United States of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 113th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 159 WASHINGTON, THURSDAY, APRIL 11, 2013 No. 48

House of Representatives

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

DESIGNATION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

WASHINGTON, DC,
April 11, 2013.

I hereby appoint the Honorable VIRGINIA FOXX 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.

REGULATE THE REGULATORS—THE REINS ACT

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

Mr. POE of Texas. The regulators continue their reign of regulation terror on businesses across America.

Jerry McKinney, from Crosby, Texas, wrote me this:

> I work in the industrial chemical business and I see the result of government regulations like those from the EPA. These cost my company good money, with no positive effects.

Larry, a doctor from Kingwood, Texas, said this to me:

> Small businesses need relief from the ridiculous OSHA standards. Our veterinary practice is having to spend hours and money trying to decipher all the regulations some bureaucrat has dreamed up to justify his job.

Madam Speaker, the fourth branch of government meddles in every aspect of our lives. In the name of saving us from ourselves, the regulators regulate, regulate, and when they're through, they regulate some more, without regard to the consequences of these expensive government mandates. Sometimes they put businesses out of business because of their regulations.

Dana, from southeast Texas, writes me this:

> I owned a business—bought a bowling center, my dream job, in 2007. Was totally unprepared for the amount of regulation and fees and taxes. I employed 32 people. I went bankrupt in October of 2012 because of this. I have the drive and desire and a great business plan for a new business that would employ 20 to 30 people, but I'm not sure I want to dive back into all this.

Michael, from Houston, said:

> Where should I begin? Real estate market is flooded with, yes, new regulations. It seems that banks are prevented from foreclosing on homeowners who are basically living in the house for free for several years.

Susan, a small business owner in Texas, says this:

> Our small business has operated on a shoestring for several years, and we started way back in 1978, but I fear we are at an end. We manufacture 400 products, all made from the same materials. But the new product safety regulations require we certify every product to the tune of about $500 per product, even though they're all made from the same materials. Do the math: $175,000 or more just to get these same products that we've been making since 1978 certified by the Federal Government. Add on the health care fines and the rising cost of gasoline and the rising property and sales taxes and income taxes—well, you know the rest of the story.

Madam Speaker, this ought not to be—regulators putting businesses out of business by dreaming up new, sometimes silly rules that don't solve any problem. The regulators dream up new rules to add to their 100,000 commandments every day.

Regulators regulate. That's what they do. That's what they like to do. But their addiction to power and to new, unnecessary rules must stop. Burdensome, expensive Federal regulations cost $2 trillion a year. What does that mean? That's the same amount of money all American citizens and corporations paid in income tax in 2008—$2 trillion. A lot of money.

Regulators have no concept of the cost of running a business. They don't even understand the rules and business costs that can put some American businesses out of business. So Congress should approve any regulation that reaches a certain cost threshold or has a significant economic impact. That's why I'm an original cosponsor of the REINS Act. The REINS Act requires Congress, the elected, to approve the expensive rules of the unelected or the rules will not take effect. If a new rule affects the economy in the United States over $100 million throughout the country, Congress must approve this new rule or it does not take effect by the rulemakers.

We should make new rules for the rulemakers. That's what our responsibility is. So it's time for Congress to rein in the out-of-control government and start regulating regulators.

And that's just the way it is.

TRIBUTE TO ANNE SMEDINGHOFF

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

Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois. Madam Speaker, on Sunday, April 6, at 11 a.m., America lost five of our best and brightest in Afghanistan when the convoy they were traveling in, along with an Afghan doctor, was attacked by a suicide bomber. One of them, 25-

Printed on recycled paper.

year-old Anne T. Smedinghoff, who grew up in River Forest, Illinois, in the Seventh Congressional District where her family still lives, became the first U.S. State Department officer to die in Afghanistan since the 1970s. She had less than 4 months left to serve in Afghanistan.

Secretary of State Kerry said in Istanbul, where he is on a diplomatic trip:

> A brave American was determined to brighten the light of learning through books written in the native tongue of the students that she had never met, but whom she felt compelled to help, and she was met by cowardly terrorists determined to bring darkness and death to total strangers.

Anne was killed while delivering donated textbooks to children at a new school. For Anne, who could have remained relatively safe in the embassy, delivering these books was essential to her mission, just as appearing on one of the most watched Afghan television shows to explain to the Afghan people the similarities between Eid, a Muslim holiday that celebrates giving and sharing, and Thanksgiving. Both give thanks for life's blessings, and Anne Smedinghoff discussed how she and her family celebrated back at home.

Anne recently worked on a campaign to end gender violence by producing and distributing videos to the press across the country and was rewarded when she and her colleagues saw photographs of Afghan men in markets wearing purple ribbons, a symbol of the campaign.

Her parents, Tom and Mary Beth Smedinghoff, said the foreign service was a calling, and Afghanistan was her second deployment, an assignment for which she had volunteered after a tour in Caracas, Venezuela. She died her parents said, doing a job she thought must be done. They said:

> She particularly enjoyed the opportunity to work directly with the Afghan people, and was always looking for opportunities to reach out and help make a difference in the lives of those living in a country ravaged by war. We are consoled knowing that she was doing what she loved and that she was serving her country by helping to make a positive difference in the world.

Before she joined the State Department, Anne served on the board of directors for the Ulman Cancer Fund for Young Adults' 4K for Cancer program, spending a summer cycling across the United States to raise money and awareness. She was full of life and hope. She rode her bicycle from the Red Sea to the Dead Sea. She was once photographed with a boa constrictor around her neck in South America.

□ 1010

The residents of the Seventh Congressional District join me in honoring her life and work. Her bravery, her focus on using public diplomacy for positive change, her vision of the human potential, wherever it might be, sets a standard that it behooves all of us to try and emulate.

Today a flag is being flown across the United States Capitol in her honor in recognition of her service to our country. My thoughts and prayers are with her parents, brothers, sisters, and friends during these difficult days. She is indeed a hero.

WHO WILL SPEAK FOR UNDERPRIVILEGED WOMEN?

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

Mr. PERRY. I'm wondering who will speak for underprivileged women, not only in the United States, but very particularly in Philadelphia.

I'm here today to talk about an uncomfortable subject which no one seems to want to talk about. It is the Gosnell trial in Philadelphia. The media doesn't want to talk about it—not NBC, CBS, ABC, CNBC, not Fox, and not the leaders of our Nation, not the President. It is uncomfortable, and I'd ask you to bear with me while I read to you some of the testimony that comes from this trial because I feel we must.

This man is charged with killing seven babies and murdering one woman. The prosecutors believe Mr. Gosnell killed hundreds of infants and destroyed the related records so we will never know. Mr. Gosnell ''induced labor, forced the live birth of viable babies in the sixth, seventh, eighth month of pregnancy and then killed those babies by cutting into the back of the neck with scissors and severing their spinal cord.'' He called it ''snipping.'' Sherry West, one of his clinic employees, testified on Monday that one newborn at the clinic was 18 to 24 inches long when it was killed:

> There were scores more. At least one other mother died following an abortion in which Gosnell punctured her uterus and then sent her home. He left an arm and a leg of a partially aborted fetus in the womb of another woman, and then told her he did not need to see her when she became sick days later, having developed a temperature of 106 degrees. He perforated bowels, cervixes, and uteruses. He left women sterile.

The clinic reeked of animal urine. Furniture and blankets were stained with blood, and instruments were not properly sterilized, according to the grand jury report.

These women are the most vulnerable women in our society, and they were, indeed, most likely at their darkest hour. They went to this clinic to seek help, and they did not know that this man was not qualified nor was his staff qualified to perform any of the procedures that they performed:

> There were bags and bottles holding aborted fetuses scattered throughout the building. There were jars lining shelves with severed feet that he kept for no medical purpose.

These women came because they were probably the product of violent home lives, where they felt they had no options. They came to this care provider, who was essentially unregulated. This does fall into the purview of the United States Attorney General because these patients oftentimes traveled across State lines.

This is an isolated incident. It would be disingenuous to think that all caregivers fall into this category because we know that they do not. But we also know that if there is one, there may likely be others, and that is, indeed, sad.

Prosecutors say that none of Gosnell's staff were licensed nurses or doctors and that a 15-year-old student performed anesthesia with potentially lethal narcotics.

Abortions after the 24th week are illegal in Pennsylvania. However, Gosnell allegedly aborted and killed babies in the sixth and seventh month of pregnancy and charged more for bigger babies. He also took extra precautions with white women from the suburbs, according to a grand jury report. He allegedly ushered them into a slightly cleaner area because he thought they would be more likely to file a complaint.

The abortions of the biggest babies allegedly were scheduled for Sundays, when the clinic was closed. The only person allowed to assist with such cases was Gosnell's wife, Pearl Gosnell. She was one of nine employees charged with him as well in this, and she has not obtained a lawyer at this time. He allegedly took the files home with him from the patients that he dealt with and then disposed of them.

I would say this. It gives me great pain and sorrow to have this entered and read into the RECORD. But since the media outlets refuse to cover this because it's uncomfortable, because it might not meet with their agenda, and because many of the leaders of this country refuse to discuss it, I think it's important that we have it read into the RECORD so that this history and their stories don't remain untold—the stories of these women in their most desperate hours, and the stories of these little babies that will never know the privilege of being an American, that will never realize their dream.

I would make this charge today: Mr. President, your silence is deafening. Are you so blind, are you so intractable, are you so extreme that you yourself can't even call this out for what it is, something that is reprehensible? Pro-life or pro-choice, this is reprehensible. As a father, as I am, of two little girls, it is worthy of your attention, it is worthy of your leadership, it is worthy of your direction.

DON'T FILIBUSTER GUN CONTROL LEGISLATION

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

Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas. Today, the bodies of this Congress have an opportunity to save lives. In fact, they have an historic moment. They actually have the ability to act for once after a tragedy of the proportions of

Newtown, having not acted over the years—after Columbine, the theater in Aurora, the horrific tragedy at Virginia Tech, and many, many others, including that of our colleague in Arizona.

So I am hoping that as we stand here today that the right consciences of those who have the opportunity in the other body to pass sensible gun legislation will do so. In order to aid them, to listen to the voices of the people, 50 Members of the United States House of Representatives have asked for those in the other body not to filibuster any gun legislation, but to have an up-or-down vote. The reason we say that is because of the massive numbers of loss of children, some 80 children who die every month by gunshot, the thousands of teenagers who pick up guns to resolve differences, and the million people who were killed by guns since the assassination of Martin Luther King and John F. Kennedy.

This is a Nation that is gunned, but not safe. The tragedy that happened in my area just a few days ago with the slashing of students by another student at a community college. Just imagine—14 people were injured—if that person had had an assault weapon with multiple rounds, similar to the heinous acts that occurred in Newtown, when 155 rounds were shot in 5 minutes. So I'm hoping that this letter will move those Senators not to filibuster and to let us have an up-or-down vote.

I also rise today to encourage us to do the right thing and to vote ''no'' on the National Labor Relations Board legislation that wants to stop the President from his Presidential authority, and that is to make sure that the government runs by appointing people to the NLRB through recess appointments, among others, just like President George Bush did 140 times, to make recess appointments to be able to move the government forward. In contrast to the D.C. Court of Appeals decision that ruled that our President cannot, three other decisions and other court decisions said you can.

We need to vote ''no'' on this legislation. It is destructive, it is only to stall government, and it is only to stop the work of the NLRB, where workers and corporations come together to solve their problems.

What we should be doing is working to create jobs. That's what Americans want us to do. They want us to make it in America. They want us to build up manufacturing. They want us to create and pass legislation, as we introduced yesterday with whip HOYER, 38 pieces of legislation that we all are joining to support to create jobs.

One thing they don't want us to do is to pass anything with a chained CPI on Social Security because Social Security is solvent. Those people are not the fault of any deficit or any debt; they are hardworking people. I will not ever vote for a chained CPI. And I am not a whiner.

□ 1020

I, frankly, see those people in my district who are supported by Social Security and Medicare, which they earn because they work for it. They did not have it as a handout, because seniors are important and seniors believe in young people. We should protect our seniors; we should invest in education.

I salute the President for his early pre-K initiative, that every child should have the opportunity to be in a pre-K program, supporting our teachers. So here we are; this is what we should be doing. We should be promoting job creation to bring down unemployment and to, in fact, get those who are underemployed and those who have completely gone out of the marketplace. They can be hired, they have skills, including our disabled.

Then we should continue to invest in education, including higher education, making it easier for parents to get the Parent PLUS Loans to send their children to college and putting the burden on colleges to make sure that these young people finish college and not go in and get debt and, therefore, come out with a large debt and no degree.

This is what America is about, investing in young people, protecting our seniors, and realizing that the chained CPI is not the way to go on Social Security. It's to save it because they earned it.

TRIBUTE TO THE LIFE AND LEGACY OF DEBATE COACH WILLIAM ''BILLY'' TATE, JR.

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

Ms. SEWELL of Alabama. Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize and pay tribute to the life and legacy of William Woods Tate, Jr., a beloved educator and high school debate coach, who was an extraordinary mentor to me and so many others. Coach Billy Tate, as he was known, was an accomplished speech and debate coach in Alabama and Tennessee for over 40 years. Coach Tate, sadly, passed away suddenly on Saturday, April 6, 2013, at the age of 69, leaving behind a legacy defined by his commitment to developing the oratorical skills of future leaders.

At the time of his death, Coach Tate was a five-diamond debate coach at Montgomery Bell Academy in Nashville, Tennessee, where he taught speech and coached winning debate teams for more than 30 years. He was an outstanding teacher and an inspirational leader in the National Forensic League, the oldest and largest honor society for high school students in speech and debate.

During his illustrious career, Coach Tate had multiple national finalists in policy debate and extemporaneous speaking. In 1999, his policy debate team reached the national finals, and in 2006 Coach Billy Tate made coaching history as two of his policy teams closed out the national finals winning the first-ever NFL co-citizenship in policy debate.

He was an extraordinary individual. Not only did he teach his students so brilliantly. In his spare time, he loved bridge. He was a devoted son, who always saw to the care of his beloved mother in Selma. Coach Tate also managed to keep up with his debate students through the years and relished their life successes. He demanded excellence from his students, teaching them not only the importance of debate prep and strategy, but also took great pride in exposing his students to the very best restaurants, and that included important table etiquette that accompanied such an experience.

Although Coach Tate spent the bulk of his career at Montgomery Bell Academy in Nashville, he began his speech and debate experience in 1975 at Selma High School in his beloved town of Selma, Alabama. I know that his students at Montgomery Bell Academy believe they had his best coaching years; but I am here to tell you from personal experience that the 1970s and 1980s at Selma High School honed his craft and greatly influenced his strategy. He produced some of the finest high school debaters the State of Alabama has ever seen to date, and I am proud to say that I was one of those students.

Billy Tate was my debate coach for 3 years at Selma High School. For a public high school in rural Alabama, we dominated the competition and won many State championships. For many years, the walls of Selma High School's library were lined with the hundreds of debate and speech trophies won by the teams coached by Billy Tate. Debate was more than an average extracurricular activity; it was a serious discipline. Those of us who had the privilege of being coached by him knew that it was a serious time commitment, a commitment of both time, money, and talent.

To be on Billy Tate's debate team, a student had to commit to attending summer debate camps and countless weekend travel to tournaments all across Alabama, Mississippi, Tennessee, and Georgia during the academic year. It was not the average debate class. I know that my life journey would not have been possible were it not for my debate experience under the tutelage of Coach Billy Tate at Selma High School.

I know that I speak on behalf of all the debaters at Selma High School and Montgomery Bell Academy in expressing our sincere gratitude for Coach Tate's guidance, his dedication, and unwavering belief in our abilities. I especially dedicate this tribute to the Selma High School debaters I had the privilege of competing with—Tom Bundenthal, Lawrence ''Bubba'' Wall, Derek Edwards, Max Andrews, John Polk, Leslie Looper, and Crystal Boykin, to name a few.

To say thank you to Coach Tate seems woefully inadequate, but I do

take comfort in knowing that his legacy will live on through those of us he influenced. May Coach Billy Tate always be remembered for the excellence he inspired in all of us.

Today, I ask my colleagues in the United States Congress to join with me and the hundreds of debaters he taught in his 40 years of coaching in celebrating the life and legacy of a native Alabamian and a nationally renowned debate coach, Mr. William Woods Tate, Jr.

HONORING THE UNIVERSITY OF LOUISVILLE CARDINALS

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

Mr. YARMUTH. Madam Speaker, I rise to honor the University of Louisville Cardinals, who went to a second straight Final Four this season and returned home national champions.

Going into the NCAA tournament, the question was whether the Cards' stifling defense would be enough to win it all. Well, we'll never know, because the country's best defense became the best offense too, shooting 52 percent to a tournament best 79.5 points per game. That's more than crazy. It's ''Russdiculous.''

They said he never met a shot he didn't like; but during the past month, Russ Smith hardly took a shot he couldn't make, setting Louisville's new tournament-scoring record and earning the respect and affection of a city. The All-American, regional MVP, and defensive phenom no longer cares who's scoring, as long as the jersey reads Louisville.

When these guys say the team motto ''Louisville First, Cards Forever,'' they mean it. We saw it when the team rallied around their injured teammate, Kevin Ware, as he courageously repeated, ''I'm fine, just win the game,'' before being carted off the court during the Elite Eight. We saw it when they came together to ''Win for Ware.'' But before that, the Cards won with Ware. On this team, Kevin was one of eight Cardinals to score double figures in a tournament game. That doesn't even include the players who set this team off on some of the year's most unlikely and electrifying rallies.

Walk-on Tim Henderson scored six of his season's 22 points in 45 seconds to cut a late 12-point Final Four deficit in half. All year, Stephen Van Treese snatched rebounds from future NBA big men, denied them in the paint, and set precision picks strong enough to stop a truck. And freshman Montrezl Harrell provided a constant spark off the bench, his unrelenting effort the only thing close to matching his natural ability.

Peyton Siva embodies the ''Louisville First'' spirit. Happier setting up his teammates than knocking it down himself, Peyton reminded the Nation he can also drop 18 points on the Player of the Year in the championship game. Unselfish, but a thief, he'll graduate with the school record for steals in a season and career.

Big man Gorgui Deing is unselfish, too. Louisville's record-setting shotblocker and monster rebounder used his jump shot to pull defenders and find teammates for six assists in the championship game—three to Chane Behanan, who tied Louisville's single-season dunk record, officially making him the latest doctor of dunk. Cutting down the nets in Atlanta was great, but they should give Chane the backboards because he owned them all night.

□ 1030

This team also showed tremendous perseverance. Wayne Blackshear overcame two shoulder injuries to reach the starting lineup. And it's a good thing: he hit threes to start the Cards' scoring in both championship halves.

But the Final Four's breakout star was its most outstanding player, Luke Hancock, who scored his career-high in the semifinal and then broke it 2 days later. Luke didn't use the force; he was a force. And nothing would stop him from winning for his father, for Kevin Ware and, as always, for Louisville.

That's what Coach Rick Pitino taught this team, the master motivator, who's done everything this week but cartwheels on the Moon, built a team and mentored men we should be proud of.

And like Pitino, Jeff Walz will tell you this isn't about one person or even one team. It's about a program and a community. Trust him. That mad scientist led U of L's women to four straight NCAA tournament upsets, including what is considered to be the biggest upset in college basketball history.

Behind the jaw-dropping plays of Shoni and Jude Shimmel, sharpshooting of Antonita Slaughter, tenacity and skill of Sara Hammond, Sherrone Vails, and Bria Smith, and the unbelievable toughness of Monique Reid and Shelby Harper, the national runners-up crashed nearly every party around.

These players and coaches define an extraordinary program. Only three coaches in NCAA history have gone to a men's and women's basketball final in the same season. Louisville is the first to add a BCS Bowl victory to the mix.

But if you think it's the last, you don't know Athletics Director Tom Jurich. With sparkling new facilities, outstanding coaches, and stellar student athletes in competition and class, Tom has every U of L sport at the top of their game and climbing.

The university and the community have thrived along with them, continuing a proud tradition that began with Peck Hickman and rocketed to the top under the great Denny Crum.

I'm honored to congratulate the University of Louisville for its unparalleled winning streak, capped off by the Cards' third Men's Basketball National Championship. Go Cards.

THE AMERICAN JOBS MATTER ACT

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

Mrs. BUSTOS. Madam Speaker, I rise today to talk about our most pressing issue facing my district and our country, and that is boosting American manufacturing and creating jobs here at home.

Just this week, I introduced a bill called the American Jobs Matter Act. This commonsense bill would enable the Federal Government to find out how contracted work would impact American jobs. Contractors would be able to include how their offers would create American jobs.

My bill would raise the importance of creating jobs at home in our country and building our manufacturing industry here as Federal contractors are considered for their jobs. It would also help ensure that taxpayer money is being used to create jobs in places like Rockford, Moline, Galesburg, and Peoria, and in cities and towns across my district, across my State, and across our country—not overseas.

I'm proud to say that this bill has been incorporated into Congressman HOYER's Make It In America plan, which seeks to promote American workers, jobs, innovation, and infrastructure.

Madam Speaker, we need to do more to create jobs and support American manufacturing. My bill does just that.

THE IMMINENT THREAT POSED BY NORTH KOREA

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

Ms. GABBARD. Madam Speaker, I rise today to address the recent developments and the growing instability on the Korean Peninsula.

Today we are seeing an increasingly belligerent hostile stance by the North Korean regime toward its perceived enemies. For some, this may sound like a far-off annoyance, saber rattling coming from the East; however, nothing could be farther from the truth for families in my home State of Hawaii and in Guam who sit as named threats by the increasingly aggressive and unpredictable regime led by Kim Jong Un.

He has demonstrated a pattern of belligerent threats and even unprovoked attacks on South Korea in recent years. This new leader has adopted many of the same destructive policies of the past in his pursuit of nuclear weapons and ballistic missile capabilities. He's revealed the willingness to sacrifice the safety and needs of the North Korean people in order to advance his hostile, unproductive agenda. Rather than caring for his people, Kim

Jong Un remains singularly focused on making provocations and establishing a ''military first'' doctrine.

Along with Guam and Alaska, Hawaii has been placed in the crosshairs of this intensifying threat. It's crucial for the United States, and Hawaii in particular, to take these threats from North Korea seriously. We cannot be complacent. We cannot afford a mistake that puts the lives of our families at risk.

Intelligence and previous missile launches have shown that Hawaii, Guam, and Alaska are within range of North Korea's intercontinental ballistic missile capabilities. New intelligence suggests that North Korea may be planning multiple missile launches in the coming days beyond the two Musudan mobile missiles it has fueled, raised, and positioned along its east coast.

Our Nation's focus and commitment to the security and stability of the Asia-Pacific region now faces a serious test. As we rebalance and realign our presence in the region, it's vitally important that we get it right in terms of the strategy, as well as resourcing.

The United States has an important interest in maintaining peace on the Korean Peninsula, as well as in the Asia-Pacific region. We must stand together with our allies in the region ready to respond to any contingency, and we must take a forward-leaning approach to address this imminent threat to prevent further provocations and to protect our families and our national assets.

The international community has clearly stated its opposition to his actions and threats, but we need to ask more of those influential nations that have remained quiet. China, in particular, should be playing a strong role as a deterrent of North Korea's military ambitions.

We're also seeing a destabilizing effect outside of the region as a result of the dangerous partnership between the two isolated rogue states of Iran and North Korea as regimes working together to develop more powerful weapons, missile delivery systems, and nuclear capabilities.

It would be safe to assume that by addressing the threat on our country by North Korea, we are also affecting Iran and their nuclear ambitions.

I commend our military commanders for their firm and confident resolve that they've shown in response to the endless posturing and provocative behavior of North Korea; however, from a U.S. policy standpoint, it's time to make a serious change. Such a change must be comprehensive, carving a new path forward using diplomatic and military means in order to break the cycle of threats that has existed for far too long.

The carrot-and-stick approach that we've taken in the past has not effectively deterred North Korea's nuclear ambitions. To the contrary, we continue to face escalated threats which now extend beyond the region.

Considering the serious threats we face today and the fact that the threat of missile attack on the U.S. is likely to grow, I'm deeply concerned about the President's proposed cuts to the missile defense budget in fiscal year 2014. This is a portion of the budget that should be increased, not decreased, to ensure the safety and security of our people.

In the coming days and months, I look forward to continuing to work with my colleagues in pushing for action and resources to ensure that Hawaii and our country is protected and any potential attack is prevented.

□ 1040

NEGATIVE EFFECTS OF SEQUESTRATION ON LOCAL EMPLOYERS

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

Mr. CONNOLLY. During the past 2 weeks, I met with local employers and constituents who expressed continued frustration with the negative effects of sequestration in our community. Republicans and Democrats alike spent most of the past year warning of the dire consequences these cuts would have on our economy, and yet the recently adopted continuing resolution for the rest of the fiscal year bakes in those very harmful cuts. I share my constituents' frustrations, which is why I voted against the self-inflicted wound on our economy.

Every community in America will feel the ripple effects of sequestration, but my northern Virginia district will be disproportionately impacted because of the high concentration of military facilities, Federal employees and businesses that partner with the Federal Government. We do cybersecurity, custodial services, and everything in between. I met with a number of these employers. They expressed real concern that the lingering uncertainty over sequestration threatens job security and the ability to remain competitive economically.

I fear the consequences of sequestration and what that will mean to small businesses that don't have the same resources as their larger counterparts to weather these steep cuts. I visited one company with 200 employees who are developing a laser-based flight guidance system for NASA through a Small Business Innovation Research grant. Just recently, it announced that their technology is being deployed through a contract with the Defense Department to assist with remote detection of explosives to better protect our troops in the field. They're worried about cutbacks.

The Small Business Administration's fiscal '13 budget will be reduced by more than $92 million as a result of sequestration, and more than one-fourth of those cuts will come from the Small Business Loan Program, directly affecting small businesses, veteran-owned businesses, and female- and minority-owned businesses in their ability to hire. As my colleagues know, the Federal Government has a small business contracting goal of 23 percent. We have fallen short of that goal in the last 6 years, and sequestration will actually make it harder to ever achieve that goal.

I also met with my local chamber of commerce to discuss its desire to expand the regional Metro system here in the Nation's Capital to accommodate future growth and development throughout the region. The most recent census data says our community has the highest concentration of mega-commuters in the country. There is no question we need to invest more in our regional transportation network. This particular proposal enjoys bipartisan support, but yet, under sequestration, it's headed nowhere because the New Starts program, under the Federal Transit Administration, will be cut by as much as $100 million because of sequestration.

