me when I turned 65? Nothing. I got one day older. Except what happened was I had a plan now that had an alphabet soup—A, B, C, D.

□ 1540

The day before I had a health care plan. Why, when you turn 65 years of age, don't you have a health care plan? And in that health care plan I can pick out I don't need fertility coverage at age 65, thank you very much. And I think that's the kind of thing—allow seniors to be able to pick what meets their needs and meets their family's needs at that particular point in their life; not just one-size-fits-all, but what they need.

And seniors have done that. They do it with everything else in their life. There's no reason it should change when you hit 65. You should pick out what plan—just like you and I can do up here with the Federal Employees Health Benefits plan. There's no reason that a senior shouldn't have exactly the same plan. It will be cheaper. It will be a better plan for them, and

that's one of the things I think we're going to be discussing in the next several months when the Republican budget is published.

Mr. GINGREY of Georgia. I thank the gentleman.

Madam Speaker, as we get near the closing of the hour, I wanted to just mention several things. Dr. ROE has alluded to these, talking about the Medicare Advantage and what a beneficial program that was. Unfortunately, it's now been gutted, literally gutted, cut at least 12 percent, \$130 billion, to create this whole new program that we call PPACA, or ObamaCare.

Medicare Part D, Madam Speaker, the gentleman from Tennessee is talking about the prescription drug part of Medicare that we did my first year, when I first came here in 2003, the Medicare Modernization and Prescription Drug Act.

Seniors, for many, many years, have wanted to be able to get their prescription drugs covered by Medicare but they couldn't. And of course, when you have to go to the drugstore and get five prescriptions filled, and most of them, brand name, not generic, some generic, maybe, but these brand name drugs are so expensive. And so we finally did this for our seniors.

Now, we spent what—I don't know, maybe \$750 billion—creating that program, and we got criticized for it because it wasn't paid for. We didn't offset by cutting spending somewhere else. And I think maybe that criticism, under the current system, is legitimate.

But really, when you think about it, if you scored dynamically, and you realize that if people, seniors, all of a sudden could take their blood pressure medicine and not have to worry about a stroke, could take their diabetes medicine and not have to worry about eventually having renal failure from diabetes or an amputation, in the long run, what I'm saying, Madam Speaker, is this program, Medicare Part D, Medicare Advantage, electronic medical records, if we scored things in the right way, dynamically, at the end of the day, 10 years, 20 years, whatever, we're going to save money because people are not going to have coronary bypass surgery, they're not going to have to have these amputations, they're not going to end up the rest of their lives in a nursing home because they've had a catastrophic stroke that has left them totally incapacitated.

I'm going to yield back to the gentleman from Tennessee to close us out.

Mr. ROE of Tennessee. I have just one quick statement, Dr. GINGREY. And when you brought this up in 2003—and I want to thank you, because I can remember sitting at my desk in my office in 2003 working, and I could take this pen right here, and in about a minute or a minute and a half, I could write two or three prescriptions that might take up a patient's entire monthly income. That was the decision patients were having to have.

And Republicans stepped up to the plate, made a very difficult decision. Like you said, maybe we should have some criticism for not having offsets. But seniors out there today don't have to make that decision about whether I break this pill in half or whether I don't take it today or whether I buy food.

And you ran across that in your practice. I mean, I would look in our area, many widows that I would see would have a \$600, \$700 a month Social Security check and maybe a \$100 or \$200 a month pension. And you write three prescriptions, and the first thing they say is, Dr. ROE, it's gone. And you could easily do that. So I want to thank you for your vote.

Mr. GINGREY of Georgia. I thank my colleague.

And Madam Speaker, I thank you, and I thank the leadership of the Republican Party for allowing us to bring this information to our colleagues in a bipartisan way.

We are all about solving these problems. We talked basically about the sustainable growth formula, the way we pay doctors for a volume of care.

Clearly, we're going to have to go to paying for quality of care. We don't have time to get into all the details of that today, but in the next Special Order hour that the Doctors' Caucus leads, we'll get into more details about what we're going to recommend to our committees, to our leadership, to both sides of the aisle in regard to solving this program.

And with that, I yield back the balance of my time.

REMOVAL OF NAMES OF MEMBERS AS COSPONSORS OF H.R. 423

Mr. COFFMAN. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to remove as cosponsors from H.R. 423 the following representatives: Representative LEANA ROS-LEHTINEN, Representative JANICE SCHAKOWSKY, and Representative STEVE STIVERS.

On February 26, 2013, three names were added as cosponsors that were not intended to be included. They were meant to be added to another bill I introduced, H.R. 435.

Their removal is only necessary due to a clerical error on the part of my office, rather than a decision by the four offices.

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

There was no objection.

HOLLOW IDEOLOGIES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2013, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. KING) for 30 minutes.

Mr. KING of Iowa. Madam Speaker, it's always my honor to be recognized to speak here on the floor of the United

States House of Representatives, and I'm privileged to hear from the "Dr. Phil Show" that we've just listened to over this past 60 minutes.

I have a few things on my mind that I'd like to inform you of, Madam Speaker. And I'd start with this: that sometimes we need to take a look at the bigger, broader direction that this Congress is going and this country is going.

And one of the things that I've learned, being involved in the legislative process, in fact, back in the Iowa State Senate some years ago, one of my colleagues said we're so busy doing that which is urgent that we're not addressing those things that are important. And that should frame all the things that we do.

We should have a long-term plan. We should have a big picture plan, and the things that we do should fit into that. We should be putting the pieces of the jigsaw puzzle together under that broader view.

And how does that broader view fit?

Our Founding Fathers understood it. They understood the perspective of history. They knew where they stood in history, and they acted accordingly. They understood human nature. They understood human universals.

They watched the continuum of history to get up to their point, and they made deep, long-term, broad, deliberative decisions that were difficult and debated, they were hard-fought out, and they put those pieces in place for us. It's clear to me when I read through the documents of our Founding Fathers that they understood history and human nature.

It's not as clear to me, Madam Speaker, when I serve here in this Congress and engage in debates here on the floor and in committee and in subcommittee and around in the places where we're often called upon to comment or listen to the comment of others, that we're looking at this from the big picture.

So something that brought this home for me was on a trip that I was involved in dealing with negotiations with the Europeans, and one of the speakers who was an expert on the Middle East made a presentation about the Muslim Brotherhood. And I'm not here to speak about the Muslim Brotherhood except this: that part of his presentation was that the Muslim Brotherhood is, according to the speaker, a hollow ideology. I put that in quotes, "a hollow ideology."

Now he said that they can't sustain themselves over the long term because their belief system isn't anchored in those things that are timeless and real, those things like the core—now, I'm going to expand a little bit—the core of faith, the core of human nature, but a hollow ideology.

So when he used that term and professed that hollow ideologies cannot continue, that they will eventually expire because they're sunk by their own weight, rather than buoyed by a belief

system, then I began to look at our Western civilization.

And we are, here in the United States, Madam Speaker, the leaders of Western civilization.

□ 1550

And so when the allegation of a hollow ideology is placed upon the Muslim Brotherhood, I have to wonder: can I make the argument that our ideology is full and wholesome and identifies our values that are timeless? And are the pillars of American exceptionalism restored with the ideology we carry here? And do we strengthen this Nation so that the next generation has the opportunities we had or do we just ignorantly wallow through the day-to-day urgent decisions of Congress without dealing with the broader picture of who we are and, particularly, how we got here?

I look back to the time when I first ran for office. I was putting together a document that I wanted to hand out to my, hopefully, future constituents. I believed that I should put a quote in there that sounded wise, and hopefully was wise.

As I sat in my construction office about 1:30 in the morning, I wrote up this little quote. Part of it is naive; another part of it, I think, is appropriate. And the quote was this: that human nature doesn't change; that if we ever get the fundamental structure of government correct, the only reason we need to reconvene our legislative bodies are to make appropriations for coming years or adjustments for new technology.