Whether it's cuts in small business assistance or in transportation, sequestration is reducing our investments in the very things that create jobs and provide for our competitive advantage in the future. Local realtors I met with expressed concern about the uncertainty of sequestration putting the brakes on sales just as regional and national housing markets are finally showing signs of a robust recovery. The slow-down in Federal spending is already creating a drag on local economies. A 22 percent drop in defense spending shaved nearly 3 points off economic growth in the last quarter, and the CBO projects it could be half of the growth otherwise projected in all of 2013 because of sequestration.

Madam Speaker, I don't argue that cuts are needed, but sequestration uses a mindless, meat-ax approach in which nothing is spared and nothing is differentiated. I've long called for Members of the House to work together in a bipartisan fashion and in a balanced way—balanced between revenue growth and discrete spending cuts—to move forward and reduce the debt. This week's delivery of the President's budget is a heartening sign because he does just that. I hope we will heed his budget. I hope we will try to work with the President to achieve a balanced approach that replaces this mindless sequestration.

THE HOUSING FAIRNESS ACT

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

Mr. AL GREEN of Texas. I thank the many persons who have labored long and hard to help fulfill Dr. Martin Luther King's dream. He devoted his life to transforming neighborhoods into brotherhoods, and I'd like to speak to you today about this concept because, to do this—to transform neighborhoods into brotherhoods—we must become

neighbors. We have to have communities wherein all persons are a part of the fiber and fabric of the various communities that we live in.

Dr. King was in Memphis, Tennessee, in 1968, and he was there on this mission of bringing people together. He was there to help with some issues related to workers and workers' rights. Unfortunately, on April 4 of 1968, Dr. King was assassinated. His life's work did not end, however. His dream is still alive, and because he dared to transform neighborhoods into brotherhoods, the President of the United States at that time, President Johnson, took up the fight for Dr. King, and within 7 days a piece of legislation passed through the House that dealt with discrimination as it relates to where people live.

This legislation had bipartisan support. The Democratic supporter was Senator Walter Mondale, a very well-known figure in American politics. The Republican supporter was an African American, by the way, who was a member of the Senate, the Honorable Edward Brooke. These two Senators had for years been trying to pass this legislation to eliminate discrimination in housing. They had some degree of success, but they were not able to get the legislation passed.

In 1968, 7 days after Dr. King's death, the Fair Housing Act of 1968 passed, prohibiting discrimination based upon race, color, religion or national origin as it relates to the sale or to the financing of housing. In 1974, the act was amended to include sex discrimination. In 1988, it was amended to prohibit discrimination based upon physical or mental handicap as well as familial status.

The Housing Fairness Act, which I have introduced, models this piece of legislation. It, too, deals with discrimination that is invidious with reference to refusing to rent to a person, to sell housing to a person, to negotiate housing, to make housing available, to set different terms for some than for others, to falsely deny that housing is unavailable when it is available. This kind of discrimination still exists, but it's important for us today to realize that it is very much having an impact on persons whom many of us do not assume are victims of housing discrimination. The FY 2011 statistics, the latest available to me, connote that 27,092 complaints were filed with programs associated with the Fair Housing Initiatives, and of these complaints about 12 percent to 54 percent of them were complaints based upon disability.

Now, it's important for us to focus on disability for a moment because many of our veterans returning from wars, persons who chose to go to distant places, don't always return the same way they left. Many of them have given their lives, and others have survived, but they have survived and they are handicapped. Many of them returning will be discriminated against because there are people who discriminate against people who are handicapped. They may not know that it's a veteran, but whether they know or not, the act of discrimination is still harmful.

I will submit to you that it makes sometimes tears well in the eyes of people who understand how our veterans have fought for us. So I am here today to make an appeal that we support Fair Housing Initiatives and that we do all that we can to transform neighborhoods into brotherhoods.

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 48 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:

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

Bless abundantly the Members of this people's House. During the season of new growth, may Your redemptive power help them to see new ways to productive service, fresh approaches to understanding each other, especially those across the aisle, and renewed commitment to solving the problems facing our Nation.

May they, and may we all, be transformed by Your grace and better reflect the sense of wonder, even joy, at the opportunities to serve that are ever before us.

The issues of our day are a challenge for a Nation who claims Your blessing. May we not forget the reminders to Your chosen people of once having been oppressed foreigners and the admonitions of Scripture that we might be entertaining angels in the strangers among us. Help the Members of this House to find a balance that meets the demands of our beliefs with the practical realities that challenge us as a complex Nation.

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.

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

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

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER. Will the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. WALBERG) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. WALBERG 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.

THE BUDGET

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

Mr. WALBERG. Mr. Speaker, President Obama finally released his 2014 budget this week, 2 months late and trillions of dollars short.

Similar to last year's plan, it taxes more to spend more. While the President claims his budget will reduce the deficit in a balanced way, it won't ever balance—not in 10 years, not ever.

The President's plan is $8.2 trillion of new debt. It also includes $1.1 trillion in new taxes. Hardworking taxpayers don't deserve more taxes; they deserve a budget that allows them to keep more of their own money and not worry about financial debt being placed on their children and grandchildren.

House Republicans have passed such a budget, one that balances: a proactive budget that eliminates the deficit while also providing economic security for employers and employees, a sustainable safety net for the poor and those retiring, and a secure future for our children and grandchildren.

Americans know what it takes to create a balanced budget for their own families and their own businesses, and they deserve the same from their government.

EARTH DAY

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

Mr. QUIGLEY. Mr. Speaker, the founder of Earth Day, Wisconsin Senator Gaylord Nelson, was asked in 2005,

just before his death at the age of 89, if Earth Day should be celebrated. ''Our work is not finished,'' he replied. ''There's a lot more that needs to be done.''

As we enter wildfire season, watershed infrastructure that would mitigate future contamination of local rivers and reservoirs is still being rebuilt from last season, and funding for rebuilding is only now being allocated, having been delayed under sequestration, affecting lives and homes.

We've yet to craft an agenda that talks of a multiyear transportation plan or climate change. And, of course, the green legislator at heart would love to see tools like the Antiquities Act as a job-creating mechanism rather than spending time on the floor fighting against rolling back NEPA as we're doing this week with H.R. 678, unnecessarily, at the expense of supporting hydropower, as we should.

No, our work is not finished. There's a lot more to be done.

MOVING FORWARD WITH LIQUEFIED NATURAL GAS

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

Mr. BOUSTANY. Mr. Speaker, in 2009, the United States surpassed Russia in becoming the world's largest producer of natural gas. Due to recent technological advancements, large deposits of natural gas, mainly shale gas, are now being harvested. Through the use of hydraulic fracturing and horizontal drilling, previously inaccessible hydrocarbons are now seeing the light of day.

Having Henry Hub located in the center of the Third Congressional District, I'm fully aware that the market price of U.S. natural gas is at an all-time low and much lower than Asian and European natural gas prices. While this fact presents challenges, it also provides an opportunity for our Nation to fast become a global energy hub by exporting one of our most abundant natural resources in the form of liquified natural gas, or LNG.

With domestic demand being met, exporting LNG leads to job creation at home, a reduction in the national trade deficit, and an increase in revenues for the Federal Government. As a member of the House Ways and Means Subcommittee on Trade, these are all value-added benefits for our Nation.

The domestic natural gas boom presents the United States with an enormous economic opportunity and geopolitical opportunity. Our Nation should seize this opportunity and not let it pass. It's in the public interest.

INVEST IN AMERICAN MANUFACTURING

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

Mr. HIGGINS. Mr. Speaker, this week I took part in a town hall meeting in Buffalo, along with the Alliance for American Manufacturing, and discussed the importance of manufacturing jobs to our region and to our Nation.

With western New York's dedicated workforce and history of manufacturing success, we are ready to grow our economy with the resurgence of advanced manufacturing industry. But to do this, our workers and businesses need a willing partner in their government.

This Congress must make investing in our infrastructure and investing in our people top priorities. Robust funding to rebuild roads and bridges, along with fostering job-training programs and passing legislation in the House Democrats' Make It In America agenda, will enable us to compete with any other nation in the world.

Mr. Speaker, investing in American manufacturing creates jobs and reduces the deficit. There is much work to be done, and there are Americans who need the work.

□ 1210

THE GOVERNMENT ACCOUNTABILITY OFFICE'S REPORT ON WASTE

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

Mr. FORTENBERRY. Mr. Speaker, we engage in so much Washington speak in our debates—words like ''sequestration,'' ''continuing resolutions,'' and ''debt ceiling''—that the structure of our debates, I feel, can be off-putting to many Americans. So let's try to be a little more straightforward.

The reality is that we have a huge mismatch between revenues and expenditures. We all know that this is a struggle, but we have to get our fiscal house in order, just like American families do, businesses do and even local governments do; but instead of hashing through the same old debates, perhaps there is an easier way forward.

Right here, Mr. Speaker, is a Government Accountability Office report that came out this week. It's a new report that builds upon former reports. There are more than 300 areas in which we can tackle redundant spending across the Federal Government. So here is the right place to start, Mr. Speaker—in delivering a smarter and more effective government while also saving money.

GUN REFORM

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

Mr. MORAN. Mr. Speaker, throughout the United States, in red and blue States alike, we have speed limits for travel on public roads. These laws are good public policy because they prohibit behavior that can endanger the lives of others. But imagine if we blocked our police from using speed detection devices so they could never prove that you were speeding or if we only allowed the use of those devices on certain roads. Such a policy would make speed limits mere suggestions with no consequences for those who would violate the law.

It sounds ridiculous, but this is exactly the strategy we currently use to prohibit the purchase of firearms by criminals and those with serious mental illness. Federal law bans the purchase of guns by dangerous people, but massive loopholes in our background check system permit at least 40 percent of purchases to evade the law without detection by law enforcement.

The NRA and its supporters often claim that we need to enforce the laws on the books. Agreed. Universal background checks are designed to do just that—to provide an actual enforcement mechanism. That's what the Congress should require because 90 percent of the American public wants us to do at least that.

SITTIN' ON THE DOCK OF THE BAY

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

Mr. JORDAN. Mr. Speaker, this week, the President hosted a star-studded concert at the White House for his friends, featuring the music of Otis Redding and others. One of Otis Redding's lines in his ''(Sittin' on) the Dock of the Bay'' sums up my thoughts on the President's budget: ''Looks like nothing's gonna change. Everything remains the same.''

Just like the Senate, the President's budget raises taxes, increases the debt and never, ever, ever balances. The Obama budget has a trillion dollars in new taxes on top of the trillion-dollar ObamaCare tax and the $600 billion ''fiscal cliff'' tax from earlier this year. The Obama budget spends $46 trillion, borrows another $8 trillion, and increases the national debt to $25.4 trillion over the next 10 years. Then, after all those taxes and all that spending, we still have a budget that never, ever, ever balances.

Mr. President, we can't borrow forever. We can't keep spending more than we take in. These problems are staring us right in the face, but the big spenders in Washington are just sittin' on the dock of the bay, wasting time.

NEW JERSEY'S LIFE SCIENCES CONTRIBUTIONS TO THE COMMUNITY

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

Mr. SIRES. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to commend the contributions of the

biopharmaceutical and medical technology companies in New Jersey to Hurricane Sandy relief activities.

New Jersey companies in the biopharmaceutical field have donated an estimated $11.1 million towards Sandy relief efforts. The New Jersey biopharmaceutical and medical technology companies made contributions to a large number of organizations, including the American Red Cross, AmeriCares, Direct Relief International, Feeding America, the Salvation Army, Save the Children, United Way, and the Hurricane Sandy New Jersey Relief Fund.

The community also coordinated with the Department of Health and Human Services to ensure an uninterrupted supply chain of critical life-saving drugs as well as having teamed up with local pharmacies to provide free or discounted prescriptions to affected patients. In addition, individual companies performed a variety of services in the immediate aftermath of Sandy, including the distribution of hygiene kits; providing generators to local municipalities; deploying emergency decontamination units; preparing food for first responders; and working to supply hospitals, pharmacies, and retailers with supplies that their patients and customers needed.

While our community as a whole came together to provide relief to the victims of Sandy, we thank the biopharmaceutical industry of New Jersey.

THE ECONOMIC IMPACT OF THE PRESIDENT'S PROPOSED BUDGET

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

Mr. PITTENGER. Mr. Speaker, there is much that could be said about the President's proposed budget, but I think ordinary taxpayers need to know its impact on jobs and the economy.

Economists and national accounting firms have stated that the tax increases that President Obama pushed through in January have slowed the economy and contributed to a loss of 24,000 retail jobs in March, part of a very dismal jobs report. When consumers have less money in their pockets, the inevitable results in fewer jobs.

Apparently, President Obama has not learned from his mistake. His budget contains almost $600 billion in even more new taxes. At a time when millions of Americans are giving up hope of finding jobs and are exiting the workforce, President Obama's budget will only inflict more pain on ordinary families.

House Republicans have passed a responsible budget that leads to balance while also preserving Social Security and Medicare. Let's work together for fiscally accountable government that will help restore jobs to American families.

REDUCING GUN VIOLENCE IN AMERICA

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

Mr. KILDEE. Mr. Speaker, today, the Senate is taking up commonsense legislation to help reduce gun violence in America.

I have and always will be a staunch supporter of the Second Amendment, and I strongly support the constitutional rights of my constituents to own guns. This bipartisan legislation to expand background checks does not infringe on the rights of law-abiding gun owners. Instead, it strengthens our existing system of background checks to help keep guns out of the hands of dangerous offenders.

Forty percent of guns sold in the United States currently don't go through background checks. Failing to act means that just anyone can continue to buy weapons at gun shows or over the Internet without being subject to a background check. The vast majority of Americans support background checks. Democrats and Republicans support background checks. The vast majority of responsible gun owners support background checks.

It is commonsense legislation that should be enacted, and it will make our country safer. I urge the House to take this up as soon as the Senate completes its work.

KEYSTONE XL WILL HELP LOWER UTILITY RATES

(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, last week, I was home in Montana to highlight the important role that natural resources play in our State's economy. In fact, I put 3,000 miles in traveling around our great State. One question I was asked repeatedly was: When will the Keystone pipeline be approved?

We all know the tremendous economic impact the Keystone pipeline would have and the jobs that would be created; but when I was in Glasgow, Montana, I learned of a relatively unknown benefit as a result of the pipeline.

You see, NorVal Electric Co-Op in Glasgow is slated to supply electricity to one of the Keystone XL pump stations. If the pipeline is built, this rural electric co-op will be able to spread its cost burdens with the pipeline and, consequently, hold rates steady for its 3,000-plus Montana customers. If the pipeline is not approved, it told me that NorVal customers will see upwards of a 40-percent increase in their utility rates over the next 10 years.

As I've said time and time again, this is common sense. Keystone means jobs; it means another step towards energy independence; and it means lower utility rates for rural Montanans, for hardworking Montana families.

President Obama, it's time to approve the Keystone pipeline.

□ 1230

HUMANE IMMIGRATION REFORM

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

Mr. VARGAS. Mr. Speaker, I rise to thank the faith-based communities in this country for praying for a humane and just immigration reform. We heard from the Chaplain today in his prayer, and we probably all caught the three references. The first one was from Leviticus 19, the issue of treating the foreign born as your own. Then we heard the Hebrews treating the stranger, treat him well because he may be the angel among you. And then of course, lastly, Matthew 25, treating the stranger because that's how you're going to be judged.

I want to thank each and every pastor, each and every priest, each and every rabbi that has been praying for us on this issue. I think that hardened hearts are changing here. Certainly the debate that we've been having has been humane. Much of the leadership has come from a bipartisan group of Democrats and Republicans with open hearts, and I appreciate that. And that has not happened by itself. It has happened because of the prayers and the supplication of all of these people around the Nation saying we have to do something that matches our values.

THE PRESIDENT'S BUDGET

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

Mr. LUETKEMEYER. Mr. Speaker, the President's just-released budget calls for higher taxes, more spending, and bigger government, all of which would make it more difficult for hardworking Americans, like those in the Third District of Missouri, to find jobs. More troubling yet is the President's budget simply does not balance. Every family must balance their budget, and we in Washington should, too. We cannot continue to spend money we don't have, and it's not right for the President to take more to spend more.

Several weeks ago, I proudly supported a Republican budget that provides for a balanced budget, will foster a healthier economy and help create jobs. The President's budget, meanwhile, holds any reforms and spending cuts hostage in exchange for more tax hikes.

The American people are tired of the same old song and dance from the President and his allies when it comes to spending their hard-earned tax dollars. This budget proposal, which is months overdue, isn't a serious plan.

Mr. Speaker, I'm from the ''Show Me'' State, and this budget doesn't show me anything.

SHOUT OUT TO MEMPHIS MUSIC

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

Mr. COHEN. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Ohio mentioned the concert that the President hosted with PBS and the Grammys on Tuesday, and did a poor imitation, I guess, of Justin Timberlake on ''(Sittin' on) the Dock of the Bay.''

It was a phenomenal shout-out to Memphis music; and while there were a lot of great performers there, I want to put a particular shout-out to Ms. Cyndi Lauper because she's special. She did another Otis Redding song, ''Try a Little Tenderness,'' and it was a phenomenal performance.

I would suggest to some of my colleagues on other side of the aisle that they ought to try a little tenderness on occasion.

Ms. Lauper is special. She did an album called ''Memphis Blues'' in 2010. It was one of the best albums of the year. It brought blues back. She had Memphians B.B. King and Ann Peebles and Charlie Musselwhite on the album. She's a phenomenal lady, and I give a special shout-out to Cyndi Lauper and Memphis music.

BALANCING THE BUDGET

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

Mr. STUTZMAN. Mr. Speaker, after decades of Washington irresponsibility, Americans are facing nearly $17 trillion of debt and struggling through a deficit-driven unemployment crisis.

Unfortunately, this administration isn't offering solutions. Yesterday, President Obama introduced a budget that never ever balances and will only make these problems worse. Two months after he missed the law's deadline, President Obama introduced a reheated version of the same failed tax, borrow, and spend policies that created this mess to begin with. President Obama's budget raises taxes by $1.1 trillion, adds another $8.2 trillion to the national debt, and doesn't come close to addressing the long-term stability of our Nation's safety net programs. Under the President's plan, taxpayers can expect consequences of endless deficits and future downgrades.

House Republicans are offering a real solution. We've put forward a reasonable plan that actually balances the budget in 10 years, not because we are interested in spreadsheets and timetables, but because Americans shouldn't have to wait any longer for success and prosperity.

Let's balance the budget and put our trust in hardworking Americans.

ADDRESSING GUN VIOLENCE

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

Mrs. BEATTY. Mr. Speaker, elementary schools, high schools, movie theaters, universities, and shopping malls have all been scenes of horrific incidents where innocent lives were lost, along with our sense of security. After each tragedy, we hear sermons, speeches, console survivors and loved ones, but we in Congress have done little to change the way we address gun violence. I want to change that.

While massacres such as the one that occurred in Newtown draw significant attention to the issue of gun violence, it is a persistent problem throughout the Nation. According to a recent Johns Hopkins University survey, a solid majority of Americans, gun owners and nongun owners alike, support several initiatives to slow gun violence. For example, 89 percent of all respondents, and 75 percent of those identified as NRA members, support universal background checks for gun sales.

President Obama's plan also calls for a ban on military-style assault weapons and high-capacity magazines, like the kind that have been commonly used in so many of the mass shootings we have witnessed in the United States.

We can never prevent all crimes or gun violence, but we can work together to find ways to limit the loss of lives with commonsense solutions.

COMMON SENSE IN COMPENSATION ACT

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

Mr. MEADOWS. Mr. Speaker, over the past 2 months, Federal official after Federal official has talked about the need to furlough employees due to sequestration, yet the government continues to hand out millions of dollars in bonuses to Federal employees. Seventy-five percent of senior executive service employees received bonuses, at an average of $13,081. Regular, oftentimes blue-collar Federal workers are facing furloughs while senior employees are cashing in.

The FAA has been talking about 90-minute waits for passengers, but yet in fiscal year 2011, they handed out $40,000 bonuses to more than 86 different employees. This is unacceptable, and the recent OMB guidelines don't go far enough.

The Common Sense in Compensation Act bill that I am introducing today would prohibit those bonuses for the rest of fiscal year 2013 and cap them at a maximum of 5 percent of the salary going forward. I urge my colleagues to cosponsor my bill.

UNEMPLOYMENT IS OUR TRUE DEFICIT

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

Ms. WILSON of Florida. Mr. Speaker, it has now been 830 days since I arrived in Congress, and the Republican leadership has still not allowed a single vote on serious legislation to address our unemployment crisis. I have news for my colleagues: unemployment is our true deficit.

By getting Americans trained and back to work, we can increase our tax base and stop our borrowing. By reducing unemployment, we can stop our national epidemic of foreclosures. Regardless of the assistance you receive, you cannot keep your home if you do not have a job. My State is the Nation's foreclosure State, and my hometown, Miami, is the foreclosure capital.

Mr. Speaker, unemployment is destroying families and depressing property values. It is devastating our people and dragging down our recovery. Our mantra in this Congress should be: Jobs, jobs, jobs.

□ 1230

A TALE OF TWO CITIES

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

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, Members of Congress have just come back now from 2 weeks of recess being at home. And group after group after group that I spoke with talked about exactly the same thing that the previous speaker and others are talking about, and that is jobs, job creation, and the opportunity for our children, and sometimes our spouses, to get back into the jobs marketplace.

I remind the people of Dallas, Texas, that there's really a tale of two States or two cities. One is Dallas, Texas, and the other is Chicago, Illinois, the State of Illinois vs. Texas.

Texas, over the last few years, has created more jobs than the other 49 States combined. The reason why we've done this is because we chose not to do the path that Illinois has done, and that is, raising taxes, lowering job expectations and performance, and the ability for people to want to invest in that State and their future.

Mr. Speaker, that's exactly the same background and philosophy that our President and Democrats are having to run jobs out of America. I stand for the Texas model, lowering taxes and making sure we have jobs.

GUN VIOLENCE PREVENTION LEGISLATION

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

Ms. HAHN. Mr. Speaker, I'm happy that, finally, we are moving forward on gun violence prevention legislation in this country. And I really applaud our Senators, JOE MANCHIN and PAT TOOMEY, for coming together, finally, in a bipartisan fashion to push forward legislation to expand background checks in gun shows and for online purchases.

This is a strong first step towards a meaningful solution to end gun violence in this country. And I hope the House, I hope we take this up soon, and pass this legislation.

But I think we need to do more. And if losing 20 young innocent lives doesn't shake us up to end this epidemic of gun violence that has plagued our Nation's neighborhoods, schools, and churches, then nothing will.

If we harden our hearts to the tears and the testimonies of the parents of Newtown here with us this week, then we're telling every family that has been shattered by a gun and every family that has been shattered by this kind of violence that, if we don't act, we're washing our hands of their agony.

You know, I hope that we still have a ban on military-style assault weapons and high-capacity magazines, but this is a good first start.

THE HOUSE REPUBLICAN BUDGET

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

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, saving Medicare and Social Security for future generations is something Republicans and Democrats can and should agree on. The House Republican budget preserves Social Security and Medicare for current seniors and future generations by beginning the work of making incremental cost-saving reforms.

President Obama, however, sees the threat to Medicare and Social Security solvency as a chance to get more of what he wants. While Medicare and Social Security are going bankrupt, the President is refusing to consider reforms to save our senior safety nets unless he's allowed to raise taxes in exchange.

When it comes to tax increases, how quickly the President forgets. The President just got done raising taxes on the American people on January 1.

The American people send enough of their hard-earned money to Washington each year, and more should not be taken from them to enable further travails in misguided ''stimulus.''

Reforms to save Medicare and Social Security are critically important to future generations of Americans. They should be treated as more than bargaining chips by the President.

CELEBRATING THE LIFE OF GENE SEGERBLOOM

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

Ms. TITUS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to celebrate the life of Gene Segerbloom, who recently passed away at the age of 94. A true public servant to the end, Gene served Nevada throughout her life, first as a high school teacher, then a Boulder City Councilman and, finally, as a four-term assemblywoman in the Nevada State Legislature, beginning at the young age of 74.

While in the legislature, she worked hard to defend the rights of women and children, as well as to protect the environment and Nevada's beauty, which was painted by her husband, Cliff, in many beautiful watercolors.

The Segerbloom family has been a fixture in Nevada politics for four generations. Gene's legacy continues through her son, Tick, who is a State senator today. Tick put it perfectly when he said simply, ''She loved Nevada. My mother always had a smile on her face, and she never had a bad day.''

I miss her personally, and Nevada mourns her loss.

LET'S PUT OUR FISCAL HOUSE IN ORDER

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

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Madam Speaker, over the past break, I had the chance to go home to the beautiful Georgia Ninth, where I'm born and raised. And one of the things that I find when I go back that is always refreshing is people seem to want to find answers. They find answers to the problems of their life. They want to know what is happening, and they do not understand inside-the-Beltway-thinking that simply adds more and more talk and more and more rhetoric.

Over the past week I have sat in two committees in which the government's own inspectors have found waste, have found duplication, have found fragmentation, in which everything is going in a way in which people back home don't understand.

Sometimes we come to this well and we say, People, we need to come together. Well, what we've got to understand is what we have just heard the last 2 weeks from people in our district is that they want to see action. They don't understand sequester when you've got all this money sitting out there that is being wasted and duplication in programs such as three programs to study catfish.

As I said in the committee the other day, I've fished for catfish all my life. I don't understand why we need that much inspection.

What we need now is action to cut the waste. We've proposed a balanced budget from the Republican perspective. We're going to continue to fight to put our fiscal house in order.

REDUCING GUN VIOLENCE

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

Mr. PAYNE. Madam Speaker, the gun safety debate that we are having is not about politics or political means. It is about doing what's right by our families, protecting our children, and reducing the gun violence that persists in the streets of my district every single day. If Congress has the power to prevent some of this senseless violence, then we have a moral obligation to do so.

Background checks are an absolute must. Criminals and the mentally ill should not be able to go online or walk into a gun show and walk away with a gun.

My bill, the Safer Neighborhoods Gun Buyback Act, provides a 25 percent markup on guns traded in, creating an incentive to get the most widely used guns in crimes off of our streets.

It's not complicated. These are commonsense reforms, and the victims of gun violence and their families deserve a vote.

So I urge my Republican colleagues to bring this legislation to the floor. We owe it to the American people, and New Jersey families should not have to wait any longer for commonsense reform.

THE 50TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE USS ''THRESHER'' DISASTER

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

Ms. SHEA-PORTER. This week marks the 50th anniversary of a terrible submarine disaster. The USS *Thresher*, the first in a new class of subs designed to answer the Soviet threat in the Cold War, left the world's greatest shipyard, the Portsmouth Naval Shipyard, to conduct sea trials on April 10, 1963. Disaster struck, and America lost 129 of its finest men that day.

I honor these men who are on eternal patrol, and I honor their families, their wives and their children, some of whom never met their dads. Their sacrifices did lead to a sub safety program.

One of the surviving children wrote a song about his dad, and he said, ''A man whose love is stronger than the tide that's taken you away.''

Let's pause and remember these great men and their families.

STOP THE SENSELESS GUN VIOLENCE

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

Ms. FRANKEL of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I'm here because of Angel. Angel was just an ordinary teenager. She loved basketball. She liked to hang out. In fact, that's all she was doing on a balmy night in West Palm Beach, just hanging out, when she was violently killed by a man, devoid of humanity, armed with a gun.

And so, instead of dressing Angel for her prom, her mother dressed her for her funeral. Instead of attending Angel's graduation, her family visited her gravesite.

Isn't it time to take the guns out of the hands of criminals and madmen?

Isn't it time for this Congress to stop the senseless gun violence?

Mr. Speaker, let us vote.

□ 1240

AMERICA WORKS ACT

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

Mr. SCHNEIDER. Mr. Speaker, this week, Mr. HOYER launched his Make It In America initiative to strengthen our manufacturing sector and spur job growth. American manufacturing has been a bright spot in our economic recovery, but too often I hear from my district that a lack of skilled workers is limiting their opportunities for growth. In Illinois' 10th District, we have nearly 700 manufacturing facilities employing over 98,000 people. These businesses, and our country, will remain globally competitive only if we continue to develop and train our workforce with the skills necessary for the highly technical work that 21st-century manufacturing requires.

That's precisely why I introduced the AMERICA Works Act. I'm proud to have it included in the Make It In America agenda. This commonsense legislation promotes collaboration between industry leaders, colleges, and job-training programs to prepare students and workers with the precise skills and jobs where talented people are most needed. AMERICA Works and the Make It In America agenda is the comprehensive approach we need to ensure success for American workers and manufacturers.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 1120, PREVENTING GREATER UNCERTAINTY IN LABOR-MANAGEMENT RELATIONS ACT

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 146 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 146

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider in the House the bill (H.R. 1120) to prohibit the National Labor Relations Board from taking any action that requires a quorum of the members of the Board until such time as Board constituting a quorum shall have been confirmed by the Senate, the Supreme Court issues a decision on the constitutionality of the appointments to the Board made in January 2012, or the adjournment sine die of the first session of the 113th Congress. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. In lieu of the amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on Education and the Workforce now printed in the bill, an amendment in the nature of a substitute consisting of the text of Rules Committee Print 113-6, shall be considered as adopted. The bill, as amended, shall be considered as read. All points of order against provisions in the bill, as amended, are waived. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill, as amended, and on any further amendment thereto, to final passage without intervening motion except: (1) one hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Education and the Workforce; and (2) one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. COLLINS of Georgia). The gentlewoman from North Carolina is recognized for 1 hour.

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. POLIS), pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume. During consideration of this resolution, all time yielded is for the purpose of debate only.

GENERAL LEAVE

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

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

There was no objection.

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 146 provides for a closed rule providing for consideration of H.R. 1120, the Preventing Greater Uncertainty in Labor-Management Relations Act. Although the Rules Committee solicited amendments last week, we received only two amendments, one Democrat and one Republican, neither of which was germane to the bill.

Mr. Speaker, my colleagues on the House Education and Workforce Committee and I have been hard at work conducting oversight and challenging the National Labor Relations Board on its anti-jobs agenda. In January 2012, President Obama made three so-called ''recess appointments'' to the National Labor Relations Board while Congress was not in recess, in violation of the Constitution. The U.S. Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia recently ruled these appointments were unconstitutional. This decision calls into question every action the Board has taken since these so-called recess appointments were made.

The bill before us today, H.R. 1120, would provide greater certainty for employers and unions by requiring the Board to cease all activity that requires a three-member quorum and prohibits the Board from enforcing any decision made since the appointments in question were made in January 2012.

It is important to note also what this bill does not do. It does not prohibit the National Labor Relations Board's regional offices from accepting and processing charges of unfair labor practices. The bill also allows the Board to resume activities if one of the three following conditions is met:

The U.S. Supreme Court rules on the constitutionality of recess appointments;

A quorum of the Board is confirmed by the Senate;

The expiration of the recess appointees' terms at the end of this year.

Finally, H.R. 1120 ensures any action approved by the so-called ''recess appointees'' is reviewed and approved by a future Board that has been constitutionally appointed.

As my colleagues across the aisle are sure to point out, the President has recently nominated three individuals for Senate confirmation, in addition to the two he nominated in February. The bill before us remains necessary as a commonsense pause button on the Board's activities while the legal uncertainty is resolved. It would give employers and unions the certainty they need to operate in the interim.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote in favor of this rule and the underlying bill, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. POLIS. I thank the gentlelady for yielding the customary 30 minutes, and I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in opposition to both the rule and the underlying bill. The bill is inaccurately named. In fact, quite to the contrary, the bill should be called the Creating Greater Uncertainty in Labor-Management Relations Act, throwing into question actions of this Board, decisions on both sides, as well as agreements that have been reached through the process in the interest of business, as well as working Americans.

Two weeks ago, Congress approved a continuing resolution on a bipartisan basis to prevent the Federal Government from closing. There were give-and-takes. There were things in it from both sides that weren't perfect. Nevertheless, the majority and minority in this House, the Republicans and Democrats, worked together in good faith, successfully, to prevent a government shutdown, consistent with what the American people wanted and consistent with any responsible stewardship of the public trust.

After achieving that, I was initially optimistic that when the House reconvened this week, we might be able to build on the spirit of compromise, perhaps tackling the difficult issue of fixing our broken immigration system and replacing it with one that works, that restores the rule of law, perhaps dealing with some of the gun safety issues that are being debated across society, perhaps dealing with tax reform and bringing down our rates and broadening the base, perhaps dealing with finally battling our budget deficit.

But, instead, here we are back in Congress, picking up where we were before we worked together on the continuing resolution, passing pointless bills for presumably political reasons—bills that have no sign of passage in the Senate, bills that have a direct veto threat from the President of the United States, which is in his Statement of Administration Policy which I entered into the RECORD last night in the Rules Committee, and just as importantly, a bill that has no positive impact on the

most important issue facing our country today—job creation and economic growth.

Mr. Speaker, this bill is an attack on American workers; this bill is an attack on American businesses. Pure and simple, H.R. 1120 would effectively shut down the National Labor Relations Board, invalidate all 569 decisions that the NLRB made between January 12 and March of this year.

My colleagues claim this is a response to the D.C. Circuit Court decision. But when have we ever enshrined an intermediate court decision into statute? It makes absolutely no sense. This court decision found that nearly all recess appointments are invalid; but the reality is the decision of the D.C. Circuit conflicts entirely with judicial precedent and past practice.

President Reagan made 232 recess appointments. George H.W. Bush made 78. George W. Bush made 171. So far, President Obama has made 32—far fewer than his predecessors. In fact, every President since Reagan has appointed a member of the NLRB through a recess appointment.

In the absence of legislative action, any responsible Chief Executive takes the prerogative to make our laws and system of government work. If this body fails to pass immigration reform, the President might build upon the deferred action program and try to do what he can for detention reform. We need to change the laws. But failing that, what can a President do besides try to make those laws work?

□ 1250

In the absence of taking up ESEA reauthorization, in the absence of replacing No Child Left Behind with a Federal education law that gets accountability right and expands and replicates what works in public education and improves what isn't working, in the absence of doing that, the President and Secretary Duncan have taken the prerogative to grant waivers for States on a statutory framework that we know is insufficient and doesn't work.

So, again, it's no surprise that, in the absence of taking up nominees, the President used his recess appointment power to make sure that the important functions of government could continue.

When have we ever, as a House, responded directly to intermediate circuit court decisions by instantly making them statutes? Look, the majority of this House of Representatives wasn't so confident in the D.C. Circuit when it said that ObamaCare was constitutional. We didn't see bills instantly to say ObamaCare is constitutional because the D.C. District Court said it was constitutional. What about when the D.C. District Court upheld the constitutionality of civil unions in Washington, D.C.? Was there a bill from my colleagues on the other side to instantly say that civil unions are constitutional?

Look, this is in process through the judicial branch of government. We need to wait until the Supreme Court has decided if they will even rule in this case before we decide what to do on a statutory basis.

The executive branch needs to make the mechanisms of government work to the best of their ability. The legislative branch makes the laws. The judicial branch determines if either of the other two branches impugn the rights of one another or of the American people. It is a system that has served us well since our founding, and it's one that this bill flies in the face of.

Again, despite this bill's title, ''Preventing Greater Uncertainty in Labor-Management Relationships,'' it actually achieves the exact opposite—creates greater uncertainty in labor-management relationships. It throws judicial precedent and nearly 600 NLRB rulings into limbo.

American businesses would be severely harmed if this bill were to become law, which, of course, there is no chance of. It won't be taken up by the Senate. The President would veto it.

But were it to become law, like many other political measures that have been pursued in this body, it would generate regulatory uncertainty that would hang over business, hurting their valuations, preventing hiring of new employees, hurting the public marketplace, impacting entrepreneurs, employers, and workers to the detriment of our economy, destroying jobs in this country. Without a forum in which to mediate disagreements, labor and management, alike, have no recourse to iron out their differences and less incentive to iron out their differences. Passage of this bill could cause more strikes from workers, damaging businesses and hurting workers.

The underlying bill could very well be named the ''Strike Promotion Act.'' Instead of allowing Members and encouraging both sides of labor-management disputes to offer improvements and find common ground, quite the contrary, it destroys the very incentives that they have to reach agreement.

Mr. Speaker, it's too bad that the NLRB has become such a political punching bag, because I and many of my colleagues would certainly enjoy the opportunity to debate commonsense proposals to improve the relationship between employers and employees. If we want to have a debate about the NLRB, let us have that debate directly, not through some imposition into judicial prerogative. Let's bring in representatives from businesses and labor organizations. Let's hear from workers and businesses across America.

Look, if there's improvements to be made to the process that can lead to quicker response times, that can lead to fairer adjudication, if there's improvements that American businesses and American workers can agree on to make the process work better for economic growth and prosperity, let's do it. This bill does none of that. It leads to more strikes, leads to greater economic uncertainty, leads to destruction of jobs, leads to an interruption in the ability of a Chief Executive of this country—whomever he or she may be—from implementing the law to the best of their ability; and it's a bill that is, frankly, a waste of our time to even debate here on the floor of the House since we know that it has no chance of passage.

This bill is purely put before us for political intentions to perhaps satisfy some fringe element somewhere that likes this bill and likes to bash the rights of workers. But there's a lot of important work to be done, work that is too important for us to waste our time on this form of political posturing, which only stands to destroy jobs, hurt the economy, and create greater uncertainty, damaging American businesses and American workers.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, we need jobs in this country. There are nearly 12 million Americans unemployed and anxious to find work.

President Obama and the Senate Democrats' policies of higher taxes, record spending, and bigger government have failed to create jobs or boost economic growth. Put simply, this economy is growing too slowly to replace the millions of jobs lost. The failure of the President's runaway spending, deficits, and debt is being felt by every family struggling to put food on the table and pay their mortgages.

The March 2013 labor force participation rate is the lowest since 1979, and the 1-month increase in March 2013 of 663,000 new people not in the labor force is the largest increase ever recorded for the month of March since this data started being collected in 1975. If these individuals ''not in the workforce'' were counted in the official unemployment rate, that rate would increase to 11.2 percent.

Additionally, there are 47.3 million Americans receiving food stamps, which is equivalent to 15 percent of the population and represents, by far, the largest number in history. This number stands in stark contrast to when President Obama took office and there were only 31.9 million Americans using food stamps. Today, nearly one in seven Americans is on food stamps. What a sad commentary about our country.

All these statistics ultimately say the same thing: everyday Americans will keep struggling until our economy turns around. Fortunately for the American people, House Republicans have a plan for helping to restore economic growth and create jobs throughout the country.

The liberal elite simply cannot understand that more spending does not mean more jobs. Reckless deficit spending, mounting debt, growing red tape, higher taxes, a confusing Tax Code, higher energy prices, and rampant uncertainty all have job creators playing defense.

Campaigning for another failed stimulus and more job-destroying taxes, President Obama has repeatedly and falsely asserted that ''Congress isn't willing to move'' legislation to facilitate job growth.

While the President plays politics, House Republicans have been working and approving legislation to promote economic growth and job creation. The Republican plan for growth tears down barriers to job creation because jobs are priority number one.

As part of this plan, we are working diligently to cut job-killing red tape that costs small businesses $10,585 per employee each year; reduce gas prices; create jobs by producing more American energy, which is important since every penny increased per gallon of gas costs consumers $4 million per day; simplify the job-killing Tax Code that cost Americans $168 billion in 2010 just to comply with it; prevent job-killing tax hikes on small businesses; reduce uncertainty by tackling the debt crisis with responsible spending cuts; and the Republican plan will get Washington out of the way and put American job creators back on the offense.

Growing jobs and eliminating the deficit go hand in hand. To balance the budget, we need both spending cuts and real economic growth.

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

Mr. POLIS. Well, it sounds like I agree with the gentlelady on many of our national priorities. For goodness sake, let's reform the Tax Code; let's bring down rates. Gas prices, my constituents are complaining about them; let's take action. Preventing tax increases, balancing the budget, making sure that we have a business climate that's friendly for small businesses, why aren't we talking about any of that on the floor of the House today instead of enshrining a D.C. District Court decision into statute, to the detriment of job creation, to the detriment of American business, against many of those great concepts that my colleague, Dr. FOXX, espoused?

So, I mean, I think there's got to be a connection here. I think the American people are smart enough to make it. It's great to pay lip service to all these wonderful things that Democrats and Republicans want to pursue, but what are we doing with our legislative time that taxpayers pay for here in the House? We're trying to prevent the President from implementing the law that Congress has made.

With that, Mr. Speaker, I'd like to yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. ANDREWS).

(Mr. ANDREWS asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. ANDREWS. I thank my friend for yielding.

In the summer of 2011, as the country continued to see rising deficits, Members of the Congress knew that they had to do something about that in connection with the extension of what we call the debt ceiling, which lets the country borrow money to pay its bills.

□ 1300

As a part of that agreement, a large number of people from both parties voted for something that hasn't turned out very well, and it's called sequestration. This is not something that's just a word that gets tossed around in this Chamber and has political consequences; it is having a real and negative impact on the country.

I just came from a hearing of the Armed Services Committee where the chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff and the Secretary of Defense told us that nine battle groups and three bomber groups of our Air Force and our Navy planes have been grounded. About one-third of the Nation's air capacity isn't flying.

Across the country today, people who are on Medicare who need chemotherapy treatments from their doctors' offices are finding that many doctors are declining to do chemotherapy treatments for cancer patients because of the cuts that take place in sequestration.

I met earlier this week with employees of the Naval Sea Systems engineering command in Philadelphia, whom I represent. They are looking at a 20 percent pay cut because of furloughs. These are real problems that are affecting real people. The House is opting to do nothing about this—nothing.

The economists have told us that these ill-advised sequestration cuts will cost the economy 750,000 jobs this year. Mr. VAN HOLLEN, my friend from Maryland, has a bill, and that bill says that we should save an amount of money equal to what the sequestration is allegedly saving and not have these cuts in cancer care and not have a third of our air power grounded and not have Federal employees take a 20 percent pay cut.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN proposes that we cut subsidies to huge oil companies, that we cut subsidies to huge agribusinesses, and we have people who make more than $1 million a year in income pay a slightly higher tax rate. I understand, ladies and gentlemen of the House, that some would agree with that proposal and others would disagree with that proposal. That's democracy.

We're not even taking a vote on that proposal because the majority Republican leadership has refused to put on this floor any piece of legislation that would stop this harm to the country. I know they'll say it's the President's fault or it's the Senate's fault or it's whoever.

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

Mr. POLIS. I yield the gentleman an additional minute.

Mr. ANDREWS. I thank my friend for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I know that there will be lots of back and forth about whose fault it was that we got into this position. It's everyone's fault. There are people on both sides of the aisle that made a bad judgment on this. I'm one of them. But now we have a responsibility to fix it; and if the majority has an idea as to how we could fix the sequester problem, bring it to the floor.

Since the new Congress took office on January 3 of this year, there has not been one hearing, not one markup, not one bill, not one vote on fixing this problem that threatens the jobs of 750,000 Americans. Rather than this metaphysical legal debate we're about to have about the National Labor Relations Board, why don't we put on the House floor legislation that would create jobs in this country, postpone the sequester, and deal with the problems that we talked about here today. The House is in session, but it's missing in action when it comes to addressing the real problems of the American people.

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

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

If we defeat the previous question, I will offer an amendment to this rule that will allow the House to hold a vote on the Paycheck Fairness Act. Here we are in 2013—2013—and yet women make 77 cents for every dollar made by a man for equal work. Equal pay is not just a problem for women, but for all American families who work hard to pay their bills. It's high time that this body took up the Paycheck Fairness Act, which we will do if we defeat the previous question.

To discuss our proposal, I would like to yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Connecticut (Ms. DELAURO).

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the previous question. Defeat of the previous question will allow the gentleman from Colorado to amend the rule to provide for consideration of the Paycheck Fairness Act, an act that addresses the persistent problem of unequal pay in our economy.

It has now been 50 years since Congress passed the Equal Pay Act to confront the ''serious and endemic'' problem of unequal wages in America. President John F. Kennedy signed that bill into law to end ''the unconscionable practice of paying female employees less wages than male employees for the same job.''

But that practice persists today. Today, even though women are now half of the Nation's workforce, they are still only being paid 77 cents on the dollar as compared to men. This holds true across occupations and education levels. Don't let anyone fool you or tell you that if you hold constant for education and other areas that, in fact, there is no wage gap; it is just not true. A simple piece of legislation that says: men and women—same job, same pay. Those of us who serve in the Congress, men and women, all parts of the country, different education skills, different skill sets in general, we get paid the same amount of money. It's true in the military as well.

This week, we once again recognize Equal Pay Day, the day in 2013 when a woman's earnings for 2012 catch up to what a man made last year. Unequal pay not only affects women; it affects families all across the country who are trying to pay their bills, trying to achieve the American Dream, and are getting less take-home pay than they deserve for their hard work.

Everyone here agrees that women should be paid the same as men for the same work. That is what paycheck fairness is all about—same job, same pay.

It is why President Obama called for passage of the Paycheck Fairness Act in the State of the Union address in January.

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

Mr. POLIS. I yield the gentlelady an additional 30 seconds.

Ms. DELAURO. Because it is time for us to come together and take the next steps to stop pay discrimination—by putting an end to pay secrecy, strengthening workers' ability to challenge discrimination, and bringing equal pay law into line with other civil rights laws.

I urge my colleagues to defeat the previous question, support the Paycheck Fairness Act and unequal pay for good. Fifty years after the Equal Pay Act, it is finally time to give women the tools they need to ensure that they are paid what they deserve for the same day's work. What are we waiting for in this body?

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

This is a typical liberal habit: do as I say, not as I do.

I think, Mr. Speaker, that our colleague from Connecticut should direct her comments to the White House. There is absolutely nothing to stop the White House from correcting the egregious pay differentials that exist there among the most liberal group in the country.

With that, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. POLIS. Before further yielding, I am going to yield 30 seconds to the gentlelady from Connecticut to respond.

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Speaker, I would tell my colleague that, in fact, this body, under different leadership than this current majority, passed the paycheck fairness bill twice. It has to be done through the Congress; we have the ability to do it. I would suggest to my colleagues, who on the other side of the aisle would like to talk about pay equity for women, that they sign the discharge petition. We have 200 Members who are aboard. Let's get this bill out of the committee, onto the floor, vote for it as we did in the past, and send it to the Senate so that it could be passed there as well.

I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. DELANEY).

□ 1310

Mr. DELANEY. I appreciate my good friend from Colorado yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, I also rise in support of the Paycheck Fairness Act.

Last year, 58 percent of the college graduates in this country were women. Right now in this country, over 50 percent of the individuals that have college degrees are women, and last year in corporate America, 53 percent of new hires for positions that required a college degree were given to women. This reflects broad, gender-based parity with respect to universities and with respect to entry-level positions in corporate America.

However, Mr. Speaker, when we look at what's going on with respect to advancement—in other words, women's ability to climb or ascend the corporate ladder—we see a very different story emerging. Even though 50 percent of the workers with college degrees in corporate America are women, when it came to promotions for managers, only 37 percent of those went to women. When it came to promotions for vice presidents, only 25 percent went to women. And when it came to promotions towards the executive committee level or the C-suite, if you will, only 15 percent went to women. This reflects a significant talent drain that occurs with respect to women as they advance in corporate America.

Mr. Speaker, this is a very significant problem for this country and for every American. It's a problem if you care about our economy. To have a productive and growth-oriented economy, we need diversity, diversity of ideas, and we cannot have that unless women are represented in policymaking decisions of corporations.

This is a problem, Mr. Speaker, if we care about competitiveness because we cannot have a competitive economy if we make decisions based on gender and not based on merit.

This is a problem, Mr. Speaker, if you care about working families. More than 50 percent of the breadwinners in this country are women. If they don't have the same access that men do, it not only affects them, but it affects their children.

Mr. Speaker, this is a problem if we care about women, if we care about young women in particular and our daughters. And as a father of four daughters, I care very deeply about making sure my daughters have a view that they have equality of opportunity regardless of whatever career they choose.

We have to change the mindset of institutions, the mindset of individuals, and this legislation helps do that.

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, I'd like to reiterate again—and my colleague from Connecticut has left—that there is absolutely nothing that would prevent the White House from giving equal pay to people in jobs there. We don't need new legislation to do that. It's certainly possible for the White House to do it now. And that is one of the most egregious situations of differential pay that exists in the country right now.

With that, I reserve the balance of my time.

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

I would respond to the gentlelady that most women in this country don't work for the White House. Most women in this country work for private sector employers, public sector employers, and others.

We care about all women. We want to ensure paycheck fairness—same work, same pay. But somehow addressing this among a handful of women in the White House hardly addresses the real needs of American families, where women across our country in Colorado, in California, North Carolina, and Texas are earning 77 cents on the dollar.

It's unfair. And as my colleague Mr. DELANEY pointed out, it doesn't enhance American economic competitiveness. It hurts us as a country to have pay based on bias rather than merit. It's simply the wrong way to go.

President Obama needs this body to act and pass the Paycheck Fairness Act for us to be able to make sure that pay discrimination cannot endure in this country.

With that, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE).

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

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleagues and friends who are managing this legislation.

We are in the Judiciary Committee passing something called the REINS Act because our friends on the other side of the aisle don't believe that the President is omnipotent.

Frankly, as my good friend from Colorado said, the President doesn't control the bus drivers and school aides and nurses aides and doesn't control the secretaries and doesn't control the construction workers who happen to be women. They don't control those individuals. Oh, and let's not forget the office workers who happen to be women.

Many of my constituents who get up every morning—I saw one young woman, Mr. POLIS, get on a city bus, drop her child off at the school, really do a marathon dash to the school in order for the bus to make a U-turn around—not a school bus, a city bus—to get on that bus to track all the way across to get to her job. I can assure you that she is not getting probably equal pay for equal work because that is the dilemma that we have.

So I support ordering the previous question and voting ''no'' so that we can move forward and do the right thing.

And that just compounds my reason for coming to oppose this rule on the Preventing Greater Uncertainty in Labor-Management Relations Act because it is, in essence, a complete opposite. I would call it something else, but

I'm going to restrain myself. H.R. 1120 is ridiculous.

In actuality, my friends, what it does is put a spear through the relationships that corporate and workers are able to have before the NLRB. The President has just finished appointing Republicans and Democrats—three Democrats and two Republicans—to do the work that brings businesses together for a fair assessment of their issue with working people.

Many resolutions of issues dealing with fair pay, dealing with working conditions are done at the NLRB.

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

Mr. POLIS. I yield an additional 30 seconds to the gentlewoman from Texas.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. I thank the gentleman.

Do you know what this bill does? It puts a knife in the process that has been used by President Bush 140 times—recess appointments—to keep the work of the American people going forward. How backwards is that?

I love my friends, but we need to put on the floor sensible gun legislation, we need to be talking about immigration reform. But to talk about blocking the NLRB from work when President Bush used the same process. And the fact that a court ordered something—300 other opinions said the recess appointments are legitimate.

I ask my colleagues to vote down the rule, vote down the bill, stand with your working friends in America, stand with our unions, stand with making America great, and stand with peace and reconciliation by a working NLRB.

Mr. Speaker, I rise to oppose this rule, and the underlying bill, H.R. 1120, the "Preventing Greater Uncertainty in Labor-Management Relations Act."

This bill effectively prevents American employees from seeking remedies when their rights under the National Labor Relations Act, or NLRA, are violated.

The NLRA guarantees American workers in the private sector the right to act collectively to improve the conditions of their workplace. This applies for formal meetings with supervisors, as well as to employees who gather in the break room to discuss a new company policy or compare their paychecks. It also protects workers when they act together to protest working conditions, such as leaving the building because the employer refuses to turn on the heat. Recently, these laws protected employees who discussed their salaries with each other on facebook. You don't need to be part of a union to be protected by these laws.

Under the NLRA, employees can go to the National Labor Relations Board, or NLRB, with these grievances.

The NLRB is also charged with conducting elections for labor union representation and with investigating and remedying unfair labor practices involving unions.

Recently, the D.C. Circuit, one of our federal appellate courts, ruled that the National Labor Relations Board, or NLRB, cannot carry out its congressionally delegated duties of enforcing the NLRA because it deemed President Obama's appointments to the Board invalid.

The entire decision hinged on a controversial interpretation of the word "the" in our Constitution. Article II states that "The President shall have Power to fill up all Vacancies that may happen during the Recess of the Senate." The court decided that this clause of our Constitution refers to some recesses, but not others. Many other federal courts have disagreed with this stretched reading of our Constitution, and in areas of the U.S. covered by these courts, the D.C. Circuit decision does not apply.

While we eagerly await the Supreme Court's verdict on the meaning of the word "the," the NLRB is still allowed to continue carrying out its statutory duties under the NLRA, and American workers still retain their rights under the NLRA.

That is why I am opposing. This bill merely eliminates the rights of American workers in places outside the D.C. Circuit to seek a remedy when their employer violates our National Labor Relations Act. Without a remedy, rights are meaningless. Depriving employees of this remedy during these difficult economic times is merely a stab in the back to hard working Americans across the country. This Congress should not take actions that undermine American employees and working families.