Madam Speaker, when you think about what that means, if we ever get government right, if we ever get our laws in place, our regulations in place so that they reflect and bring about the best of human nature, since human nature doesn't change and it hasn't changed throughout the generations, then just make the adjustments for appropriations in new technology, that is a correct statement, I believe. But it is pretty naive about the reality of coming to a consensus on getting the fundamental structure of law correct, let alone the fundamental structure of regulations correct, without regard to the changing technology that always is thrust upon us here.

We are continually going to be in an argument, in a debate, about the fundamental human nature, how people react to public policy and about where we would like to see society go. Those of us on my side of the aisle believe that we have values that are timeless. Whatever was true 2,000 years ago is true today, and whatever was sin 2,000 years ago is sin today.

There are those on the other side of the aisle, many of them would advocate that society isn't going in the right direction unless you are constantly changing things, without regard to the values we are changing, without having to grasp for a higher ideal, just grasping for change. If

change is the mission and they are launched upon that mission, they believe they are doing good because they are eliminating the things that we have had and adopting something different, not necessarily something better. And they don't even argue that it is better, but they argue for change.

I would say this, Madam Speaker: that we have fundamental values, that these fundamental values have been clear to our Founding Fathers. They are rooted in human history. They go back to the time of Adam and Eve. But the things that we should keep track of here are those things that our Founding Fathers looked at as well, that being the rule of law is one of the essential pillars of American exceptionalism. Without it, we can't be a great country. Most of the pillars of American exceptionalism are listed in the Bill of Rights.

Our Founding Fathers got it right. When they guaranteed us, in the First Amendment, the freedom of speech, religion, assembly, and the press, all of that rolled up in one amendment, think what that means.

And I would argue, especially to our young people, Madam Speaker, that if we don't exercise these rights—and our Founding Fathers made it very clear, these are God-given rights. Thomas Jefferson wrote it in the Declaration, as signed by the hands of those Founding Fathers that pledged their lives, their fortunes, and their sacred honor, that these rights come from God. And it is the first time that concept had been argued, established, and put down as a foundation of this Republic. It is not the beginning of these God-given rights; it is the most defensible version of it.

I would take us back to the origins of the rule of law, which seems to be getting eroded here in this Congress—in the House and in the Senate and in the White House. I don't have that same charge to the Supreme Court these days, but I would test them in a couple of places, perhaps in a different venue, Madam Speaker.

The rule of law, the foundation of the rule of law, I will say that was handed down by Moses, Mosaic Law. And as that law was handed down and we went through those times after the birth of Christ—and we saw during that period of time of Christ that the Greeks and the Romans had embraced Mosaic Law, even though they sometimes good-naturedly teased each other about borrowing their ideas about the rule of law from Moses—it is true, Mosaic Law flowed into Greek law and Roman law.

If you look at history, the Romans flowed across Western Europe all the way up into England up into Ireland. They established themselves in a big way because of the rule of law.

That rule of law was torn asunder about the time that the Dark Ages began, around 406 AD to around 410 AD, when Rome was sacked and we saw ourselves go into the Dark Ages. And, I will say, the uncivilized began to de-

stroy anything that they saw that was evidence of the civilizations of the Greeks and the Romans. They tore down the buildings. They tore down the symbols, those things that reminded them of the former civilization.

Out of that, the Roman church collected and protected many of those documents of the classics and the Irish monks collected and protected many of the classics of the era of the Greeks and the Romans. And we went through those hundreds of years of the Dark Ages when people forgot how to think about the age of reason, how to apply deductive and inductive reasoning, rational thought. That disappeared, and it became the rule of emotion rather than the rule of law, the society driven by instinct and emotion rather than a society that was ordered by rational thought.

And how did this come back together? We think we couldn't lose this again today, Madam Speaker. It was lost at one time, and it was reconstructed again after hundreds of years.

I think about how that was bridged. There are a number of symbols of the bridging of the classical period of the Greeks and the Romans through the Dark Ages into the Middle Ages and into today.

One of those symbols would be the Cologne Cathedral dome in Germany. Now, if I have my history right—and I am going to speak generally, Madam Speaker, because I didn't commit this to precise memory for the purposes of delivering it, but conceptually I will—the origins of that cathedral and that church and that diocese there began about 330 AD or so.

Can you imagine, before the fall of the Roman Empire, the Christian faith was building gothic edifices in Western Europe as monuments and symbols of the deep core of their belief system, not a hollow ideology, but a full ideology driven by a Christian faith and followed along by individual rights.

The foundation of the Cologne Cathedral dome began to be laid around 330 AD. The architectural plans, as I recall them, for the church that exists today was about 832 AD. Then they began to build for a few hundred years. Around about 1100 AD or so, they ran out of money.

Now, we haven't yet emerged from the Dark Ages, but it is beginning. Hundreds of years of Dark Ages and the construction of this church had stopped. They ran out of money. The Dark Ages had suppressed it, and the image and the vision of this not hollow but full ideology had to weather through centuries.

Then coming out of the Dark Ages in 1100 AD or so, they began their fundraising drive again. For 600 years they raised money to finish the cathedral that was planned. Architectural drawings were put down on parchment about 832 AD.

They picked up those plans 600 years later, the same plans, to complete the church that was completed in the late

part of the 19th century and exists today.

That is an idea of the length of time that a vision can sustain itself. A not hollow but a full ideology can drive itself through the collapse of the Roman Empire, through the Dark Ages, through the reconstruction period, into the modern era and survive, in fact, survive all the allied bombers that went over it in World War II. That is a vision of not a hollow ideology but a full ideology that is driven by culture, by civilization, by faith.

Here we are today. As I listen to that presentation about the hollow ideology of the Muslim Brotherhood, I thought: what is our agenda here in Congress? Does this agenda reflect our value system? Does it anchor in these core beliefs that go back in a timeless way? Does it recognize that there are human universals that never will change? And does it recognize that we are motivated by those human universals and that it is anchored in our value system?

I don't know that our agenda reflects that these days. It seems as though we are running herky-jerky from one economic issue to another economic issue, not with a long view picture, but with the idea that we are going to get past this crisis and then somehow we are going to put this back together on the other side of the crisis.

□ 1600

That's the case with the fiscal cliff. That's the case with reordering the issues of sequestration, continuing resolution, and, later on, the debt ceiling. These are the urgencies that are being addressed, sometimes at the expense of the bigger picture.

It would be different if we were dealing with urgencies that were fitting the jigsaw puzzle pieces into the big picture, but I don't believe that we are. I think that we are starting to lose sight of who we are as a people and we're starting to lose our grip on those fundamentals.

There is a big difference going on in this country that we have not seen in the history of the United States of America, Madam Speaker, and the difference is this: those of us who believe that we have timeless values and that we need to be reconstructing and refurbishing the pillars of American exceptionalism competing against those who believe that chiselling those pillars of American exceptionalism down and replacing them with something or nothing is preferable to restoring them. I think that that is being driven out of the White House and the people that share common cause, Madam Speaker, with the President of the United States.

This movement that he is driving, it divides people against each other. When you see this concept of multiculturalism—which is something that I embraced when it emerged on the public scene because I believed it was a good tool for us to respect all people of all races and all ethnicities,

whatever their behaviors might be in life. But I began to see that the people on the other side were using it as a tool to divide, not to unite, a tool to pit people against each other rather than to draw them together. I've seen the President use that in his politics repeatedly to the extent that I've never seen in the history of this country. I did, though, recognize it.

When Bill Clinton was elected President, I wrote an op-ed about the method that he used to appoint his Cabinet. That method was: I'm going to put together a multicultural formula and I am going to—and he said this: I'm going to appoint a Cabinet that looks like America. That would be the quote from Bill Clinton after he was elected, before he was inaugurated, as he put the Cabinet together.

I thought at that time, the President of the United States should be putting together a Cabinet that best serves America, regardless of what they look like. But that wasn't what happened under the Clinton administration, and I'm not convinced that's what's happened under any subsequent administration, Republican or Democrat, since then. But this President has pitted us against each other along the lines of race, along the lines of ethnicity, with sometimes little comments that are made that aren't so subtle. These things divide us as a people rather than unite us as a people.

When you hear the promise out there that people won't have to worry about their rent check or won't have to worry about their car payment, that somebody will take care of you—this idea that government is going to step in and lift the burden off people and take away individual responsibility is something that was pervasive in the last two Presidential races, particularly in the last one, and it undermines the efficiency of the American people.

We should be thinking, Madam Speaker, about a Nation of over 300 million people that has some of the longest and the highest and most sustained unemployment rates in the history of this country—the Great Depression would be the exception—and a Nation with around 313 million people in it, a little over 13 million people who have signed up for unemployment, another number of people that approaches that of about 20 million people that are definably underemployed, and that's just a piece of those who are not engaged.

When we look at the Department of Labor's Web site and we start to add up those unemployed to those who are of working age simply not in the workforce, we come to a number of over 100 million Americans, Madam Speaker, that are not contributing to the gross domestic product, that are of the age group that one would think we would get some work out of some of them. Now, I recognize in that group of over 100 million there are some that are retired, some are early retired, some are in school, some are homemakers. It's

difficult for me to complete the list of reasons why people would not be contributing to our economy.

But we seem to think that 100 million Americans not in the workforce doesn't seem to trouble very many people in this Congress, but it's okay for us to be looking at 11 or 12 or 20 million people that are in this country unlawfully, who are working unlawfully, and who are, at least theoretically, taking jobs that Americans might take.

At one point, Madam Speaker, I wrote an op-ed that laid out an analogy. It described the United States as analogous to a huge cruise ship—it would also be a sailing cruise ship—with 300 million people on it. You need some people that will pull on the oars and swab the deck and trim the sails and work in the galley and clean out the cabins and do those kind of things up in steerage and in first class and wherever else, and somebody there to man the navigation and take care of the captain. That's all jobs that happen on a cruise ship. And our whole economy and our society is tied together, 50 States and 300 million people.

What kind of people, if they needed somebody else to pull on the oars or swab the deck or trim the sails or calculate the navigation, what kind of people would say, We've got 300 million people on this ship and we've got 100 million of them that are sitting up in steerage, but we need somebody else to do the work that those people in steerage won't do, so let's pull off on this continent and load another 10 or 20 million more people on to do the work that people on this cruise ship won't do? No captain in his right mind would sail that ship over there and load a bunch more people on to do work if he had 100 million people up in steerage that had opted out because somebody is taking care of delivering the food, cleaning their cabin, and making sure they have a place where they can stay. That's what happens to human nature when you have a domestic policy that makes it easy to turn the safety net into a hammock.

That's something that Phil Graham used to discuss about how it's one thing to create a safety net—and we're for a safety net in here almost universally—but to turn the safety net into a hammock and then ask somebody else to come do work that Americans aren't willing to do is a reach that I'm not willing to accept.

Neither do I accept the idea that there's work that Americans won't do. Every single job category has Americans working in it in a majority of that job category. We saw some of that data today, Madam Speaker.

So I'd say this instead. We are a country that is richer than any country ever in the history of the world. We have more technology than ever in the history of the world. We have more capital created. We have more human capital, more know-how, more can-do people out there to pull on the oars and

trim the sails and navigate the ship and do all of the things that need to happen. This country has all of those assets and all of those resources in greater number and supply by any measure than any civilization in the history of the world, and Madam Speaker, we can't live within our means? We have to run a deficit of \$1 to \$1.2 trillion and borrow money from the Chinese and the Saudis—and, by the way, about half of this debt is held by domestic debt, the American people that are buying bonds and T-bills.

But a Nation that's the richest Nation, the richest culture, the richest economy, the richest civilization in the history of the world has to borrow over \$1 trillion a year just to sustain this lifestyle that we have, while we have 100 million—a third of our population—that is of working age that is not contributing to the gross domestic product. Think of what that means. Think how posterity will judge us if we don't step up to our responsibilities, get our spending under control, bring more of the people into the workforce that are, I will say, living off of public benefits.

I would be willing to submit that you won't find someone on the streets of America that can name for you all of the means-tested welfare programs—Federal programs that are means tested—that we have. That number used to be 72. Then it went to 80. This is a number that has been calculated and pulled together by Robert Rector of the Heritage Foundation. I asked him, you know, I used to quote you at 72, now you say 80. What happened? He said, I found some more. I said, Is 80 the finite number, 80 different means-tested Federal welfare programs? He said, Well, there are at least 80; why don't you say a minimum of 80.

So 80, a minimum of 80 different means-tested Federal welfare programs, some of them competing with each other, and no one can list them from memory, and no one has the capability of understanding how they interrelate with each other nor how they motivate or demotivate the people that they are designed to help. What kind of a country would do that?

And why would we have 100 million people of working age not in our workforce while we're running up a debt of \$1.2 trillion a year? We've seen that the per capita national debt now for a baby born in the United States—babies born today, their share of the national debt is \$53,000. It went over \$53,000 just the other day. So, welcome to the world. You're an American citizen born here by birthright citizenship, but you don't have a right not to contribute to paying off the national debt, and your share is \$53,000.

□ 1610

What kind of a country would do that and not tighten its belt and not put some of its people to work? And then I end up with these economic discussions, Madam Speaker. They come from smart people who will say, well,

the labor force should be determined by supply and demand. Why don't we let human migration follow where the jobs are? Well, Milton Friedman had the answer to that. He said that you cannot have open borders and a welfare system, especially one that is as generous as our welfare system is.

So which one can you fix? Can you fix the border problem? Can you fix the welfare problem? I'd like to fix them both, Madam Speaker. One of them is a little easier than the other. We can control the borders and shut off the jobs magnet easier than we can make the case that we should be tightening down the welfare system in this country. But we need to do both. We need to bring the country back within its means. The entitlement system that's out there that fits within those 80 different means-tested welfare programs needs to be completely reexamined.

I think Congressman LOUIS GOHMERT is correct when he said we need to put all of the welfare into a single committee so they're responsible for all of the programs that we have. It's the only way we can begin to get a handle on it. The committee jurisdiction is scattered out through multiple committees, and he knows that better than I.

The big picture that I started to talk about in the beginning, Madam Speaker, is that we need to identify the pillars of American exceptionalism and we need to refurbish those pillars. The identification of them become the things that we've inherited from far back in the origins of Western Civilization. Mosaic law flowed through Greek and Roman law, and the Magna Carta that was signed in 1215 established individual freedom from the monarch or the despot that no subject could be—let's say no one other than a serf at that time—could be punished arbitrarily. They had to have the right and the protection of the rule of law.

We have these guarantees in our Constitution, freedom of speech, and I'm exercising it now, Madam Speaker, and I encourage all to do so. If we stopped exercising freedom of speech, we would eventually lose it because it would be defined away from us. Freedom of religion fits the same category. If we don't exercise our freedom of religion, it becomes redefined away from us. How about freedom of the press? I would submit, Madam Speaker, that those who abuse freedom of the press, those who do not have journalistic integrity, are undermining our First Amendment right. If every newspaper out there printed things that they knew were dishonest, if they just drove purely a political agenda on the front page, on the side where they're held accountable for journalism, or in their commentary when they print falsehoods as fact, it undermines all of our freedom, because when someone abuses a freedom, they diminish that freedom for all of us.

Now, think in terms of this—if that's hard to understand for some folks, Madam Speaker, I'll put it this way: If

everybody went out there and abused the Second Amendment right, it wouldn't be long before we wouldn't have the right to keep and bear arms, regardless of what the Constitution says. We have to utilize those rights, and we have to exercise them in a responsible way. The abuse of God-given rights, the abuse of these rights, especially in the Bill of Rights, undermines the rights that we have.