The argument that an active NLRB produces economic uncertainty is unfounded. America has prospered since the creation of the NLRB. Other countries that have much stronger laws protecting worker rights and are much more heavily unionized, such as Australia, Canada, Germany, and the Netherlands, are doing better or at least as well as the United States in this economic downturn. H.R. 1120 merely seeks to add more uncertainty and create fewer rights for American workers during these tough economic times.

Mr. Speaker, I oppose this rule, and the underlying bill. Congress should not remove the ability for employees to seek redress for workplace wrongs. Instead, we need to stand up for our employees and working families.

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

I want to respond again to my colleague from Colorado in his saying that we have to pass a bill on pay equity to get the President to do the right thing. That just seems incomprehensible to me.

I think the President should be our leader in this country and should practice what he preaches, and so should our colleagues across the aisle. I think that the White House could show itself as a model for the rest of the country by paying the women in the White House the same as the men are being paid. I find it interesting that our colleagues have simply ignored what is happening in the White House and call for a bill to be passed to make the President do what is the right thing. In the past, our country and the people in our country have looked to our President to be a role model for us.

With that, Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time, and I would ask the gentleman if he is ready to close.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I have one remaining speaker.

I happen to have a gentlelady currently working for the Rules Committee sitting next to me here and helping with our research on this bill, and she informs me she used to work for the White House. She's a female. She tells me she was paid the exact same amount as her male colleagues.

With that, I'd like to yield 2 minutes to the gentlelady from Ohio (Ms. KAPTUR).

Ms. KAPTUR. I thank Congressmen Polis, a leader on these issues, for yielding me time.

I rise, Mr. Speaker, in opposition to the rule and the underlying bill, which would prevent the National Labor Relations Board from doing its job.

The NLRB is tasked with protecting employees' rights to organize by helping employees determine whether they want a union to represent their interests or not.

Nations with bargaining rights have middle classes; those that don't have bargaining rights don't have middle classes.

The NLRB also investigates charges of unfair labor practices from both employees and employers, facilitates settlements rather than expensive lengthy litigation, and enforces rules by administrative law judges that provide orderly procedures to prevent the disruption of the flow of commerce due to a labor dispute.

This bill before us is just another partisan ploy to undermine union workers and continues the Republican war against the middle class.

First we had the Ryan budget, which would put the burden of paying for two wars and tax cuts for the wealthy on the backs of seniors and our middle class families. Now we have a bill that would result in violations of worker rights going unpunished, union elections not being certified, and that would end recourse for workers who are wrongfully terminated.

Instead of letting the courts do their job, Republicans want to take a Big Government action by preempting any decision from a higher court.

□ 1320

This bill ignores the fact that Republicans in the Senate would not allow for a vote on any of the President's nominees, and said publicly that they just wanted to make the NLRB inoperative.

It is ironic that when President Obama follows the path as President Reagan and President Bush did, that of appointing individuals to carry out the work of our government, the Republican House proposes a bill to completely undermine an independent Federal agency.

Finally, studies show that the world's best performing economies and strongest middle classes have high union density and a high level of cooperation between labor and management. If Republicans care about creating jobs and strengthening our economy, then why are they considering a bill that would take away a forum for employers and unions to work out their differences?

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to join me in opposing this rule and the underlying bill.

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, I assume the gentleman is ready to close, so I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. POLIS. I am ready to close, and I yield myself the remainder of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Colorado is recognized for 4 minutes.

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, rather than addressing a number of issues that my colleagues have talked about here today, whether that issue is gas prices, whether it's equal pay for women, whether that's equal pay in the White House or equal pay for Main Street America, that's something that's important to American families. Whether it's balancing our budget, whether it's keeping taxes low and making sure that American businesses can go and create jobs, none of those things are being talked about here today. Instead, we are bringing forward a bill that would be a bureaucratic nightmare, all without protecting a single American worker and without protecting a single American business.

This bill was reported out of the Education and the Workforce Committee, on which I serve, without a single Democratic vote, and it is being rushed to the floor for consideration at a time when we face record deficits, record gas prices, have a crisis for which we need to create jobs; yet here we are, debating a bill that will go nowhere, and if it did, it would destroy jobs in our country.

I'd love to see us spending more time balancing the budget and in training and educating our workforce—preparing kids for the jobs of the future. We have limited floor time here in Washington. Every moment that we have is sponsored by the taxpayers of this great country. We owe it to those who elect us and those who pay for this body to be open as they pay for the very cameras which allow Americans to watch us here today. We owe it to them to invest the limited time we have here wisely, on critical issues of national importance, including making sure that women across our country are paid the same amount for equal work.

If we are going to have a discussion of the NLRB, let's at least do it in a serious way rather than trying to enshrine a D.C. District Court decision into law. Let's bring businesses and workers together and have serious discussion; involve Senate Republicans, involve Senate Democrats, involve the administration to come up with a better framework for ensuring that labor and management can work together to promote American competitiveness, to grow jobs and to grow the middle class.

That's not what today's process is about, but these are just a few of the ways we could improve the broken process. Unfortunately, again, it seems like the Republicans have chosen none of the above.

I urge a ''no'' vote on the rule and on the bill, and I urge my colleagues to vote ''no'' and defeat the previous question.

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

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

In closing, Mr. Speaker, House Republicans are committed to upholding the Constitution and providing certainty for employers, employees, and unions. The rule before us today provides for the consideration of a bill that ensures that certainty by pressing ''pause'' on the National Labor Relations Board's activities until the legal uncertainty is resolved.

Therefore, I urge my colleagues to vote for this rule and the underlying bill.

Mr. CHABOT. Mr. Speaker, research released this week from the National Federation of Independent Business indicates that more small businesses are decreasing their number of employees than increasing. On top of that, the net percent of owners planning to hire new employees fell last month to zero percent.

Some of this unfortunate news can be attributed to the legal chaos created by the Administration's recess appointments to the National Labor Relations Board, NLRB—appointments that a U.S. Court of Appeals rendered unconstitutional. Despite this ruling, the NLRB continues to issue job-crushing edicts.

Unfortunately, this confusion is only creating more costly litigation—not jobs.

The Preventing Greater Uncertainty in Labor-Management Relations Act, H.R. 1120, will resolve this confusion by preventing the NLRB from implementing, administering, or enforcing any new decisions, until a duly appointed and confirmed board can be organized.

I am proud to support this legislation on behalf of businesses through Southwest Ohio, and I hope the Senate will act quickly on it in order to provide some certainty for employees and employers.

The material previously referred to by Mr. POLIS is as follows:

AN AMENDMENT TO H. RES. 146 OFFERED BY MR. POLIS OF COLORADO

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

SEC. 2. Immediately upon adoption of this resolution the Speaker shall, pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule XVIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the bill (H.R. 377) To amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 to provide more effective remedies to victims of discrimination in the payment of wages on the basis of sex, and for other purposes. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. General debate shall be confined to the bill and shall not exceed one hour equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Education and the Workforce. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. All points of order against provisions in the bill are waived. At the conclusion of consideration of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions. If the Committee of the Whole rises and reports that it has come to no resolution on the bill, then on the next legislative day the House shall, immediately after the third daily order of business under clause 1 of rule XIV, resolve into the Committee of the Whole for further consideration of the bill.

SEC. 3. Clause 1(c) of rule XIX shall not apply to the consideration of the H.R. 377 as specified in section 2 of this resolution.

THE VOTE ON THE PREVIOUS QUESTION: WHAT IT REALLY MEANS

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

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

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

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

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

Ms. FOXX. I yield back the balance of my time, and I move the previous question on the resolution.

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

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 and clause 9 of rule XX, this 15-minute vote on ordering the previous question will be followed by 5-minute votes on adopting House Resolution 146, if ordered, and approving the Journal.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 226, nays 192, not voting 13, as follows:

[Roll No. 97]

YEAS—226

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

NAYS—192

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

NOT VOTING—13

Barton
Blumenauer
Braley (IA)
Castor (FL)
Collins (NY)
Costa
Hastings (FL)
Huelskamp
Lynch
Markey
Pompeo
Speier
Young (FL)

□ 1351

So the previous question was ordered.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated for:

Mr. COLLINS of New York. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 97, H. Res. 146, On Ordering the Previous Question, had I been present, I would have voted "yea."

COMMUNICATION FROM THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication from the Clerk of the House of Representatives:

OFFICE OF THE CLERK,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, April 11, 2013.

Hon. JOHN BOEHNER,
Speaker, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: I have the honor to transmit herewith a scanned copy of a letter received from Mr. Rupert T. Borgsmiller, Executive Director, Illinois State Board of Elections, indicating that, according to the unofficial returns of the Special Election held April 9, 2013, the Honorable Robin L. Kelly was elected Representative to Congress for the Second Congressional District, State of Illinois.

With best wishes, I am

Sincerely,

KAREN L. HAAS,
Clerk.

Enclosure.

STATE BOARD OF ELECTIONS,
STATE OF ILLINOIS,
Springfield, IL, April 11, 2013.

Hon. KAREN L. HAAS,
Clerk, House of Representatives, The Capitol, Washington, DC.

DEAR MS. HAAS: Although it is not the normal practice of the Illinois State Board of Elections to release unofficial election results, in response to a request from your office, we are hereby transmitting UNOFFICIAL election results for the April 9, 2013 Special Election in the Second Congressional District in the State of Illinois.

Sincerely,

RUPERT T. BORGSMILLER,
Executive Director.

SWEARING IN OF THE HONORABLE ROBIN L. KELLY, OF ILLINOIS, AS A MEMBER OF THE HOUSE

Mr. GUTIERREZ. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentlewoman from Illinois, the Honorable Robin Kelly, be permitted to take the oath of office today.

Her certificate of election has not arrived, but there is no contest and no question has been raised with regard to her election.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. Will Representative-elect Kelly and the members of the Illinois delegation present themselves in the well.

All Members will rise and the Representative-elect will please raise her right hand.

Ms. KELLY of Illinois appeared at the bar of the House and took the oath of office, as follows:

Do you solemnly swear that you will support and defend the Constitution of the United States against all enemies, foreign and domestic; that you will bear true faith and allegiance to the same; that you take this obligation freely, without any mental reservation or purpose of evasion; and that you will well and faithfully discharge the duties of the office on which you are about to enter, so help you God.

The SPEAKER. Congratulations, you are now a Member of the 113th Congress.

WELCOMING THE HONORABLE ROBIN L. KELLY TO THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. GUTIERREZ) is recognized for 1 minute.

There was no objection.

Mr. GUTIERREZ. Mr. Speaker, I yield that 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from Illinois, BOBBY RUSH. His name obviously ends in R and mine in G and that's why I got to be the dean, but we're sharing this together because this is a joyous day.

Congressman BOBBY RUSH, please introduce the gentlelady.

Mr. RUSH. I want to thank my colleague, LUIS GUTIERREZ, the dean of the Illinois delegation.

Ladies and gentlemen of the House, it is my honor to introduce to you one of the most remarkable persons that you will ever want to meet—a fine, outstanding, accomplished public servant, one who has cut her teeth helping to address the pain and the problems of those who reside in the Second Congressional District.

This fine woman is a sterling example of the kind of public officials that we send to Washington from the Land of Lincoln. She's beyond reproach in every area of her life. She commits herself day and night to solving the problems of common, everyday, ordinary people. She's a person with keen vision, enormous insight, and enormous capacity to accomplish what she starts out and what she began. She is indeed an inspiration to all of us. She is a person that's going to make this House proud, the State of Illinois proud, and the people from the Second Congressional District very, very proud of her.

As the Congressman from the First Congressional District, I'm so glad to introduce you to the new Congresswoman from the Second Congressional District, ROBIN KELLY.

Mr. GUTIERREZ. Mr. Speaker, I now yield to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. SHIMKUS).

Mr. SHIMKUS. I thank my colleague.

We want to welcome ROBIN KELLY to the Chamber. You'll find that people are working hard on both sides of the aisle to represent the folks that they are here to represent. The Illinois delegation has a monthly bicameral luncheon, and we look forward to meeting with you there so that those downstaters and those from other districts can understand the concerns of the south side of Chicago, and the like, and you can understand the concerns of real rural, deep southern Illinois.

Thank you, and welcome to the Chamber.

Mr. GUTIERREZ. Thank you, Congressman SHIMKUS.

And now, ladies and gentlemen, the newest distinguished lady from the State of Illinois (Ms. KELLY).

The SPEAKER. The gentlewoman from Illinois is recognized.

Ms. KELLY of Illinois. Thank you so very much. It is truly an honor to be standing here and humbling to have been chosen to represent the families of the Second Congressional District. I thank the entire Illinois delegation for their support and advice. I would also like to thank my many family members, friends, and staff who are here in the gallery today.

□ 1400

As I look around this hallowed Chamber, I know this is a place where so much history has been made. But today, I stand before you to talk about our present.

I ran for Congress so that I could work to bring about a safer, less violent, and more prosperous future, one in which our children can grow up without the fear of gun violence. Today is an important day in that fight. I look forward to working with you to protect our children from criminals and to protect our Second Amendment rights for law-abiding citizens. Because we should—and can—do both.

I look forward to working on the many issues we face, such as creating jobs, passing immigration reform, and continuing the hard work of improving our health care system. But today is about a new beginning for the people of the Second Congressional District, who I am so proud and honored to represent. I look forward to being their advocate and their champion and to working with you to create a brighter future for all of our constituents.

Thank you and God bless.

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

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER

The SPEAKER. Under clause 5(d) of rule XX, the Chair announces to the House that, in light of the administration of the oath to the gentlewoman from Illinois (Ms. KELLY), the whole number of the House is 433.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 1120, PREVENTING GREATER UNCERTAINTY IN LABOR-MANAGEMENT RELATIONS ACT

The SPEAKER. Without objection, 5-minute voting will continue.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the resolution.

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 226, nays 194, not voting 12, as follows:

[Roll No. 98]

YEAS—226

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

Valadao
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walorski
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (IN)

NAYS—194

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

NOT VOTING—12

Barton
Braley (IA)
Castor (FL)
Collins (NY)
Hastings (FL)
Huelskamp
Lynch
Markey
Pompeo
Rush
Speier
Young (FL)

□ 1408

So the resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated for:

Mr. COLLINS of New York. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 98, H. Res. 146, On Adoption of the Rule, had I been present, I would have voted "yea."

THE JOURNAL

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

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

This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 272, nays 136, answered "present" 1, not voting 23, as follows:

[Roll No. 99]

YEAS—272

Aderholt
Alexander
Amodei
Bachmann
Bachus
Barber
Barletta
Barrow (GA)
Beatty
Becerra
Bera (CA)
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Bustos
Butterfield
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Cantor
Capito
Capps
Cárdenas
Carney
Carson (IN)
Carter
Cartwright
Cassidy
Castro (TX)
Chabot
Chu
Cicilline
Clay
Coble
Cole
Conaway
Connolly
Cook
Cooper
Cramer
Crawford
Cuellar
Culberson
Cummings
Daines
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Deutch
Diaz-Balart
Doggett
Doyle
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Edwards
Ellison
Ellmers
Engel
Enyart
Eshoo
Esty
Farenthold
Fattah
Fincher
Fleischmann
Fleming
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Gibbs
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Grayson
Grimm
Guthrie
Hahn
Hanabusa
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings (WA)
Heck (WA)
Hensarling
Himes
Hinojosa
Holt
Horsford
Hoyer
Huffman
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt
Issa
Johnson, Sam
Kaptur
Kelly (PA)
Kildee
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kline
Kuster
Labrador
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Langevin
Lankford
Larsen (WA)
Levin
Lipinski
Loebsack
Lofgren
Long
Lowey
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Lummis
Marino
Massie
Matsui
McCarthy (CA)
McCarthy (NY)
McCaul
McClintock
McCollum
McHenry
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
McNerney
Meadows
Meehan
Meeks
Meng
Messer
Mica
Michaud
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Moore
Mullin
Mulvaney
Murphy (FL)
Murphy (PA)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Neugebauer
Noem
Nunes
Nunnelee
O'Rourke
Olson
Pascrell
Paulsen
Pearce
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Perry
Petri
Pingree (ME)
Pitts
Pocan
Polis
Posey
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rice (SC)
Richmond
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Ruiz
Runyan
Ruppersberger
Ryan (WI)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Scalise
Schiff
Schneider
Schrader
Schwartz
Schweikert
Scott (VA)
Scott, Austin
Scott, David
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sessions
Sewell (AL)
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Shimkus
Shuster
Sinema
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Stewart
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tierney
Titus
Tonko
Tsongas
Upton
Van Hollen
Vela
Wagner
Walden
Walorski
Walz
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watt
Waxman
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Welch
Wenstrup
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (FL)
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Yarmuth
Yoho
Young (IN)

NAYS—136

Amash
Andrews
Barr
Bass
Benishek
Bentivolio
Bishop (NY)
Bonner
Brady (PA)
Brooks (IN)
Broun (GA)
Burgess
Capuano
Chaffetz
Clarke
Cleaver
Clyburn
Coffman
Cohen
Collins (GA)
Conyers
Costa
Cotton
Courtney
Crenshaw
Crowley
Davis, Rodney
DeFazio
Denham
Dent
Dingell
Duckworth
Duffy
Fitzpatrick
Flores
Foxx
Garcia
Gardner
Garrett
Gerlach
Gibson
Gingrey (GA)
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Gutierrez
Hall
Hanna
Heck (NV)
Herrera Beutler
Holding
Honda
Hudson
Huizenga (MI)
Israel
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Jenkins
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, E. B.
Jones
Jordan
Joyce
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Kilmer
Kind
Kinzinger (IL)
Kirkpatrick
Lance
Larson (CT)
Latham
Latta
Lee (CA)
Lewis
LoBiondo
Lowenthal
Maffei
Maloney, Carolyn
Maloney, Sean
Marchant
Matheson
McDermott
McGovern
Miller (FL)
Miller, George
Negrete McLeod
Nugent
Palazzo
Pallone
Pastor (AZ)
Payne
Peters (CA)
Peters (MI)
Peterson
Pittenger
Poe (TX)
Price (GA)
Radel
Rahall
Reed
Renacci
Ribble
Rigell
Rooney
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Salmon
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schock
Sires
Slaughter
Southerland
Stivers
Stockman
Terry
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tiberi
Tipton
Turner
Valadao
Vargas
Veasey
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walberg
Woodall
Yoder
Young (AK)

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—1

Owens

NOT VOTING—23

Barton
Braley (IA)
Castor (FL)
Collins (NY)
Farr
Gohmert
Granger
Grijalva
Hastings (FL)
Higgins
Huelskamp
Johnson (GA)
Lynch
Markey
Moran
Nolan
Pompeo
Rangel
Reichert
Simpson
Speier
Stutzman
Young (FL)

□ 1416

So the Journal was approved.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated for:

Mr. COLLINS of New York. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 99, Journal, On Approval of the Journal, had I been present, I would have voted "yea."

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. HUELSKAMP. Mr. Speaker, I was unavoidably detained by the Medal of Honor ceremony for Father Emil Kapaun on Thursday, April 11th and missed rollcall votes 97, 98 and 99.

Had I been present, I would have voted as follows: "yea" on rollcall No. 97, "yea" on rollcall No. 98, "yea" on rollcall No. 99.

HOUR OF MEETING ON TOMORROW

Ms. FOXX. 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 gentlewoman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

PROTECTING LIFE

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

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, there is nothing on Earth more precious than life. No matter where you stand on the abortion issue, most Americans find the practice and actions of Dr. Kermit Gosnell, an abortion provider, to be brutal, unconscionable, and barbaric.

The astounding reality is that Dr. Gosnell's methods of killing babies who survive abortions are commonly used by clinics across the Nation. Similar deadly actions take the lives of 1 million unborn children each year in the United States. This is a violent act that is entirely unjustifiable.

I am a firm believer that every human being is created in God's own image, every life is precious, and we have an obligation to protect life at every stage. It's time we get rid of this gruesome procedure once and for all, and I hope and pray that the President will consider it before more innocent lives are taken.

HONORING THE MEMORY AND MOURNING THE LOSS OF RONNIE RASPBERRY OF HOUSTON, TEXAS

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

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to one of the greatest labor leaders that I have known and to honor the memory and mourn the loss of Ronnie Raspberry of Houston, Texas. I rise to pay tribute to him as a champion of working people, one of the great community leaders in the cities of Houston and Harris in Texas.

Unfortunately, he passed. In this month of April, we lost a dear friend. Ronnie Raspberry was born in 1941 in the midst of the times of challenge. And he married his beloved wife, Roycie, and they are proud parents of five children.

Being born in the midst of World War II, he understood as a child the value of service, and so he joined the United States Marine Corps and was honorably discharged.

He then began to work in an apprenticeship program under the Houston Joint Apprenticeship and Training Committee for the Electrical Industry. He then became a member of Local Union No. 716 of the International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers, where I first met him. What a generous heart; what a man who loved people. He loved to train people. He was a fighter to ensure that there was dignity in the workplace.

In 1974, at age 32, he was elected as business manager. He held that position for 15 years. During his stewardship, he served as its chief contract negotiator, chairman, and secretary of numerous boards and trusts and committees. He continued to represent labor at labor conferences. He was elected and served 5 years as a representative of the Sixth District International Executive Council.

Ronnie was awarded the West Gulf Ports Council ''Labor Leader of the Year,'' Mr. Speaker, and appointed to many other positions by Governor White. We knew he was a good leader.

So I stand here today to offer my deepest sympathy to his wife and family and to thank him for his service as he rests in peace. We love you. We thank you for being the great leader that you've been to all those who are in need, fighting for the working people. Thank you, Ronnie. God bless you. And, again, may you rest in peace.

Mr. Speaker, I rise to pay tribute to Mr. Ronnie Raspberry, a great American, a champion of working people, and one of the great community leaders in the City of Houston. Ronnie Raspberry died this past Monday, April 8, 2013, at the age of 71. His loss is mourned not only by his family and friends but the thousands of people he helped and inspired over the course of his full and eventful life.

Born on August 14, 1941, Ronnie Raspberry later met and married his beloved wife, Roycie, and they were the proud parents of five children.

After serving and receiving an Honorable Discharge from the United States Marine Corps, Ronnie applied for and was accepted into a 4-year Apprenticeship Program under the Houston Joint Apprenticeship and Training Committee for the Electrical Industry.

After completing his first of apprenticeship training, Ronnie became a member of Local Union #716 of the International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers. Ronnie served on every committee his local union, IBEW Local #716, would allow.

Ronnie completed his apprenticeship, graduating with honor. He then ran for and was elected to a number of Board positions in his Local Union.

In 1974, at the age of 32, he was elected as Business Manager of IBEW Local Union #716. He held this position for 15 years.

During Ronnie's stewardship of Local Union No. 716, he served as its Chief Contract Negotiator, and as both Chairman and/or Secretary of numerous Boards, Trusts, and Committees, as well as all other responsibilities that go with being Business Manager. He continued to represent labor at Labor Conferences and Conventions, as well as Political Conferences and Conventions.

Ronnie was elected and served 5 years as representative to the Sixth District International Executive Council of the International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers representing the IBEW members from Texas, Oklahoma, Louisiana, Arkansas, New Mexico, and Arizona.

In 1986, Ronnie was awarded the West Gulf Ports Council "Labor Leader of the Year" Award. Ronnie also appointed by then Governor Mark White, to serve on the Management Task Force for the Texas State Treasurer, Ann Richards. He later was appointed by Governor Ann Richards as a Commissioner on the Texas State Licensing and Regulation Commission, a position he held for six years.

Ronnie served as the Executive Secretary of the Houston Gulf Coast Building and Construction Trades Council until December 2012 when he finished his term. He then joined the high respected law firm of Williams Bailey, now Williams Kherkher, of Houston, Texas, serving as Labor Relations Officer, a position he held until he passed away earlier this week.

Mr. Speaker, Ronnie Raspberry lived a full and consequential life and he will be deeply missed by all who knew him as a friend, colleague, advocate, and community leader. Most of all he will be missed by his relatives and his children who knew and loved him as Dad; his loving wife, Roycie.

Mr. Speaker, I ask a moment of silence in honor of the memory of Ronnie Raspberry.

□ 1420

THE RECOVERING SERVICE MEMBERS DISABILITY BENEFITS ACT

(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, today my colleague, Representative LOEBSACK, and I are proud to reintroduce the Recovering Service Members Disability Benefits Act. This legislation is commonsense and fixes a glaring problem.

Currently, our Nation's wounded warriors are forced to wait 5 months for their approved Social Security disability benefits. This is injustice to our Nation's heroes. These are benefits that they have earned at a very high price, and they deserve better.

The Recovering Service Members Disability Benefits Act will remove this mandatory 5-month waiting period, allowing the wounded warriors to collect the benefits for which they have been already approved. To be clear, this bill does not approve benefit requests or add new individuals into the system. The bill simply expedites earned and approved benefits to eligible wounded warriors.

It is an honor to introduce this legislation and correct this issue. Our disabled servicemembers deserve the immediate reassurance of knowing there is financial support as they cope with the emotional and physical challenges of recovery.

Together, we hope this bipartisan legislation will be brought through committee and to the House floor in a swift manner.

Thank you, and God bless all those who serve our country.

CLIMATE CHANGE

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

Ms. LEE of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in solidarity with my colleagues from the Safe Climate Caucus to call on Republicans to end their silence and join the conversation on climate disruption.

A recent United Nations report provides a stark warning, saying that if we don't address climate disruption, the number of people living in extreme poverty could increase by up to 3 billion by 2050.

The report is clear: failing to act now creates a much larger and more costly problem later. Fortunately, we have the ability and the means to address climate disruption.

I'm proud to say that clean-energy companies and universities in my own district are leading the way in research, clean-job creation, and sustainable long-term solutions.

But this type of innovation and job creation cannot go on if Republicans continue to ignore the threat of climate change and recklessly cut funding to important programs that protect the air we breathe and the water we drink.

I urge my Republican colleagues to think about their moral responsibility to join this dialogue and to protect our planet for their children and for the long-term stability of this country.

THE BUDGET

(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, I rise today to congratulate the President on finally sending up a budget, though it was 65 days late with no real explanation for why it was late.

Of course, the House passed its budget on time. The Senate, to their credit, for the first time in 4 years passed a budget on time. And the amazing thing, Mr. Speaker, is that in the face of an almost $1 trillion deficit and a $17 trillion debt, the President sent up a budget that increases spending, increases taxes, increases the deficit, cuts Social Security and Medicare, and still never balances. That's quite a feat.

Mr. Speaker, America knows our debt and our deficit are strangling our economy. Let's roll up our sleeves, work with the Senate, and solve the fiscal mess this Nation is in.

GUN SAFETY

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

Mr. LANGEVIN. Mr. Speaker, I am encouraged by the clear bipartisan support in the Senate for a full and fair debate on meaningful ways to reduce gun violence in our country.

Having experienced a gun accident myself that left me paralyzed more than 30 years ago, I know firsthand that the answer to keeping people, especially our children, safe is not having more guns around our kids and our communities as the gun lobby has proposed.

I am hopeful that the Senate has heard the public outcry for real change with 90 percent of Americans favoring the basic step of universal background checks.

Forty percent of the gun sales in America occur at gun shows that require no background check at all. Let's close the gun show loophole and ensure that whenever a gun is bought or sold in this country, that there's a background check so we keep the guns out of the hands of criminals or those who have mental illness that is so severe that they would be a danger to themselves or their community.

As the Senate moves forward, I continue to urge Speaker BOEHNER to stop delaying full debate on the House floor on responsible gun safety legislation. The House Gun Violence Prevention Task Force has put forward a comprehensive set of proposals, and I welcome ideas from both parties.

What is inexcusable in the wake of so many gun tragedies is inaction. We cannot sit back and wait any longer.

THE BUDGET

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

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Speaker, I come to the House floor today fresh from a Budget Committee hearing. We had the OMB Director presenting the President's budget today.

I know so many folks have said, I thought the budget was required by law to be here the first week of February. That's true. Better late than never continues to be true, as well. But as we listened to the details of the budget, Mr. Speaker, what we heard was that the President is proposing to increase spending, increase taxes, and increase the debt.

Mr. Speaker, there are thousands of pages to this budget. I hope we'll find some things that we can agree on. But I know that the American people agree with Republicans in this House when we say taxes are already too high, spending is already too high, and the debt is already too high.

The President's budget never, ever pays one penny of our Federal debt. It's wrong. We can do better. This House must come together and lead that charge.

REGARDING NATIONAL MEDIA COVERAGE OF PHILADELPHIA MURDER TRIAL

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

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on the subject of my Special Order.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, will the decades-long national news media cover-up of the brutality and the violence of abortion methods ever end?

Will Americans ever be told of the horrifying details as to how and how often abortionists dismember, decapitate, and chemically poison innocent babies?

Will Americans ever be informed by a conscientious, unbiased national news media that in the past 40 years over 55 million child victims have been brutally killed by abortion, a staggering loss of children's lives that equates to the entire population of England, and that many women have been hurt physically, emotionally, and psychologically? And according to the Center for Disease Control—and this is a very conservative estimate from CDC—over 400 women have actually died from legal abortions.

Will Americans ever be told that of the 55 million children, Planned Parenthood alone claims responsibility for destroying 6 million babies and that just 2 weeks ago a Planned Parenthood leader in Florida testified at a legislative hearing at a State initiative to protect born-alive infants that even when a child survives an abortion, the decision to assist or kill the born-alive infant should be ''up to the woman, her family and her physician''? In other words, if a child intended to be aborted survives the assault, the choice to kill remains—so-called ''after-birth abortion.''

□ 1430

Isn't that extreme child abuse?

Murdering newborns in the abortion clinic, it seems to me, is indistinguishable from any other child predator wielding a knife or a gun. Why isn't the child also seen as a patient in need of medical care, warmth, nutrition, and—dare I say—love?

Now another national media cover-up—in this case, even when a Jeffrey Dahmer-like murder trial of an abortionist named Kermit Gosnell, who ran the benign-sounding Women's Medical Society unfolds in a Philadelphia courtroom, replete with shocking testimony of beheadings, unfathomable abuse, death, and body parts in jars. To this day, the national news media remains uninterested, woefully indifferent—AWOL.

Why the censorship? Why does Gosnell's house of horrors—his trial—fail to this day to attract any serious and meaningful national news reporting?

Dr. Kermit Gosnell is on trial for eight counts of murder. One count is for the death of a woman, a victim who

died during an abortion in his clinic. Seven counts are for babies who survived their abortions and were born alive but then killed by severing their spinal cords with a pair of scissors.

In the words of the grand jury report: ''Gosnell had a simple solution for unwanted babies—he killed them.'' He didn't call it that. He called it ''ensuring fetal demise''—a nice euphemism. The way he ensured fetal demise was by sticking scissors in the back of the baby's neck and cutting the spinal cord. He called that ''snipping.'' Over the years, according to the grand jury report, there were hundreds of snippings.

Indeed, the national news media has not only taken a pass and looked the other way, but their stunning indifference has done a grave disservice to Gosnell's victims: the woman killed, other women injured, and children slaughtered by Gosnell. Because of the national news media's indefensible silence and because of their failure to report, other women and children at other abortion mills might also be at risk.

The grand jury report, again in January of 2011, pointedly pointed out and noted that an absence of press coverage and gross negligence by the health department in Pennsylvania enabled Gosnell to show a ''contemptuous disregard for the health, safety, and dignity of his patients that continued for 40 years.''

Right from the beginning of Roe v. Wade, he was overlooked by a media that was disinterested. Some media commentators, however, are beginning to take note of the national news media blackout and the bias that undergirds and is inherent in that blackout.

The title of an editorial yesterday in the Investors Business Daily was ''Newtown in the Clinic: The Media Ignore the Gosnell Trial.'' It begins in part:

> Media bias: A basketball coach who shoves and curses at his players merits constant coverage by a media also transfixed by Newtown; but a Philadelphia doctor on trial for murdering a woman and seven babies? It's ignored.
>
> Those who get their news from the three major networks have probably not heard of Dr. Kermit Gosnell, now on trial in Philadelphia, charged with seven counts of first-degree murder and one count of third-degree murder for killing seven babies who survived abortions and a woman who died after a botched painkiller injection.

The editorial points out that, according to the Media Research Center, in 1 week, Rice—who is the coach from Rutgers—received 41 minutes, 26 seconds on ABC, CBS, and NBC in 36 separate news stories. Gosnell received zero coverage.

The editorial points out:

> If Dr. Gosnell had walked into a nursery and shot seven infants with an AR–15, it would be national news and the subject of Presidential hand-wringing.

In today's edition of USA Today, columnist Kirsten Powers writes:

> Infant beheadings, severed baby feet in jars, a child screaming after it was delivered during an abortion procedure. Haven't heard about those sickening accusations?
>
> It's not your fault. Since the murder trial of Pennsylvania abortion doctor Kermit Gosnell began March 18, there has been precious little coverage of the case that should be on every news show and front page.

She goes on to write in her column:

> A LexisNexis search shows none of the news shows on the three major national television networks has mentioned the Gosnell trial in the last 3 months. The exception is when Wall Street Journal columnist Peggy Noonan hijacked a segment on ''Meet the Press.''

Again, I ask my colleagues, and I ask the news media: Why the blackout?

Will America ever be told the brutality of abortion and the violence that is commonplace inside the abortion industry; or will the media, the national media especially, continue to censor and censor and, in this case, censor a trial—a trial of the century—that exposes all of the all too inconvenient truth: that not only are unborn children destroyed in these killing centers by being decapitated and dismembered but that even babies who survive the abortions can't escape the deadly hand of these child predators?

I would like to yield to my good friend and colleague, VICKY HARTZLER.

Mrs. HARTZLER. Thank you so much. I appreciate this opportunity to share today, as we look at the national media coverup of this very, very horrific act.

As we gather today to bring awareness to the trial of Kermit Gosnell and to the horrific actions he has been charged with, we remember the many who were murdered at the Women's Medical Society clinic and denied the chance to be our siblings, playmates, our friends, our peers. We mourn their losses, and we mourn the deep pain and confusion that abortion has inflicted upon women, men, and their families.

This trial provides revealing insights into the abortion industry, and it specifically highlights the reality that abortion involves taking a human life. These killings expose the very gruesome nature of what happens in abortion clinics all across this country where over 1.2 million unborn children die in abortions every year.

As a legislator, I will continue to speak in defense of the most basic human right—life. I will continue to support legislation that would stop the Federal funding for abortion providers, and I will continue to champion the inherent human dignity of every life born and unborn.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I thank my good friend and colleague Mrs. HARTZLER for her very eloquent statement, for her championing the rights of the unborn and their mothers, and for joining us in this Special Order today.

I'd like to now yield to a medical doctor who has been the leader on conscience rights in the House of Representatives, in the Congress, Dr. FLEMING.

Mr. FLEMING. I certainly want to thank my good friend from New Jersey for all the great work that you've done on this and the work you continue to do.

I have to say, Mr. Speaker, that just hearing about this trial—and quite frankly, I haven't heard about it on TV. If I weren't informed about it in leading up to this Special Order, I wouldn't know about the Gosnell trial—one in which, I think, it is really sickening just to hear the facts.

It's interesting. This country has reached a point in which we have focused so much on the humane treatment of animals—that is, to treat animals like humans. Then that leaves the question: Why do we not treat people like people? Why don't we treat humans humanely? I think that is an important question. What do people say who themselves have survived abortion?

I was at a meeting several months ago, and I met two fantastic mothers, mothers of children today. As to one of them, her mom, while she was still pregnant with her, attempted to have an abortion, but for whatever reason, she never could get around to it. She couldn't get it lined up or whatever, and eventually, she just ended up not having the abortion. Of course, this beautiful lady was eventually born, and now she has grown up to be an adult, and is very productive and very beautiful and herself has children. Of course, if you asked her, Well, what do you think about your mother's attempt to have an abortion of you while you were still in the womb? she would say—speaking, I think, for millions of unborn today and unborn in the past—Let me live. Give me an opportunity—I, the innocent unborn—to live. Give me a chance to live in society.

□ 1440

I met another beautiful lady at this meeting. Her mother, while still pregnant with her, late term, actually attempted to have a saline abortion. It was a botched abortion. It didn't work. By that I mean she was born alive and remained alive. And, fortunately for her, the health care workers decided to go ahead and revive and resuscitate her. And, of course, we know that saline abortions, if you have a child that survives, it scalds the skin. It creates injury to that baby. But she was treated, and she grew up to be a beautiful woman who married and who had children. If you asked her today, she would tell you she speaks for the millions of the unborn, both in the past and those who are killed in the womb today: Yes, let me live. Give me a chance to live.

Well, what about the question of infanticide? That's really what we're talking about in the Gosnell case. These babies, for whatever reason, he certainly wasn't a good enough doctor to accomplish the abortion while the babies were still in the womb, and then has to go on and do something I think most Americans would consider murder, and that is infanticide. In most

places, perhaps all places in America today, infanticide is murder.

But the question is: Do you realize there are two bioethicists in Australia who have recently proposed a concept called ''post-delivery abortion?'' Of course, we know that to be infanticide. Once the baby is born, if you kill the baby, that's infanticide. But they want to do a little wordsmithing and call it something else—post-delivery abortion. What they mean is this: if the baby is born and there's something about the baby that you're dissatisfied with, maybe it has an abnormality of some sort, maybe it's going to cost some money for a heart deformity or a facial deformity, maybe it's born with a genetic defect, that you should have, as a mother, the option of killing that baby even outside of the womb. There has even been a hint that perhaps taking a baby's life, even up to the age of conscious life, which can be, I don't know, a year or even more, would be still incongruent with the concept of post-delivery abortion.

So you see, Mr. Speaker, this is a slippery slope. Once you get past the fact that life begins at conception, and of course with today's technology, infants born as early as age 22 weeks, certainly 24 weeks, often survive at a time when they couldn't in the past. This has become an extremely slippery slope to the point where there are many out there who would actually turn their backs on life even after the point of delivery.

Well, Mr. Speaker, what about the lives of the women themselves? I'm a physician, and I've seen women after they've had an abortion. I can even think of a couple of cases in my practice when of course I would never send a lady for an abortion, but I was forced to treat a lady after an abortion because she was treated by an itinerant physician who comes into town, does a bunch of abortions, leaves town, and says if you have any complications, go see your family doctor. Well, of course, that is sickening for me. That means I am involuntarily participating, at least tacitly, in treating a lady who has had complications from an abortion.

This really goes to show you to the point with Dr. Gosnell just how unfeeling and inhumane the whole consideration is.

But what drives people to do this? Well, we know if you look at studies, it's about money. It's all about money, Mr. Speaker. They make millions of dollars. I think in the case of Dr. Gosnell, he became a multimillionaire because of all of the many abortions he provided over the years.

But, again, back to the women. What happens to the women who have abortions? Well, these are some things that we know. Once a woman has an abortion, her chance of having a future miscarriage goes up. And so now we're talking about miscarriages, stillborn, and the issue of infertility. Rate of suicides, they're higher in women who have had abortions. What about the rate of other complications, rates of depression and other things? We know they're all higher. The outcomes in the future lives of young women, and even not-so-young women who undergo abortions, Mr. Speaker, are really not very positive. So why would we encourage this? And certainly we know that a woman who gets an abortion a first time is far more likely to get a second and a third abortion, and oftentimes it really becomes a form of birth control.

So, in summary, Mr. Speaker, I stand up with my colleagues today to speak out against the fact that not only are we seeing abortion continue, the taking of innocent life through this Nation, but even the mere consideration of ending the life of an infant after birth, either because of a botched abortion or even deliberately just because there is some dissatisfaction with the outcome. I think is really horrible and something we should be ashamed of. Certainly, Mr. Speaker, if we can give consideration and humane treatment to animals, should we not do this for our own as well?

So, again, I rise in support of my colleagues on this very important issue. I do think that if we can't do it on a Federal level, we need to move forward in our States, such as my own State of Louisiana, where we have developed certain requirements, elevated requirements of accountability for doctors who provide abortions so that they can't just fly in and fly out and leave a mess. They have to have certain credentials and maintain hospital privileges perhaps; create limitations after so many weeks can an abortion actually be done. Let's do away with late-term abortions, again, an abominable act. We know through studies that the unborn feel pain at least as early as 20 weeks gestation, and maybe earlier.

Certain States, such as Arkansas, recently passed laws against late-term abortions. And, again, in my home State of Louisiana, we have a cooling-off period where you have to think about this. Think one more time, just think for 24 hours, maybe even pray about it: Is this something I really want to go forward with, end the life of my progeny? And certainly the requirement of an ultrasound, at least a requirement of the option of seeing your baby before you terminate its poor life.

Once again, I thank my colleagues. It is certainly a privilege and an honor to speak on what is, I think, one of the most important issues that we have in America.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I thank you, Dr. FLEMING, so much for your leadership and for that very concise statement. And now I would like to yield to my good friend and colleague, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. GARRETT).

Mr. GARRETT. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for arranging today's Special Order. I thank the gentleman from New Jersey also for his leadership on this very important issue, not just today, not just yesterday, but over years, year after year after year, coming to this floor, speaking around our State, speaking around the Nation as well, speaking for those who do not have a voice, speaking for the weak, the unborn. We thank you for your leadership in this area. We recognize that you have done a profound thing for this Nation, and we thank you for that.

I, too, come from New Jersey; and tonight I would like to speak briefly, and I will reference a woman who lived in New Jersey, who lived in Bergen County, who actually lived in Tenafly, up in my neck of the woods. And maybe some of you have heard her name before, and you would if you've walked about this Capitol, because she is commemorated in a sculpture located in the rotunda of this building, and I'm talking about Elizabeth Cady Stanton. She was a suffragette. She was a women's rights activist. She was someone who fought long and hard to ensure the equality of women before the law in this country. And also she fought for the important issue of the sanctity of life. Way back over 100 years ago in 1873, she wrote a letter to Julia Ward Howe, a prominent abolitionist and also a suffragette, and in it she wrote the following:

> When we consider that women are treated as property, it is degrading to women that we should treat our own children as property to be disposed of as we see fit.

□ 1450

So she classified abortion as a form of infanticide.

Today, Mrs. Stanton, I believe, would be horrified. I believe she would be disgusted, as my colleagues are as well, with what millions of Americans are watching going on in Philadelphia right now.

Kermit Gosnell is on trial in a city that gave birth to America, in a city that gave birth to the Declaration of Independence, a city that gave birth to the idea, the promise of life and liberty and the pursuit of happiness. He's there on trial for the callous murder of eight Americans, one woman, she who died from a botched abortion, and seven innocent, defenseless children who were born alive and healthy but then were killed by the abortionist.

These are only the murders that Gosnell is being charged with. His clinic, it is recorded, has carried out literally hundreds, thousands of abortions over the years using the doctor's own gruesome techniques on children, who were often over the Pennsylvania legal limit of 24 weeks.

Now, as was pointed out, news reports on the trial are nonexistent. Reports of testimony in the grand jury are basically nonexistent in the media. But if you dig down and you get a copy of the grand jury's report, you see what we're talking about and how gruesome it is.

According to the grand jury's report, ''Gosnell had a simple solution''—this

is from the grand jury's report. ''Gosnell had a simple solution for unwanted babies; he killed them.'' He didn't call it that. He called it, ensuring fetal demise. He called it, then, ''snipping.'' Over the years there were literally hundreds of snippings. This we find from the grand jury's report.

Snipping? This is not a medical procedure. This is murder, and we should call it for what it is.

Where, then, is the protection of life? Where, then, is the protection of liberty? Where is the protection of the pursuit of happiness?

Where is the outrage at what is going on there? Where is the outrage that nothing of this is being reported in any of the major newspapers across this country, on any of the major radio stations, on any of the major TV or cable channels across this country?

You have to dig, as I did, to find it in the back pages. The media and the pro-abortion movement are more concerned about things like Rush Limbaugh's comments on contraception, or ensuring that girls under 18, kids, have easy access to the morning after pill than they are with this trial, the gruesome acts in the trial, they allege, of Dr. Gosnell, or for the 1.2 million unborn Americans who die in America every year.

So, Mr. Speaker I join the rest of my colleagues tonight in expressing my disgust with this case and the failure also, the disgust also with the media to cover these actions.

Every child is precious. Every child is a gift. We must continue, then, this fight to protect this most fundamental right for the unborn, and each of us, the right to life. And we must also make sure that when it is destroyed, that it is exposed.

Again, with that, I conclude, and I thank the gentleman from New Jersey for his actions tonight.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I want to thank Mr. GARRETT for his eloquence, but also for his faithfulness in defending the powerless and the people who need voices, unborn children and their mothers, all those who are similarly situated, the vulnerable and the weak. He is always there, and I want to thank you so much, SCOTT.

I'd like to now yield to the chairman of the Health Subcommittee for the Energy and Commerce Committee for the House of Representatives, JOE PITTS, and note that Congressman PITTS, Chairman PITTS, is the author of the Abortion Control Act of 1980, the legislation that established, within the framework of Roe v. Wade, a very aggressive attempt to protect, to the maximum extent possible, pursuant to that onerous decision by the Supreme Court, and it was upheld by the Supreme Court, to do investigations of clinics and to just hold to a higher standard so that, to the greatest extent possible, life would be protected.

Congressman PITTS has been leading the charge on life for his entire career, both in the State legislature and in the U.S. House of Representatives, so it is a distinct honor to yield to my good friend.

Mr. PITTS. Thank you, Congressman SMITH, for your leadership on this issue here in Congress, very, very wonderful, inspiring leadership to all of us who've been engaged in this, on this issue for years in State legislatures like Pennsylvania and across the other parts of the country.

But U.S. Route 30 runs through the heart of my district, in Lancaster County and Chester County, in Pennsylvania. You follow that road all the way into Philadelphia, you'll pass a nondescript, triangle-shaped brick building at 38th Street. And for years, Dr. Kermit Gosnell operated a factory of death in this location, just across the street from a church.

This week, Gosnell is on trial for multiple homicides that demonstrate just how thin the line between abortion and murder is in this country.

Dr. Kermit Gosnell spent years taking advantage of vulnerable women, offering illegal and dangerous abortions in exchange for cash. He also operated a pill mill, selling prescription drugs to anyone in the neighborhood with enough cash.

He sold death to the poor, and he lived handsomely for years. State authorities never darkened the door of what he called a ''clinic'' until a mother died of an overdose during one of Gosnell's procedures.

He used clinical terminology to pave over the fact that in many cases he was killing a child who had already been born. While he is charged with seven counts of murdering an infant and a single count of murdering a mother, we don't really know how many children died after they were born.

Just as he was careless with the lives of children, he was careless with the lives of mothers, and he treated them in terrible conditions, often sending them out of the clinic injured and still under the influence of anesthesia.

We should always remember that abortion is the most violent form of death known to humankind. And there are always two victims in every abortion. One is the child, the unborn child. The other is the mother. One is dead, one is wounded.

An abortion is violence against the unborn. It's also violence against women.

But the facts of this case raise the disturbing question of just how close legal abortion practices come to outright murder. Gosnell knew that there was little real medical difference between killing the child in-utero and killing them outside of the mother.

Like standard, legal abortion practice, he would use chemicals to first poison the unborn child. And if he had waited until death to remove their bodies, he would be within the law. Because he took the children out of the mothers while they were still alive, he is guilty of murder.

Gosnell only took a leap that certain intellectuals and so-called medical ethicists have been talking about for decades. Just last year, two researchers published a paper in the prestigious Journal of Medical Ethics entitled ''After Birth Abortion.'' Their assertion was that a fetus doesn't become a child until they are wanted.

Let us never say that these are unwanted children, not while there are tens of thousands of married couples waiting to adopt, couples who wait months or years to bring home a baby boy or a girl. Many Americans even travel far abroad in order to adopt. In many cases, they go all the way to China or Ethiopia.

Gosnell's victims, and the millions of other lives lost to abortion are, by no means, unwanted.

The case of Dr. Gosnell is gruesome. The place that he ran was a gruesome factory and disturbing, but only because it strips away the clinical nature of most abortions.

□ 1500

His carelessness exposed what the fetus actually was—a human that he cruelly murdered. And yet the press will ignore, will remain silent on what is happening in this very important trial in Philadelphia. We ignore the tiniest human life at great peril because, as Gosnell demonstrates, flippancy for life creeps from the infant to the adult. We must protect all life, no matter how small or at what stage.

And so I commend Congressman SMITH and my other colleagues who have come to speak today about this important policy issue. It's about people, it's about children, it's about women.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I want to thank Chairman PITTS for his very eloquent statement. Even the grand jury report noted that if Mr. PITTS' law had been followed faithfully, the whole Gosnell destruction of not only women's lives but the death and murder of one woman and the killing of these children might not have occurred.

I'd like to yield to Dr. ANDY HARRIS, a Johns Hopkins physician and also a Member of the U.S. House from Maryland.

Dr. HARRIS.

Mr. HARRIS. Thank you very much. I would like to thank the gentleman from New Jersey for bringing this subject to the attention of the American people because this is a subject that's not going away.

What we're talking about today, of course, is a trial going on in Pennsylvania, little heard about in the press, but one that's very significant. Because when it's coupled with what the gentleman from Pennsylvania and the gentleman from Louisiana spoke about, the overarching medical ethics question, it's something that we have to come to deal with. Because, Mr. Speaker, it is true that apparently in Dr. Gosnell's mind there was little difference between a late-term abortion and killing a baby after birth. And make no mistake about it, these children were killed. Because the trial

right now is for seven cases of murder on those newborns. Interestingly, it was only discovered because of the death of the mother. And to show how flippantly many States have dealt with the issue of regulating clinics like that, we would never have known unless this mother died.

In my home State of Maryland, two deaths have recently occurred; and only as a result of those deaths has the Department of Health and Mental Hygiene decided that, yes, maybe we actually should regulate clinics where this kind of surgery is done. And, in fact, they have closed four of those clinics until they can bring them up to standards that we would consider modern medical practice.

But let's pay attention—because my specialty is anesthesiology—to what was going on in that clinic in Pennsylvania. Dr. Gosnell hired a surgical technician. This is someone he hired to clean instruments. He had that person administer anesthesia to those poor women going to that clinic thinking they were going to get good medical care. This is someone whose training was in how to clean a metal instrument and now administering life-threatening drugs. And, Mr. Speaker, we know they're life threatening because the misuse of those drugs resulted in that woman's death. In fact, three drugs administered—Demerol, a powerful narcotic; Valium, a powerful sedative; and promethazine, another sedative—administered by someone whose training was to clean medical instruments. And that is what's considered acceptable practice in many States in the country because many States choose not to regulate clinics where these abortion procedures are done.

But let's make no mistake about it. It wasn't just the killing of the mother that's at issue here. It's the grotesque procedure that was done in that clinic by the doctor and the people he trained to end the lives of those babies who were born alive. We might think this is a terrible thing. In fact, that grand jury thought it was a terrible thing. They, in fact, indicted on seven counts of murder. They called it ''murder.''

But the gentleman from Pennsylvania and the gentleman from Louisiana bring up an article published just last year in the Journal of Medical Ethics by professors from Italy and Australia. These are fairly civilized countries. The title of the article is fascinating. If the gentleman doesn't mind, I'm going to go through some of this because America has to understand what this moral discussion going on worldwide is. I will tell you I'm shocked because 10 years ago—I'm shocked now that this article is published, and 10 years ago, it wouldn't even be thinkable. The title is, ''After-Birth Abortion: Why Should the Baby Live?'' And it's about committing what this author calls after-birth abortion, which is currently called euthanasia or murder, or infanticide in our current speech. But these authors propose a new term: after-birth abortion. We're going to make this sound better because we know abortion is legal so we're just going to call this after-birth abortion. What it is is justification for killing a child after birth when no abortion was intended.

Mr. Speaker, this is just the next step to what Dr. Gosnell did. Dr. Gosnell killed a child after an abortion was intended. We think that's bad. A grand jury thought it was bad. There's seven indictments for murder in Pennsylvania. These medical ethicists propose that even if it wasn't an intentional abortion, that mother went and had her baby and decided that her daughter just wasn't going to fit in with the family, literally, and that it was okay to kill that baby. And if you don't believe me, ladies and gentlemen, just go and Google it. Read the article yourself. It's chilling.

Some people say, Well, maybe the child is born disabled or born with some terrible illness or something that's very painful and maybe we're just doing a good thing for the child. But the authors say these include cases where the newborn is not disabled. And I'm going to read from these word-for-word because I want to get this right and, Mr. Speaker, I want America to understand what's at stake here.

They make the argument that the fact that a fetus or a newborn has the potential to become a person who will have an acceptable life is no reason for prohibiting an abortion, or in this case, killing that child after birth. They argue that—and I'm going to quote:

> When circumstances occur after birth such that they would have justified abortion, what we call after-birth abortion should be permissible.

Mr. Speaker, let me remind you that in the United States, sex-selection abortion is legal in many States, in China. And if we don't think this is a slippery slope, remember what's happened in China over the past decade. They've decided under their one-child policy that if you have a live birth of a second child, it's legal to kill that child for the sole purpose of it being a second child. And, Mr. Speaker, as we know, occasionally the girls were killed, if they were the first child, knowing that you can only have one child and the family wanted a boy. So in China it's gone past sex-selection abortion to sex-selection infanticide. But that's exactly what this article speaks about.