But we do have freedom of speech, religion, and the press and assembly. If we stopped exercising them, we would lose them. We have the right to keep and bear arms, not for hunting, not for target, not for self-defense, and not for collection. All of those four reasons to keep and bear arms are—I'll say they are additional rights; it's just the bonus that comes along with it because our Founding Fathers understood that a well-armed populace was a protection against tyranny. I agree with that and defend the Second Amendment because that is what allows us to defend ourselves against tyrants.

You can go on up through the Bill of Rights, the right to property in the Fifth Amendment—nor shall private property be taken for public use without just compensation. The Kelo decision took that phrase out of there, “for public use.” I think one day, a Supreme Court, if we raise an adequate objection, will have to go back and revisit the Kelo decision. It was an unjust decision that didn't reflect the language in the Fifth Amendment. Property rights is another core of American exceptionalism.

Without these rights, freedom of speech, religion, and the press, and the Second Amendment rights to keep and bear arms, without property rights, without being tried by a jury of our peers and the right to face our accusers, without the concepts of federalism and these enumerated powers in the Constitution, that being reserved for the Congress and the balance of them that revert to the States or the people respectively, without those components, we would not have emerged as the country that we are. We can't sustain ourselves as a country that we are to be if we don't protect those pillars of American exceptionalism.

In the core of those pillars of American exceptionalism is, as I said earlier, the rule of law. When the rule of law is usurped by a king or a despot or a President of the United States, it diminishes us all, and it diminishes the potential destiny of the United States of America. We've seen, as the President of the United States has decided, that he will enforce the law that he sees fit, and he will not enforce the law that he doesn't agree with. And it's clear in a number of ways, Madam Speaker. The President suspended No Child Left Behind. He won't enforce that. He essentially has waived it off the books.

Now, he took an oath to take care that the laws be faithfully executed. That is in the Constitution, and it's a

requirement. He took the oath, he understands it, he taught constitutional law, but he simply set aside No Child Left Behind. It isn't the issue that I'm advocating here; it is that a President must take care that the laws be faithfully executed.

Behind that, he suspended welfare to work. In the middle 1990s, there were three times that President Clinton vetoed the welfare reform law. He finally signed it and took credit for it—okay, that's politics—but one component of that was welfare to work. And only one of all of our more than 80 different means-tested welfare programs that we have, or a minimum of 80 different means-tested welfare programs that we have, of all of them, there's only one, Madam Speaker, that requires work. That one is the TANF program, Temporary Assistance for Needy Families. And it says in there that it specifically prohibits the President from suspending or waiving the work requirement. The President did so anyway.

Sticking with this rule of law that has been so damaged by our President, it's also true with immigration law. The immigration law requires that people who are in violation of it be put into the process for deportation. The President has decided he won't do that. Now, it's one thing to have prosecutorial discretion. I agree that the executive branch has to be able to decide which highest priorities are there for the resources of law enforcement. But when the executive branch—the prosecutorial discretion is always on an individual basis, not on a group basis, not on a clear-the-board basis. But look what the President has done. He has issued a memorandum, actually a memorandum that was written by Secretary Napolitano of the Department of Homeland Security, that said that we're not going to enforce immigration law. So I'm here to endorse the rule of law and stand up and defend the Constitution. I appreciate your attention.

I yield back the balance of my time.

SUFFERING UNDER SEQUESTRATION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2013, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GOHMERT) for 30 minutes.

Mr. GOHMERT. Madam Speaker, the sequestration has taken place that we were told a year and a half ago would not. The President said during the debates last fall it would not, but it has taken place, as the President traveled around the country demonizing those of us back here that were hoping for a better way to cut, hoping that something could be reached in the way of an agreement that would have given more flexibility, but that didn't happen. People were too busy going off doing other things to be here in Washington with us and work out some kind of an agreement.

One bit of good news, though: We had heard from the Secretary of Homeland

Security that the lines would be long in the airport, there would be delays and there would be all kinds of problems. Initially, it was announced that FAA officials would be pulled from between 150 to 200 airports. They were going to make America feel as much pain as possible. But with all the tough news for travelers, we can all be comforted. This is dated March 5, a story by Elizabeth Harrington: The TSA was able to seal a \$50-million sequester-eve deal to buy new uniforms.

So the lines will be longer traveling. We are told by Homeland Security they are going to make America feel pain because we managed to cut less than 2 percent of government spending when it's increased over 20 percent over the last 4 years, when every American who works and pays taxes had their taxes go up 2 percent on January 1. This was merely taxes going up 2 percent, giving basically a tax on government for 2 percent, the same one America suffered.

□ 1620

That is the same amount basically, and yet we have officials in this administration who say, Oh, no. We can't stand a 2 percent cut. Heck, here at the House itself, our budgets have been cut 11½ percent over the last 2 years. We did it. And you've got TSA, you've got FAA, you've got Homeland Security, you've got people being released from custody that will put American citizens in jeopardy all to make the point that we can't live with a 2 percent cut like every hardworking American taxpayer has. At least we know that TSA will have new uniforms while the lines are getting longer.

It also is worth noting a story here by Terence Jeffrey March 4 of this year, that President Obama borrowed nearly six times as much in February as the sequester cuts all year. I recall in 2006, the last year Republicans were in the majority before Speaker PELOSI took the gavel, Democrats on this side of the aisle appropriately beat up Republicans because we had a budget, an appropriations that year that spent \$160 billion more than we brought in, and we should have gotten it balanced. They were right.

I would never have dreamed that within a few years and with a Democrat in the White House, with a Democratic majority in the House and a Democratic majority in the Senate, that they wouldn't spend \$160 billion more than we took in; they'd spend \$1.6 trillion more than we took in. And here, with all the gloom and doom and claims of how bad it's going to be—oh, it's going to be horrible—we find out that the President borrowed \$253.5 billion in one month, the shortest month of the year, February, six times more than the sequester was with all the complaints.

I have an interesting story here in Townhall.com by Heather Ginsberg: "President Obama's Golf Trip Could Have Saved 341 Furloughed Jobs." She

goes on to outline the millions of dollars it cost for the last golf outing. That's pretty tragic.

I think we have one of the most gracious and graceful First Ladies that we've ever had. She made a wonderful quote previously. She said:

This is really what the White House is all about. It's the people's house. It's a place that is steeped in history, but it's also a place where everyone should feel welcome. And that's why my husband and I have made it our mission to open up the house to as many people as we can.

That was our First Lady, and that was a wonderful position to take.

So I'm sure she was not consulted today when the White House in its frustration that all of us in Congress—heck, the cut we are having in Congress is going to put us around a 20 percent cut of our budget in the House. The Senate hadn't cut themselves 11½ percent like we have, but we will have cut our own budget in the House of Representatives in every office at least 20 percent in 3 years' time. The President, even though his government has grown about 20 percent in 4 years, could not live with just pulling back 2 percent of that 20 percent increase.

So, today, as the story indicates from today—this is from the Washington Examiner:

Never say the White House isn't affected by sequestration. The Visitors Office just notified Congress that tours of the White House are canceled until further notice.

Due to staffing reductions resulting from sequestration, we regret to inform you that White House Tours will be canceled effective Saturday, March 9, 2013 until further notice, the White House email to legislative offices explains. Unfortunately, we will not be able to reschedule affected tours. We very much regret having to take this action, particularly during the popular spring touring season.

Well, knowing that, as the story reports here, we could have had 341 Federal employees that could have kept their jobs and not been furloughed if the President had not taken his last golf outing. It seems to me that since there are so many people coming to Washington—it appears to me as many Democrats as Republicans, possibly more—they have wanted, they have counted on the quote from the first lady. They were so looking forward to touring the White House.

I filed an amendment with the Rules Committee this afternoon so that we can work together. The amendment to the continuing resolution of funds—and I'm hoping and begging and pleading that the Rules Committee will make this amendment in order. It's an amendment to H.R. 933 offered by Mr. GOHMERT of Texas:

At the end of division C (before the short title), insert the following:

None of the funds made available by a division of this act may be used to transport the President to or from a golf course until public tours of the White House resume.

That way we will both work together so the President will not be able to take a golf outing that causes 341 more Federal officials to be furloughed and

lose their job, at least temporarily. Then perhaps by avoiding furloughing all these Federal employees, we'll be able to get the Democrats and Republicans across America, people that didn't even have a party because they're just Americans, they'll be able to get their tour of the White House, and all it will cost is one or two golf trips less.

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

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 4 o'clock and 27 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1736

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. WOODALL) at 5 o'clock and 36 minutes p.m.

HOUR OF MEETING ON TOMORROW

Mr. COLE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet at 10 a.m. tomorrow.

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

There was no objection.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 933, DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE, MILITARY CONSTRUCTION AND VETERANS AFFAIRS, AND FULL-YEAR CONTINUING APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2013

Mr. COLE, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 113-12) on the resolution (H. Res. 99) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 933) making appropriations for the Department of Defense, the Department of Veterans Affairs, and other departments and agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2013, and for other purposes, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

Karen L. Haas, Clerk of the House, reported and found truly enrolled a bill of the House of the following title, which was thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H.R. 307. An act to reauthorize certain programs under the Public Health Service Act and the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act with respect to public health security and all-hazards preparedness and response, and for other purposes.

ADJOURNMENT

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

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 37 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, March 6, 2013, at 10 a.m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

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

576. A letter from the Chief Counsel, FEMA, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule—Final Flood Elevation Determinations (St. Helena Parish, LA, 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.

577. A letter from the Chief Counsel, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule—Final Flood Elevation Determinations (Unincorporated Areas of Craven County, North Carolina) [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.

578. A letter from the Chair, Advisory Council on Alzheimer's Research, Care, and Services, transmitting the 2013 Recommendations of the Public Members of the Advisory Council on Alzheimer's Research, Care, and Services to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

579. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting fiscal year 2012 Performance Report to Congress for the Animal Drug User Fee Act to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

580. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting fiscal year 2012 Performance Report to Congress for the Animal Generic Drug User Fee Act to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

581. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting Transmittal of D.C. ACT 19-479, "Compassionate Release Authorization Amendment Act of 2012" to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

582. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting Transmittal of D.C. ACT 19-654, "Council Notification on Enforcement of Laws Amendment Act of 2012" to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

583. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting Transmittal of D.C. ACT 19-649, "Schedule H Property Tax Relief Act of 2012" to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

584. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting Transmittal of D.C. ACT 19-655, "Retail Incentive Amendment Act of 2012" to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

585. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting Transmittal of D.C. ACT 19-652, "Israel Senior Residences Tax Exemption Act of 2012" to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

586. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting Transmittal of D.C. ACT 19-656, "Sign Regulation Authorization Amendment Act of 2012" to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

587. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting

Transmittal of D.C. ACT 19-657, "Re-entry Facilitation Amendment Act of 2012" to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

588. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting Transmittal of D.C. ACT 19-653, "Washington Metropolitan Area Transit Authority Board of Directors Act of 2012" to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

589. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting Transmittal of D.C. ACT 19-658, "Motorized Bicycle Amendment Act of 2012" to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

590. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting Transmittal of D.C. ACT 19-659, "Service Animals Access Amendment Act of 2012" to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

591. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting Transmittal of D.C. ACT 19-668, "Workplace Fraud Amendment Act of 2012" to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

592. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting Transmittal of D.C. ACT 19-660, "Bloomingdale and LeDroit Park Backwater Valve and Sandbag Act of 2012" to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

593. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting Transmittal of D.C. ACT 19-667, "Uniform Commercial Code Revision Act of 2012" to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

594. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting Transmittal of D.C. ACT 19-661, "District of Columbia Flood Assistance Fund Act of 2012" to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

595. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting Transmittal of D.C. ACT 19-662, "Construction and Demolition Waste Recycling Accountability Act of 2012" to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

596. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting Transmittal of D.C. ACT 19-666, "Bad Actor Debarment and Suspension Amendment Act of 2012" to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

597. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting Transmittal of D.C. ACT 19-663, "Administrative Disposition for Weapons Offenses Amendment Act of 2012" to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

598. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting Transmittal of D.C. ACT 19-664, "United House of Prayer for All People Real Property Tax Exemption Technical Temporary Act of 2012" to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

599. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting Transmittal of D.C. ACT 19-665, "Beulah Baptist Church Real Property Equitable Tax Relief Temporary Act of 2013" to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

600. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting Transmittal of D.C. ACT 19-651, "State Board of Education Personnel Authority Amendment Act of 2012" to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

601. A letter from the Human Resources Specialist, Department of Defense, transmitting nineteen reports pursuant to the Fed-

eral Vacancies Reform Act of 1998 to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

602. A letter from the Director, Administrative Office of the United States Courts, transmitting a copy of the Report of the Judicial Conference of the United States for the September 2012 session to the Committee on the Judiciary.

603. A letter from the Federal Register and Regulatory Liaison Officer, National Aeronautics and Space Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule—NASA Information Security Protection [Document No.: NASA-2012-0006] (RIN: 2700-AD61) received February 20, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology.

604. A letter from the Chief, Border Security Regulations Branch, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule—Modification of the Port Limits of Green Bay, WI [Docket No.: USCBP-2011-0031] (CBP Dec. 13-2) received February 22, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

605. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule—Revised Exhibit: Sample Notice to Interested Parties (Announcement 2013-15) received February 22, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. ISSA: Committee on Oversight and Government Reform. Billions on Oversight and Government Reform. Billions of Federal Tax Dollars Misspent on New York's Medicaid Program (Rept. 113-11). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. COLE: Committee on rules. H. Res. 99. A resolution providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 933) making appropriations for the Department of Defense, the Department of Veterans Affairs, and other departments and agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2013, and for other purposes (Rept. 113-12). Referred to the House Calendar.

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. KING of Iowa (for himself, Mrs. BACHMANN, Mr. BACHUS, Mr. BARR, Mr. BARTON, Mrs. BLACK, Mr. BONNER, Mr. BOUSTANY, Mr. BRADY of Texas, Mr. BROWN of Georgia, Mr. BUCSHON, Mr. CHABOT, Mr. COLE, Mr. COTTON, Mr. CRAMER, Mr. CRAWFORD, Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina, Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee, Mr. FINCHER, Mr. FLEMING, Ms. FOXX, Mr. GARDNER, Mr. GINGREY of Georgia, Mr. GOHMERT, Mr. GOODLATTE, Mr. GOSAR, Mr. GRAVES of Georgia, Mr. GRIFFIN of Arkansas, Mr. GRIFFITH of Virginia, Mr. HARPER, Mr. HARRIS, Mr. HUELSKAMP, Mr. HUIZENGA of Michigan, Ms. JENKINS, Mr. JORDAN, Mr. LAMALFA, Mr. LAMBORN, Mr. LONG, Mrs. LUMMIS, Mr. McCLINTOCK, Mr. MEADOWS, Mr. MULVANEY, Mr.