This article, again, was written by professors from Italy and Australia, published in a prestigious journal that ethically justifies killing a child after birth because, well, Mr. Speaker, for any reason. Because they argue that child has no right to grow up. And if you don't believe me, they go on to say that this is not an actual person. It's a potential person. It's not an actual person.

So they say if a potential person like a fetus or a newborn does not become an actual person because you don't allow it to grow up like you or I, then there is neither an actual nor a future person who can be harmed—I'm not sure I understand that—which means there is no harm at all. So killing the fetus or the child, there's no harm at all.

But they go on to say this, which is amazing and this is why people have to understand how foreign a thought this is to many of us, ''So if you ask one of us if we would have been harmed had our parents decided to kill us when we were fetuses or newborns, our answer is no.''

□ 1510

What, Mr. Speaker? They're suggesting that if someone came up to me and said, would I have been harmed if my parents had decided to kill me when I was a newborn, my answer should be no? How many people do they really think you can go up to and ask, if your parents had killed you as a newborn, would you have been harmed? Do they really think people are ready to say, no, no harm, no foul; I wasn't a person, that's all right, that's totally ethical.

They create an ethical framework completely consistent with abortion policy throughout most of the United States, and that is, that a late-term, third-trimester fetus has no rights as a person, and only merely extend that logic to the period after birth. That's all they're doing.

So although this may sound grotesque and shocking that they suggest that there is no moral problem with killing a newborn, it's merely an ethical, logical extension of the way we have been treating fetuses since 1973.

It gets worse. Because the gentleman from Pennsylvania suggested, well, there are plenty of people who would adopt this child. They go on to say that it's actually better in many cases to kill the child than to put it up for adoption. This is stunning. The reason they say that is that we need to consider the interests of the mother, who might suffer psychological distress for giving her child up for adoption. They suggest there would be no psychological distress for that woman to have carried that child for 9 months, given birth to a normal baby, decided they don't want it, and agree to have someone kill it? It's stunning. It's striking.

Let me tell you, and I'll close on this, because we're shocked by this. But let me tell you something, we can't argue with nature. We can't argue with what nature tells us. It answers the question: Why in the world is the younger generation more pro-life than my generation? It comes up in poll after poll after poll. How in the world can that be? We have an enlightened younger generation? Isn't it enlightened to think about this ethical framework? How can this be?

Mr. Speaker, let me suggest how this can be. This is the first generation where two things hold true: They fully

understand what makes a human a human because they learned genetics and chromosomes, and they know that every single person is unique from every other person ever, based on science.

There's one other thing they know, Mr. Speaker. This is the first generation where they know that they could have been aborted legally. The first generation where they actually answer those ethicist questions: Would harm have been done to me if I would have been killed as a fetus? Their answer, resoundingly—because that's why the polling shows this—is they know the answer is yes. We are harming a human in the decision to take its life. That is true whether it is at 3 months, 6 months, 8 months. Because they know that was them as an embryo and a fetus at 3 months, and that was them at 6 months, and that was them at 9 months. And if they were in Philadelphia, in Dr. Gosnell's clinics, that would have been them 1 minute after birth or 5 minutes after birth. They know that under that construct of ethics by those professors in Italy and Australia, published in Journal of Medical Ethics, they're proposing that could have been them at 1 day, 1 week. Because those professors actually go on to say we can't really set what the deadline is for how long it's ethical. Mr. Speaker, that younger generation is smarter than my generation on this issue.

I want to thank again the gentleman from New Jersey for bringing this issue up. This is something that is so troubling, we have to come to grips with this. We have to understand the slope we are on when we neglect to treat every human being as one worthy of protection.

I thank the organizer of this Special Order.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Dr. HARRIS, thank you for that very insightful—and I would say brilliant—defense of not just the unborn, but the newly born, and your very logical argument as to how this is already being extended in what is euphemistically called after-birth abortion to those, like Dr. Gosnell's victims, who have been born and then are killed.

I would point to my colleagues, before going to Mr. STUTZMAN, that one of the clinic individuals who was actually killing these children—this came out in testimony at the trial—said that when he heard the child crying, it was like an alien.

Children cry when they're being killed—and in this case, a very painful—as you pointed out, pain-capable children are at least 20 weeks gestational age. Many of these kids were 23, 24, 25, even higher. As we've learned from the grand jury, as well as from these proceedings, some of these children were as old as 30 weeks gestational age—very, very large children, very mature children, but no different than the child who just a few weeks and even months before, same child, just a little more mature and, as you said, worthy of protection always.

I'd like to yield to Mr. STUTZMAN.

Mr. STUTZMAN. I thank the gentleman from New Jersey for yielding, and I appreciate his efforts to bring this particular matter to the attention of the American people.

I also want to thank the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HARRIS), who just spoke so eloquently and factually and knowledgeably about this particular issue as a doctor.

My heart is torn, as I stand here on the floor of the U.S. House of Representatives as we're discussing a matter that's happened right here in our own country. I tell the gentleman from New Jersey that I was just meeting with a doctor in my office within the last couple of hours who worked in one of the neonatal clinics in northeastern Indiana. The work and the technology, the ability and the effort that doctors in a neonatal facility go through to save the life of a baby that is wanted is amazing and is heart-touching. And to then come to this particular matter and to hear the details of this tragic location in Philadelphia that was performing abortions like this is just heart-wrenching.

Mr. Speaker, I would just share with this body that certain places are permanent reminders that evil men will do evil things, whether it's in Auschwitz's ovens, Cambodia's killing fields, and now a run-down brick building on the corner of 38th and Lancaster in west Philadelphia.

In that building—crawling with animals, reeking with urine, and filled with blood-stained furniture—Kermit Gosnell was running a slaughterhouse. On a regular basis, he used a pair of scissors to sever the spinal cords of helpless babies who were born alive during illegal, late-term abortions.

The loss of these lives should scar the conscience of civilized people everywhere. This is not a discussion about abstract concepts like choice. We are talking about brutal deaths of newborn children.

Mr. Speaker, Kermit Gosnell is a predator who must be publicly exposed and openly denounced. That's why I come to the floor, to bring attention to this case, that the American people are informed of it, aware of it, and realizing the acts that are happening within our own country.

I have no doubt that in this life or the next he will be held accountable for his crimes. However, right here and right now we ought to take a serious look at our culture's careless disregard of this story in particular, and innocent life in general.

How is it that in our age of constant news not a single major news outlet has devoted serious attention to the atrocities that weren't committed halfway around the world but in west Philadelphia, Pennsylvania?

□ 1520

Has our national conscience been irreversibly seared by the deaths of more than 1.2 million unborn children every year in this country. I believe this is something that the media should be talking about. They talk about so many other issues that affect our country, and rightly so. But I believe this is one of those that should be discussed and reported on by the media.

I've only seen a brief report on this within the last week. Mr. Speaker, I am confident that one day the era of abortion on demand will close and we will restore a lasting respect for life. However, until that day comes, each of us must take up the cause of those who cannot speak for themselves.

I thank Congressman SMITH for his unwavering commitment and his leadership and his efforts to protect life, and especially to bring this particular matter to the attention of the American people, so that we as a country will stand up and do the right thing for those who cannot speak for themselves.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Indiana for that very extraordinary and eloquent speech, bringing to the American people an inconvenient truth that needs to be exposed, and for, again, reminding us all that the major news media—NBC, CBS, ABC—have all had a blackout, there's been a coverup. If this was any other trial of a horrific bloodletting, a house of horrors, it would be front page, it would be the lead story, maybe second or third on some nights on the major networks.

The Philadelphia Inquirer, to its credit, a newspaper that is not pro-life editorially, and I know that because I've talked to them over the many years, they, nevertheless, have deployed reporters who have done a very, very good job in covering this trial. But that's pretty much where it ends. And, again, the major networks ought to be there.

I would point out that the reason why this clinic in this house of horrors was allowed to do much of what it has done is because of the chilling effect that the proabortion side has had on inspections of clinics where children are routinely slaughtered.

The grand jury itself said: ''The politics in question were not antiabortion, but proabortion. With the change of administrations from Governor Casey,'' a Democrat pro-lifer, ''to Governor Tom Ridge,'' a proabortion Republican, ''officials concluded that inspections would be putting a barrier up to women seeking abortions. Better to leave the clinics to do as they please,'' went on the grand jury report, ''even though, as Gosnell proved, that meant both women and babies would pay.'' That is found on page 9.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to yield to my good friend and colleague from Pennsylvania (Mr. ROTHFUS) for as much time as he may consume.

Mr. ROTHFUS. Thank you.

''Troubling'' is the word for what we see happening in Philadelphia. I think if you look at what this trial is about, about 20 years ago we had a decision

from our Supreme Court that basically said:

> At the heart of liberty is the right to define one's own concept of existence, of meaning, of the universe, and of the mystery of the human life.

I suggest that at the heart of Dr. Gosnell's trial is this understanding on the part of Dr. Gosnell that he had the liberty to define his own concept of existence and of meaning and of the universe. But that's to be juxtaposed with what our Founders described as self-evident truths, that we are endowed by our Creator with certain unalienable rights, that among them are the right to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness.

That concept was enshrined in our Constitution, where our Fifth Amendment provides that no person is to be deprived of life without due process of law; and, again, our 14th Amendment adds that no State shall deprive a person of life without due process of law.

As we watch this trial unfold in Philadelphia and continue to hear the daily testimony of what's happening, I think it's appropriate that we reflect on those words of the Founders and how far we've come from those days.

Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I thank my friend for coming from his markup to be with us here today.

There was a report in the Philadelphia Inquirer—again, just tell the truth, just tell the story about what's happening in the trial—and they report that this week an ex-employee of Gosnell talked about how she perceived the brutal snipping of the spines of newborns still alive after abortion.

''Did you know it was murder?'' Assistant District Attorney Joanne Pescatore asked ex-clinic worker Lynda Williams, referring to the clinic's practice of snipping the spines of babies born alive during abortion procedures.

''No, I didn't,'' said Williams, 44.

She goes on to say that one of her duties was to retrieve fetuses from women who would sometimes spontaneously abort in the waiting room after getting large doses of drugs. ''One day,'' she testified, ''a women expelled a second trimester fetus and it was moving.'' Williams said she took a pair of scissors and snipped the spine as Gosnell showed her. ''I did it once,'' she said, ''and I didn't do it again because it gave me the creeps.''

Mr. Speaker, let me conclude. Dr. ANDY HARRIS a few moments ago talked about the bioethicists who had made statements that after-birth abortion is justified because the newborn, or children who have been out of the womb for even weeks, have the same moral stature—and that is none—as an unborn child. Those two bioethicists say: ''The devaluation of newborn babies is inextricably linked to the devaluation of the unborn.'' They said: ''We propose that this practice of after-birth abortion be called that, rather than infanticide, in order to emphasize that the moral status of the individual killed''—that is to say the baby—''is comparable to that of the fetus.''

Whether she will exist is exactly what our choice is all about. So the choice to kill extended to the point of snipping the spines of children who were born and struggling and gasping for breath and for some kind of outreach of hands that would save that child, but it wasn't there. That is now being prosecuted, as it ought to be, as murder.

Our hope is that the blackout of this trial of Kermit Gosnell will end. It is ongoing. It's occurring today. It's occurring every day. I don't know how long it will take. But to NBC, CBS, and ABC and to the major news media, The Washington Post, The New York Times, and others, just tell the story. Keep your editorials on the editorial page—you are absolutely entitled to that—but don't let that creep onto and bleed onto the other pages. Just tell the story. And the indifference, again, and the lack of coverage suggests a coverup.

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

CONGRESSIONAL PROGRESSIVE CAUCUS

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

Mr. POCAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today on behalf of the Congressional Progressive Caucus. We are here today to talk about a specific item in the President's budget, and that item is the chained CPI in Social Security.

The chained CPI is an idea that originated with the Republicans and was included in the President's budget as a way to try to convince them to come to the table and have a budget for the Nation. But the chained CPI is more than that. We have a problem with the way the chained CPI works.

Chained CPI. No one in the real world talks about chained CPI. It's like sequester. I don't know a single person who tells their child, I'm going to sequester your toys.

Chained CPI is another Washington idea. What that idea is, in layman's terms, is essentially a cut in how people will receive the cost of living increase for Social Security. A real important way to talk about this is currently the consumer price index is how we determine any increases to people who receive Social Security.

□ 1530

When you do the chained CPI, it takes the rate that we provide for that cost of living increase and changes the cost of living increase in a different way that makes it a smaller increase for people who receive that.

The problem is specifically for seniors and disabled and children who are receiving Social Security. Seniors, especially, pay about 20 percent to 30 percent of their incomes on health care, and health care costs have risen more than the consumer price index or the cost of living increases that people have had. So by doing the chained CPI, essentially it is a cut in Social Security to people who need it the most.

There is a famous Midwesterner, a former Senator from the State of Minnesota, Hubert Humphrey who once said:

> The moral test of government is how that government treats those who are in the dawn of life, the children; those who are in the twilight of life, the elderly; and those who are in the shadows of life, the sick, the needy and the handicapped.

Our moral test today is Social Security. It's our moral promise to seniors for their economic security. That promise comes in the form of Social Security.

It's also our promise to veterans, to people with disabilities and to our children and orphans in this country. If we break that American promise by moving to a chained CPI, it'll have real consequences to real people.

Granted, this was a Republican proposal that the President included. This is a Republican idea that the President included in his budget in order to try to get them to the table. Nonetheless, it is a bad idea no matter where it comes from.

Let me give you a little example about the amount of cuts that would be provided on average to some seniors through this. Benefits for someone who's 75 years old would see $658 less a year. If you're 85 years old, you would see $1,147 less a year. If you're a 95-year-old, you would see $1,622 less a year. And for our 3.2 million disabled veterans in this country who sacrificed for our country, it means they would see reduced disability in Social Security benefits as well.

These cuts grow deeper and deeper, as I explained, the older you get, but they also are especially hard on women in this country. Women have longer life expectancies. They rely more on their income from Social Security, and they already are more economically vulnerable than men.

Let me give you an example of what this means in real terms.

My mother is 84 years old. My father died in 1991, and she has been alone all those years living on Social Security. I called her and I asked her specifically what she gets from Social Security every month. She gets $1,101 a month. That comes out to $13,212 annually.

I asked her to break out her expenses for me. I went through every possible expense that we could, just to get an idea of what it's like to be 84 and to be on a modest income. I grew up in a lower middle class family. She's already gone through most of her savings, living to 84. Her mother lived to 101. Should her genes hold out, her savings will definitely not hold out that amount of time.

First of all, her utilities, her gas, electric and her water bill come to $130 a month. She said she spends $40 to $50 for groceries and other essentials a week. That comes to an average of $180 a month.

The average senior's health care is 20 percent to 30 percent of their income. That's why the chained CPI is especially hard on seniors, because it's such a large percent of their income, because so much of their income goes to health care, whether it's copayments, prescription drugs, or other needs. So with that income of $13,212, let's just go right down the middle and take 25 percent. That's $275 on average a month.

Her car insurance and home insurance averages out to $77 a month. Her property taxes are $3,285. She's fortunate she owns her home, but she has property taxes that come to about $273 a month on average. Her phone and cable bill, combined, comes to $140 a month. She has to have help doing her snow shoveling, mowing her grass, and other errands around the house. That comes to about $50 a month. Finally, her gas she has estimated—she doesn't do as much traveling as she used to—is about $40 a month.

That grand total is $1,165. That means she is underwater. She is in the red by $64 a month. That is before other expenses.

Now, she is fortunate that she doesn't have a mortgage anymore. But could you imagine if you had a mortgage and on top of that $1,165 you added another $600, $800, $1,000, $1,200 a month.

She has her car paid for, but it's from the nineties. That car, if it was a payment, would be $200 or $300 a month. Add that on top. She was just telling me about repairs. She spent $1,700 fixing her furnace at her home. That's not calculated in all of her other monthly expenses, car repairs, et cetera.

The bottom line is that that $1,101 a month, which is essentially what she lives on—and one in three seniors live on that Social Security payment a month. You cannot afford to lose, at her age range, over $100 a month. At $100 a month, that means she's either cutting back on her food, cutting back on her medicine, turning the thermostat down in winter or up in the summer. But it has real-life implications on people who can afford it the least, people like my 84-year-old mother and millions of seniors across this country.

There are some in this body who try to rewrite history. They are trying to say that our economic woes, our deficit, is somehow caused by Social Security. Nothing could be farther from the truth. Social Security, by law, cannot contribute one dime to our deficit.

Are there long-term issues with Social Security? Well, long-term we do have to make sure that we're making sure that those funds are available in the future, but there are other ways we can do that. But the chained CPI merely extends the Social Security program for 2 years. Those real cuts to every single senior that receives those payments are real dollars that people will lose.

I respect the President's desire to achieve a comprehensive and bipartisan budget proposal. I'm one of the freshmen in this building. I came from a State legislature. When we did a State budget—and I used to be the co-chair of that committee—we spent 8 hours a day, 3 days a week for 3 or 4 months crafting a budget. And every single line of that budget meant something. It was a statement of your values. It's a moral statement of your values as a government.

This government hasn't had a budget to work off of for a number of years. We just can't seem to get people on both sides of the aisle in both houses to be able to sit down and have a document that guides the country.

So the President, in an effort to do that, said, I heard the discussions we've had on the fiscal cliff, on the debt ceiling, on the sequester. He's listened to the people on the other side of the aisle. And one of the things that's been asked for by the Speaker of this Chamber and the others is the chained CPI, a cut in Social Security benefits. So the President included it in his budget in order to try to bring them to the table.

Now, I sat through the Budget Committee today, which I serve on here in the House. I can tell you, it was not bringing people to the table. With no surprise, it just brought criticism from the Republicans on the President's budget in general.

So I think the President does not need to keep the chained CPI in his budget proposal. It is a break, I believe, to the promise we've made to seniors about what they will see from us. In fact, 107 people in this House, Democrats in this House, including myself, have signed a letter to the President explicitly stating that we don't want to see any cuts to Social Security, Medicare, or Medicaid.

If I can, let me just read a little bit of this letter to you that was signed by a majority of the House Democrats back in February.

□ 1540

We thank the President for standing strong and the American Taxpayer Relief Act to protect Social Security, Medicare and Medicaid from benefit cuts that would jeopardize the well-being of millions of Americans.

We write to affirm our vigorous opposition to cutting Social Security, Medicare or Medicaid benefits in any final bill to replace sequester. Earned Social Security and Medicare benefits provide the financial and health protections necessary to keep individuals and families out of poverty. Medicaid is not only a lifeline for low-income children, pregnant women, people with disabilities, and families, it is the primary source of income of long-term care services and supports for 3.6 million individuals.

We cannot overstate their importance for our constituents and our country. That is why we remain deeply opposed to proposals to reduce Social Security benefits through use of the Chained CPI to calculate cost-of-living adjustments. We remain committed to making the changes that will extend solvency for 75 years, but Social Security has not contributed to our current fiscal problems, and it should not be on the bargaining table.

Then it goes on to discuss Medicare and Medicaid.

We have been very explicit that there are other ways that we can extend the solvency of Social Security. Remember, it did not cause the financial situation this country is in right now. That was an economic uncertainty caused by the financial institutions and the housing crisis that put every State in this country into fiscal chaos, but that was not caused one dime by Social Security. So for us to balance the budget on the backs of seniors and the disabled, of veterans and the children who receive Social Security doesn't make sense.

Now, there is something that does make sense. Currently, we take a portion out of every person's check to pay for Social Security. It is your earned benefit. You pay in in every paycheck to Social Security so that, when you need it, it is available for you whether it be at retirement or through disability. At $113,700, you are capped when you make that much income. Not $1 more in income do you pay additional dollars into Social Security. If we lift that cap and, like so many other provisions, you continue to pay taxes on your salary—so, if you make $500,000, you don't just stop at $113,700 and paying into Social Security, but you would continue to pay into Social Security like you do on all your other taxes—that would extend the solvency of Social Security for at least 75 years.

Now, that is a commonsense way for us to make sure a program that is probably one of the most popular and crucial programs the Federal Government offers to its citizens that we've all paid into—our money, our social contract, our insurance so when we need it we have it—can be extended simply by lifting that cap, and that would go a long way to providing the economic certainty that we need.

So while we are supportive of so many of the measures that the President has in his budget, the President's budget focuses on what we need to, which is the immediate need to make sure that we are improving the economy and that we are creating jobs. That is our focus that we need to do in this country.

In fact, the Congressional Budget Office, which is our nonpartisan agency that we work with—that both Republicans and Democrats work with to get the financial numbers that we work with in our bills and to make all the decisions we make—has said that three-quarters of this Nation's deficit in the next year that we're all talking about a budget for, 2014, is caused by economic weakness—in other words, unemployment and underemployment. If we address those two issues, that is

the best way to stop the trajectory with the deficit and the debt. By getting people back to work, you can do that.

I'll tell you, in this budget, the President does much of that. The President includes extra funding for research and development. It's what we have been told by businesses is the best thing we can do to be competitive in a global market. It includes $50 billion for infrastructure investment—to get people working now, to have us help stimulate the economy.

I can tell you, when we had the last recovery dollars that happened at the very start of the recovery that we had with this bad economy—when we were at our worst and our lowest point—we were bleeding hundreds of thousands of jobs a month. When those recovery dollars came to the States and my committee, the Joint Committee on Finance, we had to approve every single dollar that went to roads and schools and other programs. We had our road-building industry and our vertical construction industry in our State tell us that 54,000 jobs were saved or created because of those dollars.

In the Budget Committee, I asked the question of Dr. Elmendorf from the Congressional Budget Office nationally, what did that do for us, those recovery dollars. They estimated—not the Democrats, not the Republicans, not anyone else but our official agency—up to 3.3 million jobs were saved or created because of those recovery dollars.

The President has $50 billion in infrastructure to make sure that people are working again, and he's getting them back out, while we need to, to keep the economy moving. He has focused on advanced manufacturing: some innovative ideas that we could create these hubs where people can create new jobs and have jobs come back to America from overseas. He also provides tax credits for small business owners who will hire new workers so that we can, again, continue to have the private sector, as well as what we can provide through infrastructure, to help get the economy to grow and to create the jobs we need to.

Those are all good provisions the President has. At the same time, he is working at $1.8 trillion in deficit reduction, which, on top of the previous $2.5 trillion, takes us exactly to the target people have been talking about of the $4 trillion deficit we need to address in the immediate amount of time. It has the long-term picture in mind as well. It's not saying the Holy Grail is the deficit reduction, but the Holy Grail is the economy and job creation to solve our deficit problems, and the budget does that.

There are many strong provisions in the President's budget, but many in this House—107 people who signed a letter in this House on the Democratic side and many of us in the Progressive Caucus—have been especially outspoken about the one provision that we think takes a completely wrong turn. That completely wrong turn is the Chained CPI—to change how we deal with increases for Social Security, how we estimate the payments for Social Security—which essentially turns out to be a cut, a real dollar cut, to people on Social Security. I can tell you they have given us some really better ways to illustratively explain what those cuts mean.

If you take the cuts under Chained CPI and if you are 65 years old, that cut will be about 2 weeks' worth of groceries. When you're at 70, it's about 6 weeks' worth of groceries, and it continues to grow. At 75, 9 weeks of groceries; at 80, 13 weeks of groceries. That's a quarter of the year that you have less for groceries that you need to get by. At 85, people like my mother, 16 weeks of groceries, and if you make it to 90 and 95, 20 and 23 weeks of groceries. That's the cut in real terms that comes from Chained CPI.

We stand to make sure that we are raising the issue that as we continue to talk about the budget—and we need to go to conference committee. We have a House budget; we have a Senate budget; and we have the President's budget. But do you know what that means? We have no budget. That means we will continue to have continuing resolutions, that we will continue to fight every 2 or 3 months and do stopgap measures with chewing gum and Band-Aids unless we have a budget.

So I appreciate what the President did. He's giving us a measure specifically to make us all come to the table to try to do this. His intention was to take a Republican idea, Chained CPI, and put it in his proposal to show he's willing to compromise. Unfortunately, all we've heard from the Republicans has been criticism of the budget.

In the House, their budget is a fantasy as far as balancing the budget in 10 years as they claim. It is a fantasy because it repeals the Affordable Care Act, benefits of which include making sure that people with preexisting conditions have health care, making sure that children up to 26 have health care, making sure that we have dollars for preventative care. It repeals the benefits, but it keeps the savings and the revenue. Well, you can't do that. We can't tax the people in the Affordable Care Act so that we can pay for the benefits but not give them and keep that money and try to balance the budget. So it's not a real budget.

What we need to do is have a real budget, and we need to get people to the table. I urge this House to announce conferees so we can start the hard work of doing that. The three positions are on the table. We need to do that.

We want to say strongly—the Progressive Caucus and 107 Democrats in this body—that the one thing that is unacceptable is to balance that budget on the backs of people who didn't create the crisis, and they are our seniors, the disabled, our veterans, and our children and orphans who rely on Social Security; and the Chained CPI would provide just that sort of a cut to those people.

□ 1550

So, Mr. Speaker, those are some of the strongest problems that we have with the change in the Consumer Price Index. That is called chained CPI. There are a number of organizations, Mr. Speaker, that have joined us in this. They range from the AFL–CIO, on behalf of the working people of this country, to PCCC, to MoveOn, and a number of other national organizations that have stood with us at multiple press conferences this week to try to raise awareness that this is a bad idea.

This is taking the budget situation we have in the future and balancing it today on those who can least afford it. We need to have the backs of our seniors and our disabled, not put the budget on their backs. And the chained CPI is a provision that, unfortunately, does just that.

So while it is not the President's idea, it is absolutely not the Democrats' idea. It was an idea proposed by the Republican Speaker and other Republicans just in the last couple of years. It was put forward in the President's budget to try to bring people to the table. We want to make sure that it is heard loud and clear that many of us will not support a bill that includes a chained CPI. It will not get the support of many people in this room if it includes those cuts to our country's promise, which is to our seniors.

Mr. Speaker, it is a huge concern to those of us in the Progressive Caucus. There are a number of groups, including Strength in Social Security, who join us in our efforts against this, who've put out some various estimations of what this means. They have said that for someone who is 75 years old, the cut they would see would be about $658, which is 3.7 percent of what they are currently receiving in Social Security.

If you're 85, they estimate that to be $1,147 a year, 6.5 percent. Again, to my mother, who's getting that $1,101, that is almost a $100 a month cut. As I estimated from her utilities to her groceries to her other payments that she has, none of those are necessarily luxuries at 85. None of those are excessive payments. They are the basic payments just to get by that she comes up with, for about $1,165 a month. After burning through savings for 20 years, she just doesn't have it left.