NUGENT, Mr. NUNNELEE, Mr. PALAZZO, Mr. PERRY, Mr. PITTINGER, Mr. POE of Texas, Mr. ROE of Tennessee, Mr. ROSS, Mr. SALMON, Mr. SCALISE, Mr. SCHWEIKERT, Mr. STOCKMAN, Mr. WALBERG, Mr. WESTMORELAND, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, and Mr. YOHO):

H.R. 946. A bill to preserve and protect the free choice of individual employees to form, join, or assist labor organizations, or to refrain from such activities; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. SCHOCK (for himself and Mr. THOMPSON of California):

H.R. 947. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to expand the availability of the cash method of accounting for small businesses, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. REED (for himself, Mr. DOGGETT, Mr. REICHERT, Mr. LEWIS, Mr. BOUSTANY, Mr. YOUNG of Indiana, Mr. GRIFFIN of Arkansas, Mr. RENACCI, Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. TIBERI, and Mr. PAULSEN):

H.R. 948. A bill to establish consistent requirements for the electronic content and format of data used in the administration of certain human services programs under the Social Security Act; to the Committee on Ways and Means, 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. RAHALL (for himself, Mr. DEFAZIO, Ms. NORTON, Mr. NADLER, Ms. BROWN of Florida, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. LARSEN of Washington, Mr. CAPUANO, Mr. BISHOP of New York, Mr. MICHAUD, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. WALZ, Mr. COHEN, Mr. SIREN, Ms. EDWARDS, Mr. GARAMENDI, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Mr. NOLAN, Mrs. KIRKPATRICK, Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York, Ms. ESTY, Mrs. BUSTOS, Mr. LOEBSACK, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. HIGGINS, Mr. PETERS of Michigan, Mr. VISLOSKEY, and Mr. CICILLINE):

H.R. 949. A bill to ensure that transportation and infrastructure projects carried out using Federal financial assistance are constructed with steel, iron, and manufactured goods that are produced in the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, and in addition to the Committee on 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. FARENTHOLD:

H.R. 950. A bill to require the Director of the Office of Management and Budget to send a report to Congress indicating how amounts could be transferred within agencies and departments for fiscal year 2013 to avoid all furloughs or reductions in force; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. POLIS (for himself, Ms. DELAURO, Mr. CONYERS, Ms. DEGETTE, Mr. GRIJALVA, Ms. MOORE, Ms. NORTON, Mr. LANGEVIN, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Ms. BROWN of Florida, Mr. SIREN, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mr. LEWIS, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. ELLISON, Mr. GARAMENDI, Mr. CICILLINE, Mr. MORAN, and Ms. WATERS):

H.R. 951. A bill to promote the economic self-sufficiency of low-income women

through their increased participation in high-wage, high-demand occupations where they currently represent 25 percent or less of the workforce; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. SWALWELL of California:

H.R. 952. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow small businesses to defer the payment of certain employment taxes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GRAYSON:

H.R. 953. A bill to improve security at State and local courthouses; to the Committee on the Judiciary, 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 Ms. BONAMICI (for herself, Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. RUSH, and Mrs. DAVIS of California):

H.R. 954. A bill to amend the Workforce Investment Act of 1998 to provide for the establishment of the Small Business Liaison Pilot Program; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. RUSH (for himself and Ms. KAPTUR):

H.R. 955. A bill to increase public safety by punishing and deterring firearms trafficking; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KIND:

H.R. 956. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to treat certain amounts paid for physical activity, fitness, and exercise as amounts paid for medical care; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mrs. LUMMIS (for herself, Mr. HIMES, Ms. BONAMICI, Mr. MCCARTHY of California, and Mr. COOK):

H.R. 957. A bill to reduce temporarily the royalty required to be paid for sodium produced on Federal lands, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. LARSEN of Washington (for himself, Ms. BONAMICI, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Ms. BROWNLEY of California, Ms. CHU, Mr. CONYERS, Mrs. DAVIS of California, Ms. DELBENE, Ms. HANABUSA, Mr. HECK of Washington, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Ms. NORTON, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. STIVERS, and Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ):

H.R. 958. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to improve the reproductive assistance provided by the Department of Veterans Affairs to severely wounded, ill, or injured veterans and their spouses, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, and in addition to the Committees on the Budget, and Armed 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. WHITFIELD (for himself, Mr. BARROW of Georgia, Mr. GRIFFITH of Virginia, Mr. MCKINLEY, Mr. MURPHY of Pennsylvania, Mrs. ELLMERS, Mr. POMPEO, Mr. BURGESS, Mr. TERRY, Mr. GUTHRIE, and Mr. OLSON):

H.R. 959. A bill to prohibit the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency from awarding any grant, contract, cooperative agreement, or other financial assistance under section 103 of the Clean Air Act for any program, project, or activity to occur outside the United States and its territories and possessions; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, 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 con-

sideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. GRIMM (for himself, Mr. KING of New York, Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York, and Mr. MEEKS):

H.R. 960. A bill to amend the National Flood Insurance Act of 1968 to provide relief from increased flood insurance premium rates for homes in disaster areas; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. LYNCH:

H.R. 961. A bill to amend title 5, United States Code, to provide for the computation of normal-cost percentage for postal employees as a separate and distinct class, and to provide for the disposition of certain excess retirement contributions made by the United States Postal Service; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mrs. DAVIS of California (for herself and Mr. VELA):

H.R. 962. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to reduce the incidence of diabetes among Medicare beneficiaries; 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 Ms. DEGETTE (for herself and Mr. STIVERS):

H.R. 963. A bill to assist low-income individuals in obtaining medically recommended dental care; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Ms. DEGETTE (for herself and Mr. COFFMAN):

H.R. 964. A bill to amend the Controlled Substances Act to provide that Federal law shall not preempt State law; to the Committee on the Judiciary, 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. GUTIERREZ:

H.R. 965. A bill to prohibit the possession or transfer of junk guns, also known as Saturday Night Specials; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Ms. HANABUSA (for herself, Ms. GABBARD, Mr. HONDA, Mr. TAKANO, Mr. FALCOMA, Ms. CHU, Mr. SABLON, and Mr. FARR):

H.R. 966. A bill to exempt children of certain Filipino World War II veterans from the numerical limitations on immigrant visas and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. LUMMIS (for herself, Mr. SMITH of Texas, and Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas):

H.R. 967. A bill to amend the High-Performance Computing Act of 1991 to authorize activities for support of networking and information technology research, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology.

By Ms. MATSUI:

H.R. 968. A bill to amend the National Flood Insurance Act of 1968 to allow the rebuilding, without elevation, of certain structures located in special flood hazard zones that are damaged by fire, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. PRICE of Georgia (for himself, Mr. BOUSTANY, Mr. ROE of Tennessee, Mrs. BLACKBURN, and Mr. CASSIDY):

H.R. 969. A bill to prohibit conditioning licensure of a health care provider upon participation in a health plan; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. MICHAUD:

H.R. 970. A bill to amend part D of title IV of the Social Security Act to prohibit States

from charging child support recipients for the collection of child support; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PAULSEN (for himself and Mr. MCHENRY):

H.R. 971. A bill to prohibit the sale or trade to another community of community development block grant award amounts; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia:

H.R. 972. A bill to protect individual privacy against unwarranted governmental intrusion through the use of the unmanned aerial vehicles commonly called drones, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SENSENBRENNER (for himself, Mr. CHABOT, Mr. PALAZZO, Mr. HARPER, Mr. BACHUS, Mr. KING of Iowa, Mr. TIBERI, Mr. BOUSTANY, Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio, Mr. MULVANEY, Mr. HUIZENGA of Michigan, Mr. RIBBLE, Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee, Mr. CARTER, Mr. NUGENT, Mr. CONAWAY, Mr. PETRI, Mr. AMODEI, Mr. LANKFORD, Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mr. WESTMORELAND, Mr. FITZPATRICK, Mrs. BLACK, Mr. MARINO, Mr. GINGREY of Georgia, Mr. MILLER of Florida, Mr. JORDAN, Mr. WALBERG, Mr. BARLETTA, Mr. FORBES, and Mr. DUFFY):

H.R. 973. A bill to exempt employers from any excise tax and certain suits and penalties in the case of a failure of a group health plan to provide coverage to which an employer objects on the basis of religious belief or moral conviction; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committees on Ways and Means, and Education and the Workforce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. SIREs (for himself, Mr. SMITH of Washington, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Ms. HAHN, Ms. BROWN of Florida, and Mrs. NAPOLITANO):

H.R. 974. A bill to amend titles 23 and 49, United States Code, to establish national policies and programs to strengthen freight-related infrastructure, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. WALZ (for himself, Mr. JONES, Ms. TSONGAS, Mr. ROONEY, Ms. PINGREE of Maine, and Mr. DENHAM):

H.R. 975. A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to extend the duration of the Physical Disability Board of Review and to expand the authority of such Board to review of the separation of members of the Armed Forces on the basis of a mental condition not amounting to disability, including separation on the basis of a personality or adjustment disorder; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. WOMACK (for himself, Mr. GRIFFIN of Arkansas, Mr. CRAWFORD, Mr. COTTON, Mr. CONAWAY, Mr. HARRIS, Mr. ADERHOLT, Mr. ROGERS of Alabama, Mr. KINGSTON, Mr. WESTMORELAND, Mr. JONES, Mr. MULVANEY, Mr. COLE, Mr. CRAMER, Mr. SCALISE, and Mr. LONG):

H.R. 976. A bill to declare that certain agency actions by the National Labor Relations Board shall have no force or effect until final disposition is made in certain actions relating to the appointment of individuals to such Board that are pending in Federal court, and to prohibit further actions by such Board until such time; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. KING of New York (for himself, Mr. MEEKS, Mr. STOCKMAN, Mr. GRIMM, and Mr. BISHOP of New York):

H. Con. Res. 21. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress that John Ar-

thur "Jack" Johnson should receive a posthumous pardon for the racially motivated conviction in 1913 that diminished the athletic, cultural, and historic significance of Jack Johnson and unduly tarnished his reputation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DUFFY (for himself and Mr. MICHAUD):

H. Res. 97. A resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives that the Federal Government should take all appropriate measures to ensure that citizens continue to be provided with paper-based information, products and services, and public notices while providing, where appropriate, the ability for all citizens to opt-in to electronic delivery if they so chose; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. GOSAR (for himself, Mr. BROWN of Georgia, Mr. COFFMAN, Mr. CONAWAY, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Mr. GRIFFITH of Virginia, Mr. LANCE, Mr. LONG, Mr. MICA, Mr. SALMON, Mr. STIVERS, Mr. PALAZZO, and Mr. WESTMORELAND):

H. Res. 98. A resolution expressing support for Israel and its right to self-defense against the illegal nuclear program by the Islamic Republic of Iran; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. GRIJALVA:

H. Res. 100. A resolution supporting the goals and ideals of National Middle Level Education Month; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Ms. NORTON:

H. Res. 101. A resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives that the United States Postal Service should issue a commemorative postage stamp in 2015 to honor Constantino Brumidi, Artist of the Capitol, and to commemorate the 150th anniversary of his completion of "The Apotheosis of Washington" in the eye of the dome of the Capitol, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Ms. NORTON:

H. Res. 102. A resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives supporting the Federal workforce; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XII,

Mr. MARKEY introduced a bill (H.R. 977) for the relief of Esther Karinge; 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. KING of Iowa:

H.R. 946.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This Act erases the forced-dues clauses in the National Labor Relations Act (NLRA) and Railway Labor Act (RLA). As such, this bill makes specific changes to existing law in a manner that returns power to the States and to the People, in accordance with Amendment X of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. SCHOCK:

H.R. 947.

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 as stated in Article I, Section 7 and Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. REED:

H.R. 948.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1 of the United States Constitution, to "provide for the common Defence and general Welfare of the United States."

By Mr. RAHALL:

H.R. 949.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 and Clause 18 of the Constitution.

By Mr. FARENTHOLD:

H.R. 950.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18

By Mr. POLIS:

H.R. 951.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 1, All legislative Powers herein granted shall be vested in a Congress of the United States, which shall consist of a Senate and House of Representatives.

By Mr. SWALWELL of California:

H.R. 952.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8; Sixteenth Amendment

By Mr. GRAYSON:

H.R. 953.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3

'The Congress shall have Power . . . To regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes.'

By Ms. BONAMICI:

H.R. 954.

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. RUSH:

H.R. 955.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3

'The Congress shall have Power . . . To regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with Indian Tribes.'

By Mr. KIND:

H.R. 956.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I Section 8.

By Mrs. LUMMIS:

H.R. 957.

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. LARSEN of Washington:

H.R. 958.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

As described in Article 1, Section 1 "all legislative powers herein granted shall be vested in a Congress."

By Mr. WHITFIELD:

H.R. 959.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section 8, Clause 3
The Congress shall have Power To regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes.

By Mr. GRIMM:

H.R. 960.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, section 8, clause 1; and Article I, section 8, clause 3

By Mr. LYNCH:

H.R. 961.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section 8, Clause 18

By Mrs. DAVIS of California:

H.R. 962.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section 8

By Ms. DEGETTE:

H.R. 963.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 of the United States Constitution and Article I, Section 8, Clause 18 of the United States Constitution.

By Ms. DEGETTE:

H.R. 964.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Amendment X to the Constitution of the United States.

By Mr. GUTIERREZ:

H.R. 965.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 of the United States Constitution.

By Ms. HANABUSA:

H.R. 966.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Clause 4 of Section 8 of Article I of the Constitution, which grants Congress the power "[t]o establish a uniform Rule of Naturalization . . . throughout the United States."

By Mrs. LUMMIS:

H.R. 967.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 "To regulate commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes;" and 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. MATSUI:

H.R. 968.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article 1, Section 8, Clause 3

By Mr. PRICE of Georgia:

H.R. 969.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Current law has created an unconstitutional regulatory structure over the health care system. In order to make this system more compatible with a proper Constitutional structure, this bill will ensure that there is less regulation impeding the doctor-patient relationship.

By Mr. MICHAUD:

H.R. 970.
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. PAULSEN:

H.R. 971.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article 1 Section 8

By Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia:

H.R. 972.
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. Article I, Section 8, Clause 18: The Congress shall have Power to make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the forgoing 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. SENSENBRENNER:
H.R. 973.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section 7 of the U.S. Constitution, which provides that "All bills for raising Revenue shall originate in the House of Representatives; but the Senate may propose or concur with amendments as on other Bills."

By Mr. SIRES:

H.R. 974.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
This bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. WALZ:

H.R. 975.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section 8, Clause 14
To make rules for the Government and Regulation of the land and naval Forces.

By Mr. WOMACK:

H.R. 976.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article 1, Section 8 of the United States Constitution

By Mr. MARKEY:

H.R. 977.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Clause 3 of Section 8 of Article 1 of the Constitution and Clause 4 of Section 8 of Article 1 of the Constitution.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions as follows:

- H.R. 104: Mr. GERLACH, Mr. WENSTRUP, and Mr. ROSS.
- H.R. 146: Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN.
- H.R. 163: Mr. KILDEE.
- H.R. 164: Mr. RUSH, Mr. JONES, and Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania.
- H.R. 176: Mr. STIVERS and Mr. NUNNELEE.
- H.R. 182: Mr. HIGGINS and Mr. SCHIFF.
- H.R. 184: Mr. LIPINSKI and Mr. PETERS of Michigan.
- H.R. 207: Mr. CARTER, Mr. STUTZMAN, and Mr. YODER.
- H.R. 236: Ms. ESTY.
- H.R. 274: Ms. TSONGAS, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, and Ms. SLAUGHTER.
- H.R. 285: Mr. CLEAVER.
- H.R. 292: Mr. CONNOLLY.
- H.R. 300: Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN, Mr. TIPTON, and Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York.

H.R. 303: Mr. STEWART, Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York, Ms. BROWNLEY of California, Mr. JONES, Mr. PEARCE, Mr. BURGESS, and Mr. O'ROURKE.