So like a third of Americans who live on that Social Security check, they live on $1,101. They live on that $13,212 a year. And I don't think there is anyone who could honestly say that that's too much. After you've paid in your entire life, it's your earned benefit that you paid into, that insurance for when you need it, for when you are a senior and you retire, or when you become disabled, or God forbid your parents die and now you're an orphan, that payment is this country's promise to each

and every one of those people. So to go after that $13,000 payment to this 84-year-old person and get that 6.5 percent cut, that means real things.

I remember a few years back, before, in Wisconsin, we created about a decade ago a program called SeniorCare to help seniors afford prescription drugs. It has been a great success with bipartisan support. But prior to that, my mother was one of those people who cut pills in half because she couldn't afford her medications. She doesn't have to do that anymore because of SeniorCare, but we're the only State, Wisconsin, which has SeniorCare in the entire country. There are seniors in the other 49 States who, if they get that cut, that means cutting pills in half, that means deciding which pills you're taking, and it means deciding which meal you're not eating. It means those sort of basic, basic cuts.

It is estimated that at 95 years old, according to Strength in Social Security, it's a $1,622 cut. That is a 9.2 percent cut. We're balancing the budget on the backs of those who can least afford it who didn't create the financial times we're in, and that seems entirely wrong.

What that means in a lifetime, what your cumulative benefit loss is, and that is where it really starts to add up, and maybe this will be more illustrative:

At 75, at that point on Social Security, you've lost $4,631.

At 80, you've lost $8,660.

At 85, people like my mother, she has lost $13,910 of what she has paid into and expected to get during her twilight years. That's the enormity of these cuts.

I have been joined by an extremely articulate and solid progressive colleague of mine, a mentor of mine, someone who is not only a strong leader, not only in this entire House, but especially during this hour with the Progressive Caucus, and I yield to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LEE).

Ms. LEE of California. First, let me thank the gentleman for yielding and for your kind words, and also for your tremendous leadership and for really coordinating the message hour of the week, not only on behalf of the Progressive Caucus, but for this entire body and for the American people. It is so important that the truth be told and that we continue to beat the drum to protect the priorities of all of the American people, not just the few. So thank you very much.

We are here today to talk about the budget and its priorities, and also some of the issues that are very troubling, which I'll mention in just a minute.

I'm pleased, though, to see that the President's budget clearly understands the need to create jobs and to grow our economy. This budget makes critical investments in early childhood education and brings down the cost of higher education. The budget protects vital nutrition programs like SNAP and WIC. This budget permanently extends vital expansion of the child tax credit, the earned income tax credit, which has lifted about 1.6 million Americans out of poverty in 2010 alone.

In stark contrast, our Republican colleagues proposed yet another $6 trillion tax cut for the wealthiest, while focusing a majority of their draconian budget cuts on shredding our Nation's safety net.

Every Member of Congress may claim to support the goal of cutting poverty in America, but gutting programs that families rely on to put food on their tables is simply not how we achieve that goal. Now, as I said, I was very pleased to see some of the innovative and groundbreaking proposals that the President included in his budget.

However, I have to join Mr. POCAN in our strong opposition to the inclusion of the so-called chained CPI in the budget. As many of us have said, chained CPI is a benefit cut, which it is, to Social Security, and I wholeheartedly oppose it.

So thank you again for beating that drum today on this because this is not the President's ideal deficit reduction plan. We should not be bargaining for Republican goodwill with policies that hurt our seniors. Social Security was established more than 77 years ago, providing economic security to generations of Americans who have made contributions over their lifetime. They worked for this.

Changing the cost of living adjustment now will disproportionately hurt seniors who rely on every single dollar of support as income. The chained CPI would cut one full month's income from a 92-year-old beneficiary's annual Social Security benefits. Seniors cannot afford that. The chained CPI will also cut living standards, and most deeply for the poorest households, which tend to rely on Social Security for all or most of their income.

The fact of the matter is Social Security should not even be a part of this discussion. It should not be a part of this budget. The program has accumulated assets of $2.7 trillion and does not contribute to the Federal budget deficit. Voters across the political spectrum oppose cuts to Medicare, Medicaid, and Social Security benefits, and we must do whatever it takes to protect these vital benefits from cuts.

Democrats believe that the best way to reduce our deficit and make our economy grow is to create jobs. That's why I join my CPC colleagues in rejecting any and every cut to Medicare, Medicaid, or Social Security benefits, including raising the retirement age or cutting the cost of living adjustments that our constituents earned and that they need.

We also know there are commonsense reforms that would reduce health care costs and save taxpayers hundreds of billions of dollars without cutting benefits. If Republicans are serious about deficit reduction, we really can make additional savings, and they should come from those who can most afford it. We can save over $110 billion just by eliminating wasteful subsidies to oil companies who have already made record profits. We can close corporate tax loopholes—that would save billions of dollars to invest in education—and we can end wasteful Pentagon weapons programs and focus our military on addressing 21st century threats.

So there are many ways that we can accomplish this. Instead of supporting policies that harm seniors, let's get back to the real problems facing our country, and that's creating 21st century jobs and growing our economy for all.

So thank you again for your leadership. This has been a tremendous hour that you have put together, and I hope that the American people are listening today. So much is at stake.

□ 1600

Mr. POCAN. Thank you so much, Ms. LEE. We really appreciate it. And again, your history in this House has been recognized by so many of us who are new and proud to be here. We appreciate all that you've done on behalf of the middle class and those who are striving to be in the middle class and those who are just getting by in this country.

Ms. LEE is also leading an initiative for the Democrats to address poverty. We are doing everything we can on the Democratic side, but it's under your leadership that's happening, and thank you so much for that.

We've been joined by another colleague who is from California who has been another one of our freshman Members of the House, and he is here to talk to us also about the issues before us on chained CPI and perhaps some other issues. I'd like to introduce, from the State of California, Mr. MARK TAKANO.

Mr. TAKANO. Thank you. I thank the gentleman from Wisconsin. I will be speaking today on equal pay. Today I signed the discharge petition to bring the Paycheck Fairness Act to the floor to ensure that women across the country receive equal pay for equal work.

This week, on Tuesday, we recognized Equal Pay Day, which is the symbolic day that marks the time it takes for women's earnings to equal men's earnings from the previous year. Thanks to the 23 percent wage gap, it takes an extra 3 months for women in America to catch up. The wage gap persists at all levels of education and exists across occupations.

In my home State of California, the typical woman, working full-time, year-round, is paid, on average, only 84 cents to every dollar her male counterparts make. In my home district the pay discrepancy is even worse. Women living in the Inland Empire make 81 cents to every dollar, and many are the sole breadwinners in their households. This isn't just an insult to women who work hard at their jobs every day, it hurts families and children.

In my district, the wage gap amounts to an average loss of $8,900 that could be used to pay for rent, groceries, and child care. This is unacceptable.

When President Kennedy signed the Equal Pay Act into law, he criticized the unconscionable practice of paying female employees less wages than male employees for the same job. Fifty years later, this unconscionable practice is alive and well, which is why we have a duty to our mothers, sisters, and daughters to pass the Paycheck Fairness Act in this Congress.

Mr. POCAN. Mr. TAKANO, would you yield to a question?

Mr. TAKANO. Yes, sir.

Mr. POCAN. Mark, I just want to ask you, you've been a leader in this body on chained CPI.

Mr. TAKANO. Yes.

Mr. POCAN. We did several press conferences this week. You're the author of a major letter from many people in this House about it.

Could you just address a little bit about why you're so passionate about the need to make sure we have Social Security for generations in the future and why you oppose the chained CPI.

Mr. TAKANO. Well, I believe chained CPI is bad for veterans and it's bad for our seniors, but let me focus on the seniors for a moment.

The chained CPI, explained in a very simple way, is a way that the government would ostensibly index Social Security COLAS, cost-of-living increases. Said very simply, under chained CPI, seniors would be paid less over time.

The assumption is that seniors would be able to substitute less costly items for the current items they might currently buy. But, you know, seniors really use health care a lot more than the rest of us, and that's the largest burden that they're facing, trying to pay for their health care costs, prescription drugs.

I think it's a false premise to say that seniors will be able to find less costly substitutions. More and more of their income would be going to that.

I believe that many people call Social Security, Medicare, entitlements. I call them sacred promises that we made to our seniors. I don't believe that we should break those promises. We must keep those promises.

People have earned these benefits over a lifetime. They planned their lives around them, and we simply can't go back on what we've promised our parents and grandparents.

Mr. POCAN. Thank you, Representative TAKANO, again, for you leadership on this issue. As I said, you've authored one of the major letters that's out there talking about chained CPI and cuts to Social Security, Medicaid, and Medicare.

And also, as a member of the Veterans Committee, I know you've been especially articulate on the effects on veterans. I thank you for your time.

Mr. TAKANO. Thank you, sir.

Mr. POCAN. As Representative TAKANO said, these are sacred promises to people who've paid into the program, and now the expectation is, as with any insurance, you've paid in and now you're able to get the benefit when you need it. That's why you've paid in all your life.

And that benefit is for people who retire and for people who become disabled and, God forbid, children who become orphans. It allows them to be able to continue, in our society, to get by.

But as I've shown, an 84-year old woman like my mother—this is my mother's actual story—gets $1,101 a month. That's $13,212 a year. We went through her expenses, from utilities, $130 a month, food and other miscellaneous items she has to buy, $180 a month.

Health care, as Representative TAKANO said, it's about 20 to 30 percent of the average senior's monthly expense or their income. I'll take it right in the middle, 25 percent; that's $275 a month.

Her car and house insurance, $77 a month, her taxes, $273 a month, her phone and cable, $140 a month, miscellaneous, having people mow her grass and shovel, et cetera, $50 a month, and her gas about $40 a month.

That's $64 a month more than she makes. And unfortunately, she has, at the age of 84, having been widowed since 1991, expended through almost all of her savings and, like a third of seniors, is living on that Social Security paycheck.

But what about the senior who's in the exact same situation, receiving and living off that check, but they still pay rent or have a mortgage? Six hundred to $1,200 more dollars you're going to have to add on to that.

And what if they have a car or they have a bus pass? Two to $300 a month you're going to add on to that.

Miscellaneous repairs. My mother, this year, had to replace her heater, at $1,700. How do you do that with a cut in Social Security?

So additional expenses, still, on the low end, add that up, you're almost at $2,000 a month. There's no way that $100 hit that'll happen is something that the average senior or person with disabilities, veteran, or child can be able to get by. That is a real life cut, and where they have to cut and make tough decisions is on their groceries, on their medicine, on whether or not they're going to be able to drive the car that they have. It's serious consequences.

And I know that the Democrats have been especially strong in the Progressive Caucus. The Progressive Caucus penned a letter that 107 Democrats in this House have signed on to that said, do not do any cuts to Social Security, Medicare, or Medicaid.

Now, there are some who say that you can't ignore it, that in the future, far down the road, decades in the future, we have to make sure that these programs, these earned benefits are still alive. But we have argued there are ways to do that.

If you lift the cap at which you pay into Social Security, you could extend it, the program, Social Security for 75 years into the future. And remember, Social Security has not added one dime to the deficit. By law, it can't add one dime to the deficit.

But, instead, we are balancing the budget, with this provision, on the backs of the very people who can least afford it.

So the senior who makes $1,101 is going to see a cut, but the company that sends jobs overseas under the Republican budget still gets a tax break for sending jobs overseas. And that CEO with the corporate jet still gets a tax break under the Republican budget.

And when you go down the list of breaks that are out there for the most wealthy, we need to find a different way to do this than balancing the budget on the backs of those who can least afford it, those who've paid in their entire lives, those who didn't create the financial situation we're in.

Our Progressive Caucus has been strong in talking about this. We have tried to take quite a bit of time today to really explain this as plainly as we can and as absolute simply as we can a person's monthly budget.

□ 1610

We all know you have other surprise expenses like your heater goes out at your home or your car needs repair. We don't even factor that in. Most people will probably still have some rent or perhaps a house payment to make. When you add all this in and if you have expended your savings like one-third of our seniors who live on that Social Security check, it is impossible to continue to get by. And to take a cut to the very people who can least afford it seems wrong.

We are honored in our Progressive Caucus to have two people that lead us, Representative RAÚL GRIJALVA and Representative KEITH ELLISON. Representative KEITH ELLISON is a fellow Midwesterner and I think a man of incredible common sense, coming from the Midwest, like we like to at least think we do back in the Midwest, coming here. And he has done an extraordinary job of leading the progressives and the Democrats in this House to make sure that we stand up for our seniors and our disabled and our veterans and the children who receive Social Security. I would like to yield to the chairman of the Progressive Caucus, the gentleman from Minnesota, Mr. KEITH ELLISON.

Mr. ELLISON. Congressman POCAN, thank you. Thanks for holding down this very important Progressive Caucus progressive message. The fact is that the Progressive Caucus and the Democrats generally are about protecting seniors. That's who we are. That's our brand. That's our identity. Social Security came out of the Roosevelt administration, came out of core Democratic values. That's what we stand for, that's what we believe in,

and that's why we are standing opposed to the chained CPI. We're not going to relent. We've been fighting this thing for months. We're not going to give up the fight. We're going to keep on pressing until this thing is settled.

The reality is that this chained CPI takes place within the general debate on budget, a general debate on fiscal items. And I happen to know that the chained CPI is an idea that emerged from Republican leaders only a few months ago. That's who came up with this. And so now the President has offered a budget in which he says, Okay, we're going to try to compromise from the beginning. We're going to try to take some compromise ideas and put them in here, along with some other good ideas like early childhood education, like investing in infrastructure and jobs. Those things are okay. But I think it was a mistake to ever include anything about Social Security in a budget because the Social Security does not contribute to the deficit. And so if you want to deal with lifting the sequester, deal with something that has to do with taxes or spending. If you want to deal with the budget, deal with something that adds to or takes away from the budget. If you want to deal with deficit reduction, deal with something that has to do with that. But don't drag in something that is actually irrelevant.

The fact is that Social Security is one of the oldest, best programs that this country has ever seen and it has taken care, literally, of millions of people. It's not an entitlement. It's an earned benefit program. It is social insurance people pay into. They earn it and then they pay into it. And then they expect it at the end years of their lives. Congressman POCAN, I think it's important just to point out that a full third of widowed women on Social Security rely entirely on Social Security.

Some people like to say chained CPI is not that big of a cut. Well, it depends on how much money you have, doesn't it? It depends on what you start with. If you're getting by on $13,000 a year, or under $20,000 a year, $250 may seem like a lot of money. My own experience as a Member of Congress is that people would ask me at community meetings all the time, Are we going to get our COLA check? Are we going to get that $250? Why? Because that's a lot of money to folks who are really trying to get by.

And so what I'm saying is let's embrace our core Democratic values. Let's look after our seniors. Let's take care of this great program, Social Security, that has done so much for so many for so long. And let's reject this idea of chained CPI, and let's stand together and say chained CPI is not a good idea. It's not something we should offer as a bargaining chip for a grand bargain. Let's just take it off the table.

I yield back to the gentleman.

Mr. POCAN. Thank you, Mr. ELLISON.

As a leader of the Progressive Caucus, I have been talking about how 107 Democrats in this House and the leadership of the Congressional Progressive Caucus have signed a letter and asked the President to not cut Social Security, Medicare, or Medicaid. So the majority of the Democrats have already signed a letter saying, Keep the hands off. As we deal with our Nation's budget, the one place we shouldn't go is to those who need it the most—our seniors, our disabled, our veterans, and their children and orphans who receive Social Security benefits.

As I talked about the realities of that $1,001 a month, as Mr. ELLISON just said, when you receive that additional $100 cut, that additional $100 cut is almost 10 percent of your budget. Think about if you had a 10 percent cut in your budget and you're not able to make any more money. At 84, I'm sorry, my mom is not going back to Taco Bell. She worked there in her seventies to continue to make money because she just didn't have it and to have something to continue to get by on. But at 84 she's already had a couple of falls. There's nothing else she can do to make additional money. So she has to make that tough cut. And I would argue that this bad idea that the Republicans came up with and the President included just to get them to the table to talk about the budget, this bad Republican idea, chained CPI, will have a real effect on tens of millions of people across this country. There are way too many seniors for whom this means just about everything in their lives.

She can't really cut her utilities. She can change the thermostat. She can set it to 60 in the winter. She cannot use any kind of air conditioning in summer. In Wisconsin, I won't recommend that in the summer. We have some humid, humid days. So you can't cut this line. Her groceries and other things she has to buy for the home, she can cut back. But she already tells me stories. There's a place in her neighborhood she'll go to that has a $1 burger special. She'll go there. This is going back over the holidays. We had to convince her to tip 35 cents. Because she said, My God, that's 35 percent. I don't tip 35 percent. But we're trying to explain to her in the economics of it, it's 35 cents to give. But she gets a burger for $1. And she says, Sometimes I get two. So she's deciding about a $2 meal. Are we going to take that away from someone, the very groceries they live on?

Health care: with rising health care costs, the facts are that 20 to 30 percent—I think specifically 26 percent is the current number—of your annual costs, seniors' health care costs. She can't change that line. Insurance: Does she not insure her vehicle? Does she not insure her home in case of a fire? That's $77 a month. We all know you can't get away and not pay your taxes. That line is off the table.

I'm going to jump down a line to her miscellaneous. She has to have people shovel and do other things around the home. That's very hard to change. That's only a $50 item. Finally, gas: she doesn't control the price of gas. So the only line she really has left is her telephone and her cable bill.

And with the way we have to deal with the budget, rather than making those who can most afford it in the country and all the tax loopholes and tax breaks for some of the wealthiest in this country, instead we're going to go to this 84-year-old woman and say you can no longer have a telephone to talk to your family and friends on, or lose the little bit of entertainment you have through a television seems wrong. It's not the values of this country. It's certainly not the values of the Democrats in this House. Yet that's what they'll face with a chained CPI cut. That's the bottom line. And when those other expenses come up, how does a senior pay for them?

So we really want to express to the President in the strongest possible terms that the Republicans may have had this bad idea of chained CPI to provide a cut to Social Security payments, but you included it in your budget to bring them to the table to make them negotiate, and all you've heard for the last 36 hours is criticism and that they won't sit at the table. You've got dollars in the budget to help grow the economy. The Progressive Caucus had a Back to Work Budget. We worked hard and steadfast in talking about growing the economy as our best way to solve the deficit and our economic problems. But if the Republicans are going to criticize that and refuse to have one more dime in revenue, not one more CEO can't still get his tax break for that corporate jet, not one more company can't get that tax break for sending jobs overseas—those are the types of tax breaks we have in this country.

And if we can't get one more dime from programs like that so that a senior doesn't have to make those tough, real-life decisions, then we're failing as a government and we are breaking our promise to the seniors of this country.

□ 1620

So I would hope that we can continue to get people who are watching this to realize it may be called chained CPI, it may have an obscure term—we're the body that came up with a sequester, right? It's a term. It's in the dictionary. But I guarantee not one person that I know of has ever used it in real life. No one has said to their child: I'm going to sequester your toys today. It's just not something that real people do. Well, chained CPI is the same thing. It may be an obscure economic term, but the bottom line, the reality of what it means to the average person who's listening, is it means a cut to those who can least afford it, to those third of seniors who live on that check exclusively to get by. And all the other seniors who rely largely on that to get by, should they have the good fortune to grow old, they'll have the bad fortune of seeing that savings go down, as they have these expenditures.

In the end, we have made a promise—a sacred promise, as Representative TAKANO said—to the people of this country that as we take their money, their Social Security, through their earned benefit they have paid into—we have put up a social insurance program to ensure that when they retire or become disabled or, God forbid, lose their parents and become an orphan, they will continue to have an ability to live in this country. It's not those people that created our financial woes that this country has. There are real ways to deal with the deficit. There are real ways to deal with Social Security. But those real ways are not the ways that are proposed through the chained CPI.

In fact, another thing that was said, I believe it was by Ms. LEE from California, was she talked about, on this floor, we have other people trying to fix Social Security. We had 104 Members of the other side of the aisle vote for a version of the budget that raised the Social Security retirement age to 70. I'll tell you, I don't know many construction workers or nurses or teachers who could necessarily still be able to do that job as well as they would like to between 67 and 70. The construction field, there is not the ability to do that job. As a nurse, when you have to lift bodies and help move people, you just can't do that job for those additional years. So, to me, to raise the Social Security retirement age is, again, part of breaking that promise.

There is a way we can continue the promise, and that is to lift the cap on Social Security. Right now, no matter how much you make, we tax for Social Security up to $113,700; but as soon as you make a dollar more, you don't get taxed for Social Security. Now, we tax in every other way in a progressive way, as you make more, you pay more in taxes, but we don't tax a dime more at $113,700. If we were simply to lift that cap or raise that amount, you would extend Social Security for decades. In fact, if you lift the cap entirely, it is estimated at least 75 years of life would go into the Social Security program. Wouldn't that make a lot more sense than instead nickel-and-diming those who can least afford to, to preserve the program?

So that is the hope of this Progressive Caucus that we have. You've heard from a number of leaders, both freshmen and people who have been here for a long time. You've heard from people from different parts of the country. It is an important promise that we have to the public.

We are the party that has been there to protect seniors. The fact that the President has it included in his budget, we all know—and the President has been very clear—it is not his idea. This was an idea from the Republican Speaker and other Republicans, and he put it in his budget proposal to try to get them to come and finally have a budget for this country, to make them come to the table.

Right now, we have very different documents. We have the Democratic document in the Senate and the President's document that invests in the economy so we can create jobs and grow the economy right now. And we have a Republican version of the budget that focuses almost exclusively on getting rid of the deficit. The holy grail is the deficit; it will cost us millions of jobs. Just in the next year it is estimated 2 million jobs will be lost. But you can't have those diverse documents and still fund Congress. So what does Congress do? We continue to have continuing resolutions that get us by for months at a time.

I have heard on this floor so many times where people will talk about a wasteful program—and there are wasteful programs in the Federal Government we should address. There is a GAO report that specifically outlines about 45 areas of duplication, where we are doing the same thing across different agencies. We have a focus on the Oversight and Government Reform Committee to find waste, fraud, and abuse wherever we can. We are working on that. The problem is when you don't have a budget that says we're going to cut these programs so we can fund these programs, we punt. And as a government, we have punted far too many times. We have not had a serious budget in place.

So the President's goal is indeed sincere, that he wants people to come to the table. I, perhaps, would have waited to compromise until we got to the table, but the President in this case put their request right in his budget and put it on the table. The problem is, that is a bad compromise. There are so many other things that we can do that will better serve the public than to cut the benefits from our seniors and our veterans and our disabled and the children and orphans who rely on Social Security.

So, Mr. Speaker, our Progressive Caucus has been here for close to the last hour to make sure that we are talking about an important program that the public, I'm sure, is concerned about. I know I'm getting the calls in my office. But we really plead with the President to make sure that as we move forward and try to bring the Republicans to the table to try to have a national budget—as we all need to—do not balance that budget on the backs of those who can least afford it.

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

ADMINISTRATION IN REVIEW

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

Mr. GOHMERT. Mr. Speaker, I know the intention of my friends on the other side of the aisle. We all want the country to run at maximum peak performance so that people have jobs. But it's interesting the ways we have going about trying to see that that happens.

Interesting, in fact, we got the President's budget yesterday—of course it took 2 months or so beyond what the law says that the President must do. We also know that when it comes to people being in the country illegally, the President decided that he didn't like the laws that were passed by Congresses of the past, both Democrat and Republican, signed into law by Presidents, both Democrat and Republican, and so President Obama got up and did what you don't normally find in a country with representative government, he just announced: I don't like the law the way it is, so here's the new law, and basically pronounced new law into being with regard to who will be allowed to have amnesty in the country, and that program has already started.

In the past, the Founders' intent was well carried out because I've been advised by people who worked here in Democratic majorities as Democratic leaders and Republican leaders of the past who said, yes, in the past, if you had a President stand up and say, I'm choosing to ignore the law that has been passed by prior Congresses, signed into being by their Presidents; I'm going to ignore those and just pronounce new law: So as I say it, so shall it be—if you had a President that acted like that, then both Democratic and Republican leaders would get together and they would head down Pennsylvania Avenue, that way. They would announce themselves and let the President know that either he would begin to comply with the law and stop doing what is solely the responsibility of Congress, or they would cut off all funding to everything he cared about. And that would take care of it.

□ 1630

Unfortunately, these days the President, those in power in the White House and executive branch, have noted that since the Democratic Party is the majority in the Senate, then even when there are enough people in the Republican Party in the House who have the nerve to stand up and say we will no longer allow violations of the law or creations of law out of whole cloth without following the Constitution, the Senate would stop those actions because they're not going to let anything like that pass the Senate. And, therefore, we have bureaucrats who begin to announce to elected Members of this government that they really don't care what we have to say, that we're not going to stop them from doing whatever they want, because the Senate will block anything we try to do here at the House.

Because this is a divided Capitol building with the Senate in the majority of Democratic hands and the House in Republican majority control, it is very important that we note what the other branch, the Presidency, is pronouncing. Under the President's proposed budget, there is an article here dated April 10 from CNS News that says:

The OMB's historical tables also reveal that the White House does not expect this administration to ever run an annual deficit as low as $458.5 billion, which was the deficit the government ran in fiscal 2008, the last fiscal year completed before Obama took office.

It's also important to note that in 2006, the last year Republicans were in control of the House, we were properly ridiculed by Democrats on this side of the aisle because we ran $160 billion-or-so budget spending over the amount that was coming in, that we had $160 billion in deficit spending. And the Democrats were correct: we should not have had $160 billion in deficit spending.

Having no idea that the promises from the friends on this side of the aisle who said, If you will just put us in the majority, we'll cut that $160 billion deficit spending the Republicans have done and we will get a balanced budget, we won't deficit spend, who would have believed that when they took over as a majority, that within 2 years they would have tripled—basically tripled—the amount of deficit spending. So much for the promise that we're going to cut deficit spending. So the $160 billion or so went to $458.5 billion, about tripled the deficit.

And then who could have possibly imagined that during President Obama's first year in office, when Democratic control was both the House and the Senate, that they would have the nerve to not run $160 billion deficit, as they said they would never do, or the $458 billion deficit, nearly three times as much as 2008, but that they would go 10 times that amount of $160 billion and hit about $1.6 trillion in deficit spending.

There are several markers being laid down in this country that make it very clear that this country is on a crash course. There are no seat belts, there are no harnesses, there are no air bags. We are barreling down this road to a definite end unless we get this thing under control.