- H.R. 311: Mr. ALEXANDER.
- H.R. 318: Mr. REED.
- H.R. 329: Mr. LANCE.
- H.R. 334: Mr. STIVERS.
- H.R. 338: Mrs. CHRISTENSEN.
- H.R. 346: Mr. JORDAN, Mr. KLINE, Mr. ROONEY, Mr. LABRADOR, Mr. WENSTRUP, Mr. CRAMER, and Mr. YOHO.
- H.R. 351: Mr. YODER, Mr. MESSER, and Mr. HASTINGS of Washington.
- H.R. 366: Ms. ESTY, Mr. DUFFY, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Mr. POLIS, Mr. CONNOLLY, Ms. BONAMICI, and Mr. CÁRDENAS.
- H.R. 367: Mr. FARENTHOLD.
- H.R. 445: Mr. LOEBSACK and Mr. BRALEY of Iowa.
- H.R. 503: Mr. SESSIONS and Mr. STIVERS.
- H.R. 519: Mr. LARSEN of Washington, Ms. SLAUGHTER, and Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia.
- H.R. 523: Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN and Mr. YODER.
- H.R. 543: Mr. REED, Mr. NUGENT, Mr. O'ROURKE, Mr. GUTHRIE, and Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York.
- H.R. 544: Mr. COTTON and Mr. PITTENGER.
- H.R. 565: Mr. MCGOVERN.
- H.R. 567: Mr. GRAVES of Georgia.
- H.R. 569: Mr. GRIFFIN of Arkansas.
- H.R. 570: Mr. GRIFFIN of Arkansas and Mr. RAHALL.
- H.R. 594: Mr. LOEBSACK, Mr. LUETKEMEYER, Mr. TIERNEY, Mr. SMITH of Washington, Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. WHITFIELD, and Mr. KIND.
- H.R. 599: Mr. CONYERS.
- H.R. 609: Mr. PRICE of North Carolina.
- H.R. 616: Mr. CICILLINE and Mr. LARSEN of Washington.
- H.R. 621: Mr. STIVERS and Mr. LONG.
- H.R. 627: Mr. DINGELL.
- H.R. 628: Mr. RAHALL and Ms. SCHAKOWSKY.
- H.R. 633: Mr. POLIS.
- H.R. 636: Ms. JACKSON LEE, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. KEATING, Ms. ESHOO, Mr. SWALWELL of California, Mr. GALLEGRO, Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, and Ms. SPEIER.
- H.R. 647: Mr. KEATING, Mr. BARLETTA, Mr. HIMES, Mr. LANGEVIN, and Mr. PAYNE.
- H.R. 650: Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, Ms. CLARKE, and Mr. CARSON of Indiana.
- H.R. 656: Mr. STIVERS.
- H.R. 670: Mr. SABLAN.
- H.R. 696: Ms. TITUS.
- H.R. 725: Mr. MCGOVERN, Ms. DELAURO, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, and Mr. PRICE of North Carolina.
- H.R. 730: Mr. OWENS.
- H.R. 749: Mrs. MILLER of Michigan, Ms. TSONGAS, Mr. KING of Iowa, Mr. JONES, Mr. WELCH, and Mr. LONG.
- H.R. 755: Ms. BROWNLEY of California, Mr. DUFFY, Mrs. ROBY, Mr. LANCE, Mr. GRIJALVA, and Mr. RUSH.
- H.R. 769: Mr. PASTOR of Arizona, Ms. BASS, Mr. YARMUTH, Mr. GUTIERREZ, Mr. WATT, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Mr. COHEN, Mr. BRALEY of Iowa, Ms. TITUS, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Ms. CASTOR of Florida, Mr. BISHOP of New York, Mr. VARGAS, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, and Mr. PAYNE.
- H.R. 792: Mr. HOLDING, Mr. NUGENT, and Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky.
- H.R. 794: Mr. WITTMAN.
- H.R. 795: Mr. YOHO.
- H.R. 798: Mr. PETERS of Michigan, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. CICILLINE, Ms. FUDGE, Mr. LEVIN, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mr. NADLER, Ms. BONAMICI, Mr. COURTNEY, Mr. FARR, Ms. TSONGAS, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. ENYART, Mr. YARMUTH, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Mrs. DAVIS of California, Mr. ANDREWS and Mr. POLIS.
- H.R. 800: Mr. GARDNER, Mr. RUSH, Mr. CROWLEY, Mr. MEEKS, Mr. MARCHANT, Mr. SCHOCK, and Mr. ISRAEL.

H.R. 807: Mr. PITTS, Mr. POSEY, Mr. BARR, Mr. OLSON, Mrs. BLACK, Mr. GRIFFIN of Arkansas, Mr. BROUN of Georgia, Mr. YODER, Mr. STUTZMAN, Mr. LONG, and Mr. PITTENGER.

H.R. 824: Mr. HUIZENGA of Michigan and Mr. ROE of Tennessee.

H.R. 826: Mr. FINCHER.

H.R. 828: Mr. RADEL and Mr. LANKFORD.

H.R. 833: Mr. NUNNELEE, Mr. CONNOLLY, Mr. GIBSON, Mrs. ROBY, Mr. STIVERS, Mr. PITTENGER, Mr. CRAWFORD, Ms. PINGREE of Maine, Mr. RUNYAN, Mrs. BACHMANN, Ms. SINEMA, and Mr. SIMPSON.

H.R. 839: Mr. HUNTER and Mr. SIRES.

H.R. 845: Mr. WELCH.

H.R. 846: Mr. GIBSON, Mr. SIMPSON, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. CROWLEY, Mr. BARLETTA, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Mr. WITTMAN, Mr. PITTENGER, Mr. CASSIDY, and Mr. POE of Texas.

H.R. 850: Mr. TIPTON, Ms. TITUS, Mr. BACHUS, Mr. HUIZENGA of Michigan, Mr. MURPHY of Pennsylvania, Mr. ROSKAM, Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN, Mr. SCHWEIKERT, Mr. NEUGEBAUER, Mr. LONG, Mr. STIVERS, Ms. HAHN, Mr. WAL-

DEN, Mr. GARRETT, Mr. WALBERG, Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. QUIGLEY, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Ms. BASS, Mr. DIAZ-BALART, Mr. FINCHER, Mr. HULTGREN, Mr. PEARCE, Mr. BURGESS, Mr. RICE of South Carolina, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. BARR, Mrs. MILLER of Michigan, Mr. LUETKEMEYER, Mr. MARCHANT, and Mr. GRIMM.

H.R. 853: Mr. COSTA, Mr. VALADAO, Mr. VARGAS, Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mr. DESANTIS, and Mr. MICA.

H.R. 879: Mr. STUTZMAN and Mr. WALDEN.

H.R. 890: Mr. GRIFFIN of Arkansas, Mr. GRAVES of Georgia, Mr. YOUNG of Indiana, Mr. PAULSEN, Ms. JENKINS, and Mr. REICHERT.

H.R. 900: Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mr. CARTWRIGHT, Mr. ELLISON, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. PAYNE, and Mrs. CHRISTENSEN.

H.R. 904: Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California, Mr. SCHOCK, Mr. KINZINGER of Illinois, and Mr. CONNOLLY.

H.R. 919: Mr. HOLT.

H.R. 928: Ms. DEGETTE.

H.R. 935: Mr. SIMPSON, Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois, and Mr. RIBBLE.

H.J. Res. 4: Mr. PETERSON and Mr. MCINTYRE.

H.J. Res. 25: Mr. SWALWELL of California and Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas.

H. Con. Res. 9: Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois.

H. Res. 30: Mr. MEEKS, Mr. JEFFRIES, Mr. SWALWELL of California, Mr. HECK of Washington, and Mr. RUSH.

H. Res. 49: Mr. SMITH of Washington.

H. Res. 71: Mr. COLE and Mr. LUCAS.

H. Res. 76: Mr. ROSKAM.

H. Res. 86: Mr. BROUN of Georgia.

H. Res. 87: Mr. POSEY.

H. Res. 94: Mr. BERA.

DELETIONS OF SPONSORS FROM PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were deleted from public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 423: Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, and Mr. STIVERS.