And for the President to propose for the first time in American history that before he leaves office in 2017, under the President's proposed budget he will preside over the spending of $4.0898 trillion in fiscal year 2016, it's unbelievable. We've got somewhere between $2.3 trillion and $2.5 trillion that is expected to be coming in to the Treasury this year, and the President is proposing $3.8 trillion in spending. It is outrageous.

And at the same time, the President has closed down tours. There's no indication that there has actually been even $18,000 or $74,000 or $78,000 in savings from not having White House tours. So you begin to wonder, now, wait a minute, you said it was to save all this money is the reason you cut out White House tours, that it wasn't just a temper tantrum to make people suffer. So, let's see, where is the savings? If there are no Secret Service being furloughed, there are no Secret Service being laid off, it would appear there's no savings.

So what then could have possibly been the purpose for saying no more White House tours? Some have said, well, Congress is just mad because it complicates their job. People saying those types of things really have no clue what's going on in Washington, because the fact is a Member of Congress' life, be it Democrat or Republican, is actually less complicated when you don't have to arrange for White House tours.

It's something that Members of Congress had taken on voluntarily in order to help the White House. So we would make the arrangements, people would call and come through our office, then we would have to write requests, beg the White House, can you find enough tickets for these individuals to allow them to go through the White House, and then we would get word back. There for a while it was unpleasant when the President first started, because we had trouble getting tickets for anybody the first year or so, which meant that the President got to have people furious with Members of Congress because they blamed Members of Congress for not being able to go through the White House on a tour, when actually we would just get notice and only be able to pass that on.

So it actually makes Members of Congress' life far less complicated when we don't have to arrange for White House tours. But the Members of Congress I know, on both the Democratic side and the Republican side, really want to enhance visits for their constituents to Washington, D.C., and so we are willing to spend part of our budget to have somebody help arrange those tours for constituents coming to Washington. We help the White House by doing that.

Even though our offices, every congressional budget has been cut about 20 percent over the last 3 years, we haven't cut out those constituent services. We have one person less in my office we just didn't replace by attrition. We've had to make adjustments. And I'm grateful to have a staff that is willing to work hard and long hours. They don't get paid overtime, but they're willing to do that because they realize this is a servant's job. I am a servant. People who work in my office are servants. We serve the public and serve at their will.

Apparently, that is not something that all bureaucrats have been able to understand and take to heart. Then we also see big news today that a gun bill has cleared the Senate hurdle as the filibuster falls short. This is a FoxNews.com story that was released today.

□ 1640

There is another story here that indicates Senator LEE says, ''Background Checks Could Allow Holder''—the attorney general—''to Create Gun Registry Using Regulations.''

In fact, ''On Wednesday,'' it says, ''Senator MIKE LEE, Republican from Utah''—the fantastic Senator that he is; that's a parenthetical insertion—''took to the Senate floor and warned that universal background checks could lead to a national registry system for guns.''

A quote from my friend, Senator LEE, is:

> ''Some of the proposals, like, for example, universal background checks, would allow the Federal Government to surveil law-abiding citizens who exercise their constitutional rights. One of the provisions we expect to see in the bill, based on what we saw in the Judiciary Committee on which I sit, would allow the attorney general of the United States, Eric Holder, to promulgate regulations that could lead to a national registry system for guns, something my constituents in Utah are very concerned about, and understandably so.''

LEE also said that the government had no place monitoring the legal exercise of any constitutional right a citizen chooses to exercise:

> ''You see, the Federal Government has no business monitoring when or how often you go to church, what books and newspapers you read, who you vote for, your health conditions—''

And actually, I have to differ with Senator LEE on health conditions. ObamaCare means the government gets to monitor all your health conditions and actually will have all of your health care records, as well.

Senator LEE goes on:

> —''what you eat for breakfast and the details of your private life, including the lawful exercise of your rights protected by the Second Amendment and other provisions of the Bill of Rights.''

Important quotes by Senator MIKE LEE.

With regard to the gun bill that's been rushed through the Senate, it is worth noting again that when bills are rushed through without being given proper scrutiny, we create bad laws, we make mistakes, and the country and the Constitution suffer. It's part of our oath that we will protect and defend the Constitution of the United States; and I would humbly submit we don't do that job when we rush through bills that people have not had a chance to read, to participate in.

As my friends know, I have, on this very floor, read quotes from Minority Leader JOHN BOEHNER who, in essence, told Major Garrett that:

> If we get back the majority, a Speaker JOHN BOEHNER will bring bills through regular order. I'm not going to rush them to the floor like Speaker PELOSI has done.

And I've had to remind my own leadership of those promises because we keep rushing through bills as Republicans that people do not have enough time to read. And I'm hoping and praying and arguing and cajoling to try to make sure we stop that process and that we return to regular order.

There are some bad bills that come out of regular order to be sure; but when we have full debate at a subcommittee level over a proposed bill and any member of that subcommittee—this is called regular

order—any member of that subcommittee can bring an amendment to any provision in that bill, you get some scrutiny of the bill in its entirety.

Then when we have a markup at the full committee level and any member—Republican or Democrat. It doesn't matter. It doesn't matter if they're on or not on any of the subcommittees. At the full committee, any member of the full committee can bring an amendment to that bill.

We took most of the day today marking up a pretty simple bill, I thought, on the issue of reining in overregulation and getting Congress to take a look at the tens of thousands of pages of regulations that come out so regularly from bureaucrats that never catch the eye of elected officials. It was a pretty simple bill. It took hours and hours to go through that because there were so many proposed amendments. And each amendment that gets made has a chance for the proponent to argue for at least 5 minutes in favor of his amendment; and then under the rules, any member of the committee can spend up to 5 minutes on each amendment. It's not a pretty process, it's not pleasant to sit through, but we get better bills when we go through that process.

Then it comes to the Rules Committee. And I prefer if the Rules Committee allows for a fully open debate. We have an open amendment process. It's not pretty either, but it gives people across America a chance to see who is advocating for what amendment, what language. And you have had all this time, from the subcommittee to the committee to the House floor; and every Member of the House, no matter who you are or no matter whether you're in disfavor with the leadership like some of us may be, you can bring amendments in an open process under regular order, and you have a chance to debate those and America has a chance to see who's standing for what positions. It gives them a chance at the next election to better select who they want better representing them by virtue of what positions they're taking.

But when it goes through the process it just did through the Senate, there's not proper scrutiny and things come to the floor and we're not sure what the impact is. It can get so ridiculous that you can even have a Speaker of the House say, ''But we have to pass the bill so that you can find out what is in it.'' That's not the way we're supposed to govern. We have an obligation to do better than that.

Now, we've also gotten word that from the sequester that hit here just recently—this is an article by Elizabeth Harrington, dated April 9 of this week, ''Safe from Sequester: $704,198 for Gardening at NATO Ambassador's Home.''

Well, that should be a nice garden. I like to work in the yard around our house. I don't have as much chance as I used to, nor does my wife, but I'm pretty sure that the gorgeous yard we have didn't cost $704,198 on our property. So you would have thought that perhaps if people were going to help the President that are in the President's administration, they'd go, Hey, I can make do on $200,000 for my yard work this year. So you can get another half million back right there.

Gee, just think of all the White House tours that would fund, even though it doesn't look like the cutting of the tours actually saved anything.

Then we have some very salient points made by Investors.com, titled, ''Six Ways Obama's Budget Is Worse Than Everyone Thinks.'' It's posted 4/10/2013:

> Fiscal policy: Shorn of its accounting gimmicks, the President's budget isn't a balanced plan to get the debt crisis under control. It's a monument to fiscal irresponsibility.
>
> With much fanfare and a lot of media hype, President Obama unveiled his latest budget plan—2 months late. An IBD review of Obama's budget finds that, among other things, it:
>
> Boosts spending and deficits over the next 2 years. Obama's own budget numbers show that he wants to hike spending over the next 2 years by $247 billion compared with the ''baseline,'' which even after his proposed new tax hikes would mean $157 billion in additional red ink.

And it's important to understand, and I insert this parenthetically here, when we talk about a baseline—yes, the bill I've been pushing for 8 years, a zero-baseline budget where no Federal department has automatic increases, did pass the House a year ago. And I'm very grateful to ROB WOODALL and PAUL RYAN and to the Speaker keeping his word and bringing it to the floor. We passed it in the House. But the Senate, under Senator REID, made clear, no, we want every department in the Federal bureaucracy having an automatic increase in their budget every year. We want their budgets going up every year.

□ 1650

Now, Social Security, they may not get an automatic increase. Medicare, they may be cut by $700 billion as they were under ObamaCare; but when it comes to every Federal bureaucracy, Senator REID made clear they were not going to pass a zero-baseline budget, that they were not going to do away with the automatic increases. They were going to push forward and make sure the government bloat—the government obesity as a bureaucracy—would continue and that there would be automatic increases in every single Federal budget.

So, when this article points out that the President adds to the baseline, it means the President is already adding to what has been an automatic increase in their budgets for every department already. It may take another election to get people who are thinking correctly in the Senate, Democrat or Republican, who will finally stand up and say, You know what? There isn't an individual, there's not a family, there's not a charity, there's not a business anywhere in America that has an automatic increase every year in their budget, so we're stopping it for the government. If an agency or a department wants an increase, they're going to have to come in and justify it.

Now, some of us wouldn't mind starting every year with a zero sum, and you'd have to justify anything that you'd get at all; but all the zero baseline does is say we are willing to start where we were last year, and if you need an increase, we'll increase. That way, when those of us conservatives who advocate for a decrease in the increase are actually still allowing for an increase, we aren't vilified for making draconian cuts, because the increases are still there. If we can get to a zero baseline, then you will actually be able to have honest and accurate criticism because, at that point, a cut would actually be a cut; it would not be a decrease in the automatic increase. But President Obama, not content with the overspending and the waste, fraud, and abuse that's going on, is adding even above the automatic increases with his budget.

This article from Investors.com says:

> Vastly exaggerates spending cuts: The press has widely reported that Obama's budget would cut spending a total of $1.2 trillion over the next decade, but Obama's own budget shows that he actually cuts spending a mere $186 billion. (The relevant tables can be found at http://www.whitehouse.gov/sites/default/files/omb/budget/ fy2014/assets/tables.pdf.)
>
> Obama inflates his claimed savings by first cancelling the automatic sequester spending cuts he previously signed into law, then reclaiming them as new savings, and by adding in cuts in interest payments on the debt.

I didn't realize that that went on, actually.

The article says:

> Relies almost entirely on tax hikes: Obama's budget shows his plan would increase revenues by $1.14 trillion over the next decade. That means his budget proposes $6 in new taxes for every $1 in spending cuts.
>
> Cuts the deficit less than claimed: ''My budget will reduce our deficits by nearly another $2 trillion,'' Obama said Wednesday. But his budget shows total deficit reduction over the next decade would be just $1.4 trillion. Plus, deficits start rising again after 2018.

It should be noted that CBO does not have a good grasp on reality. I've met with Director Elmendorf. I've talked to him more than once. I appreciate the job they're trying to do, but when they estimate the cost of ObamaCare at $800 billion, and then after it passes say, Whoops, maybe $1.1 trillion, and then after it's almost coming into effect say, You know what? It could be $1.6 trillion or $1.8 trillion, and then others more accurately say, You know what? It may be $2.8 trillion, that means, if they originally estimate $800 billion and it ends up being $2.8 trillion, then they've got a margin of error rate of plus or minus, not 1, 2, 3, or 4 percent, but more like 300 to 400 percent.

Why are we even considering CBO projections when they're projecting costs with a margin of error of 300 to

400 percent? I think you'd have better luck just bringing somebody right out of college in here and saying, You give us your guess. Surely, your margin of error would be closer than 300 or 400 percent.

Anyway, Investors.com points out that Obama's budget ''creates a new entitlement without a reliable means to pay for it.''

Obama claims he can finance a new $76 billion ''preschool for all'' program by raising tobacco taxes again; but after an initial spike, tobacco tax revenues will start trending downward year after year as more people quit smoking while the costs of this new program will keep climbing. The last time Obama hiked tobacco taxes—to pay for an expansion of Medicaid—revenues came in $2.2 billion less than expected.

So, apparently, if the President wants more revenue from smoking, he's going to need to start doing a campaign to encourage people to smoke more so that he can get more taxes in and bring down the massive deficit that he is wanting to create.

This report points out from Investors.com:

The President boosts taxes on the middle class: Obama proposes to change the government's consumer price index in a way that will lower the official inflation rate. He's selling it as a way to cut Social Security annual cost of living adjustments, which are based on the CPI; but because his chained CPI would also apply to annual tax bracket adjustments, it will end up hiking taxes on the middle class $124 billion.

The American people deserve better, and I hope and pray the Senate will wake up, come to their senses and stop trying to ram legislation through that America does not deserve.

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

AGAINST THE CHAINED CPI AND SOCIAL SECURITY REDUCTIONS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2013, the Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. KAPTUR) for 30 minutes.

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, I rise tonight to speak against any proposed reduction in earned Social Security benefits through the so-called chained CPI calculation. No issue better focuses the interests of the senior citizens of our country versus the top 1 percent greater than the debate over Social Security.

Earlier this year, over my objections, this Congress cut senior meals by $823,000 in Ohio—or, roughly, 145,000 meals. Now some here in Washington are approaching the jugular for our seniors' Social Security benefit cuts.

The majority of seniors across our land depend on every single dollar they get from Social Security to put food on the table, to pay for utilities, to pay for housing. So many struggle with that every day. By slashing benefits in Social Security, while continuing to give tax havens to the richest people in this country, it proves that the priorities in Washington lie with the 1 percent, not with those Americans who struggle every day.

The White House has chosen to include the so-called chained CPI method for calculating Social Security cost of living adjustments in its fiscal proposed 2014 budget, the one that we will be considering.

□ 1700

But I agree with Senator TOM HARKIN of Iowa, who said what a chained CPI really is is like being in a boat with a chain and a ball around your ankle, and they throw you in the water and you start to sink. That's exactly what a chained CPI is in Social Security.

Numerous government programs, including Social Security benefits, and income thresholds for tax brackets are indexed for inflation. That's what CPI is all about. Every year, seniors wait to see what their inflation adjustment will be in Social Security and in Medicare to see whether they'll get as much money as they got last year or less. The formula change that is being proposed would add up to a big cut for America's senior citizens who have earned their benefits.

Imagine, for example, a person born in 1935 who retired to full benefits at age 65 in the year 2000, and they paid into Social Security their entire working life. According to the Social Security Administration, people in that position under the current formula have an average monthly benefit of $1,435, or about $17,220 per year. Under the cost-of-living adjustment for 2012, that benefit would rise a bit to $1,986 a month this year, or about $23,832 a year. But under the chained CPI proposal, that sum would be less. It would be about $1,880 a month, or $22,560 a year. That's a cut of over 5 percent, or a $106 a month cut, and more as you go further and further into future years. In other words, it gets worse and worse.

The other problem is that the people who rely most on their Social Security benefits—people who are older, people who have illness—are the ones who sadly the chained CPI does the worst job of accommodating. In fact, the group that gets the biggest FICA tax hike is families making between 30 and $40,000 a year—dead center in our middle class. Their increase would be almost six times worse. It would affect them six times more than those who are in the millionaire tax bracket. That's because millionaires are already in the top tax bracket so they're not being pushed by the formula into higher marginal rates because of changing bracket thresholds. Isn't that convenient.

So because senior citizens spend more of their income on health care and housing, two areas where the formula is flawed and their true cost is under represented, the chained CPI proposal hurts seniors more.

Beyond the benefit inflation formula, we should not be supporting a plan that uses Social Security to pay for deficits it didn't create. The Social Security trust fund is sound. Without anything being done, it would function well into 2038; and even after that time with no changes, we could pay 80 percent of the benefits that people have earned. Now, one of the reasons that Social Security looks over a long time horizon is because of economic downturns. When people get thrown out of work, they're not contributing into the Social Security trust fund. The answer to Social Security is to put people back to work. We have 12.5 million people unemployed in this country, and that creates a temporary blip that would affect people who will retire 20–25 years from now. We can fix that problem because Social Security is an efficient and effective program, but we shouldn't be using the American people's annuity for retirement that they earned and mix it up with the regular budget. It's two different things.

About 98 percent of Social Security benefits go out in the form of benefit checks which the beneficiaries spend on whatever they value most. Most of them spend the vast majority on food. But less than 2 percent of Social Security today is put on administrative expenses. The program is very efficiently run, and no private pension plan, no 401(k) that took so much of the people's money away, no private annuity, can claim that kind of efficient operation. Cuts in promised Social Security benefits, whether they occur because of the chained CPI, or some people here are talking about a higher retirement age or means testing, will shift more costs onto already struggling American families and our senior citizens. Frankly, I don't support that.

I applaud that the chained CPI proposal that was in the White House budget had a provision to protect the very oldest and disabled persons who receive supplemental security income and low-income veterans, but let me put on the record: these groups represent less than half of the seniors who have earned Social Security benefits. The formula doesn't really take care of others who are impacted by this proposed CPI change.

Frankly, this is not the time to cut earned benefits of millions of senior Americans who are already struggling financially. And I can guarantee you, the lowest-income citizens in this country are women over the age of 85, and I would never vote to take a penny away from them. This formula should be there in a form that allows them to live in dignity.

We have been unwilling as a Congress to close tax loopholes for the billionaires and millionaires of our country. This has been a Congress unwilling to prosecute Wall Street bankers for the damage they did, but it appears that some are willing to take money from our seniors who have earned and worked for Social Security benefits that are critical to their livelihoods and which they depend upon.

You know, I have a story to tell. Last weekend, I was doing grocery shopping

for our family back home, and I saw an older gentleman. I was thinking about what I was going to say here in Congress. He was in the supermarket and he had his cart, and he was all bent over. He was trudging along aisle after aisle, and he had quite a bit of trouble even raising his neck to look at what the prices were. He seemed to be going around, and I noticed he wasn't putting a whole lot in his cart, but he was putting some things in, watching every penny. And when I finished with my shopping, I saw him out in the parking lot. I thought, Is he going to his car? Where's he going? I watched him push his shopping cart, and he had put all of his groceries in two backpacks. I saw him pushing his grocery cart across the parking lot way to the corner by the sidewalk, and I realized what he was doing: he wasn't going to a car—he didn't have a car. What he was doing was, he was putting his groceries in these backpacks to put on his back, and then in his condition walk to wherever his home or wherever he was residing. I looked at that, and I thought, you know, I have to go back to Congress and tell that story because that's exactly the kind of person that the chained CPI would impact the most.

These senior citizens shouldn't have to have this Congress debating about their benefits because they get scared all across our country. We should never do anything that upsets our seniors, who are dealing with so many issues in their own lives that each of us someday will have to deal with. And I find it sad, really, that this issue of Social Security has been included in the budget debates that we are about to get into. Social Security is separate. It has its own trust fund. It is sound. It has a formula that works. The best thing we can do for future generations is to get everybody back to work so that the FICA trust fund works 50 years down the road. But right now, we shouldn't be worrying our seniors.

We shouldn't be asking them to take cuts in senior meals. The people who go for senior meals are senior citizens who actually need better nutrition. I've gone to many senior sites. One image that remains in my mind at one site in my own district is a very thin senior woman who is probably 85 years old, and the senior center served a small sandwich for lunch. They served a little bit of warm corn. There was a little pudding, and an apple and a can of milk on the tray, and that woman ate everything but half her sandwich, and she took that half of the sandwich that she didn't eat and she wrapped it up and put it into her worn purse, and she left that senior center and walked home. Those are the seniors that we have to see here and care about.

I'm just glad and I'm very grateful to the citizens of my region that they've sent me here, and I urge my colleagues to oppose any Social Security cuts for current or future beneficiaries in any deficit reduction package, especially that contained in the chained CPI proposal. My vote will always be to give our seniors freedom from worry, freedom from the chains of the CPI proposal that would pull them down if they're thrown overboard.

□ 1710

The American people would not want to do what is being proposed in this chained CPI to the senior citizens of our country if they really understood what it means. $100 to a senior in a monthly check is doled out penny by penny by penny.

We have a program in the Department of Agriculture where, in the summer months, our seniors can go to some fruit stands around our country and they get a little coupon and they can buy fruits and vegetables. And the owner of this one fruit stand in Ohio said to me, you know, Congresswoman, I never realized, among seniors, how much they had to sacrifice. They can't buy things that normal families buy.

I said, tell me more. And the farmer said, you know, I had a woman in here last week who stared and stared at a container of raspberries. And the price on the raspberries at that stand was $4. That senior woman had not eaten raspberries in 25 years because she couldn't afford them.

And that farmer said, you know, when I saw her coupons, I told her, ma'am, I will cut the price in half. And her total bill came up to, like, I think he said it was like $10.96, and he was going to give her the four pennies back. And he said, you know what? How about if I give you some green beans to put in your sack for the extra 4 cents? And that's exactly what happened at that one transaction.

Multiply that times millions of seniors across this country and get a sense of what they face. I can tell you in Ohio, and I'm sure it's the same everywhere, the largest increase in the number of people coming into our food banks across this country are senior citizens. You can say, why is that?

Well, you know, if they had a bank account, if they were able to save a little bit, it doesn't pay anything in interest now, after the crash of 2008, so they're not making anything off any savings that they might have.

A lot of them, if their kids are unemployed, they've let them move in with them; and so grandma and grandpa are the ones that are holding millions of families across this country together until their kids and grandkids can get back on their feet again.

And I think what the seniors are doing, because prices are rising, prices haven't gone down, they're going into these food banks and they're getting a bag of groceries to help them stretch the meager dollars that they have.

So as we move into this deficit debate and into the budget debate, I want my colleagues to think about the citizens that they represent and how vital that Social Security check is, and to do nothing to those who have not asked for any reduction. They can't afford any reduction.

There are so many other places in this economy where we can go in order to try to balance the budget. We should not do it on the backs of our senior citizens.

So I would say, free our seniors from the CPI. Oppose any proposals to change the formula that would cut their benefits. We already tax those who have significant assets if they earn over a certain amount on Social Security with other income. We don't need to harm the millions of Americans who just get by month after month.

I thank my colleagues for listening.

I ask the Members of this Congress to oppose the chained CPI and to stand with our senior citizens to give them the dignity in their retirement years that they have earned.

I yield back the balance of my time.

COMPREHENSIVE IMMIGRATION REFORM

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. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the privilege to address you here on the floor of the House of Representatives and take up the topic that has come to the forefront of the American discussion, and do so again.

And that is that on the night of November 6, as people across America watched the election returns come in, there were many Republicans, people on my side of the aisle that watched with, I'll say, shock and disappointment, as the great predictions that Mitt Romney would be the next President of the United States fell by the wayside in swing State after swing State from the east coast. By the time it got west of the Mississippi, it was pretty clear the final result of the Presidential election.

And many of the predictors, who are self-assigned experts on polling and politics and the decision of the American voters, had predicted that Mitt Romney would be President, that Republicans would win the majority in the United States Senate, that there would be a three-way majority between the House, the Senate and Presidency, and we could put America back on the right track.

I hoped for that, Mr. Speaker. I prayed for that. I worked for it. But I watched as those election results came to be untrue, as we lost some seats here in the House and lost some seats in the Senate, and, of course, the President was re-elected that night.

The plans of probably half, very close to half, of the American people had to be changed and altered, because we planned to put free enterprise back in place. We planned to repeal ObamaCare. We planned to do some other things.

But one of the things we didn't really plan so much to do was take up the immigration issue in the 113th Congress.

And even though immigration was hardly a blip on the Presidential debate that took place—and being from Iowa, Mr. Speaker, I will tell you that if it was debated in the Presidential race, it likely was debated in Iowa, likely debated in Iowa first, and likely debated in Iowa the longest.

Yet as I tuned my ear to these issues, I didn't notice that it was a paramount topic or a significant plank in the platform of either Mitt Romney or Barack Obama, and I don't think the American people did either.

Nonetheless, the election polls closed on the night of the 6th of November, and those results are clear. And the morning then of the 7th of November, some self-appointed experts woke up and decided—oh, probably they didn't sleep very well because it was clear that they were wrong on their predictions. And so how would they then describe why they were so wrong in their bold predictions, even as high as 60 or more Republican seats in the Senate, and Mitt Romney sweeping swing State after swing State?

It didn't happen, of course, Mr. Speaker. How would they describe why they were so wrong?

It didn't take them very long, after the sun came up, or maybe even before they went to bed that night, to decide they were going to tell the American people that the election loss—and I wouldn't characterize it as a loss—it was a failure to achieve the goals we had set, but the President maintained his seat in the White House. But that election loss, as they characterized it, came about because Mitt Romney said two words—''self-deport''—and that explains it all, almost as logically as the video explains the violence in Benghazi.

No, it wasn't because Mitt Romney said those two words, and it wasn't because we had failed to achieve as large a percentage of the Hispanic-Latino vote, although that number dropped off from about 31 percent that JOHN MCCAIN achieved, down to 27 percent, according to the exit polls, that Mitt Romney achieved.

It wasn't even the low. The modern-day low percentage for Hispanic vote went to Bob Dole; and if my memory serves me correctly, that was at 22 percent.

I noticed that as they began to spin the narrative that it was all about immigration, along with that came the position that many of the advocates had had for a long time. These were the people that were the promoters of—and I put it in quotes—''comprehensive immigration reform,'' and that's the language that emerged during George W. Bush's administration when they first advocated the amnesty, the modern-day amnesty that is a policy that much of it was written off of the 1986 Amnesty Act that Ronald Reagan signed.

But their argument was Mitt Romney would be President if he had just had a better outreach to the Hispanic vote. And so those of us that heard that, first I realized that the open-borders people have always had the agenda to suspend the rule of law and grant amnesty and the path to citizenship for people that came here illegally, many times at the expense of those who came here as legal immigrants. But it always was their agenda.

So it was a pretty convenient excuse to analyze failed election results and put it all in the package of: if we had just passed comprehensive immigration reform. Now we must pass comprehensive immigration reform, or the party will become irrelevant electorally in the future, and we'll never win another national election.

In fact, Mr. Speaker, the President of the United States, President Obama, came before Republican House Members in a conference about a month ago and said just that. He said that we would never win another national election if we don't pass comprehensive immigration reform.

And here's the one that's the hardest to accept as being delivered with a serious look on his face, although I'm sure there had to be a little snicker in his mind. He said, to you Republicans, I'm trying to help you. The President said he's trying to help us by advocating for an amnesty plan, comprehensive immigration reform; and that's going to fix the problem of falling a little short in winning the Presidential election last November 6.

□ 1720

Well, there are a few facts that should be known, Mr. Speaker, and one of them is that, according to my team of staff as they sat on their Blackberrys, Barack Obama received 8 million fewer votes than he did in 2008 and Mitt Romney received 1 million fewer votes than JOHN MCCAIN did in 2008. That means there are 9 million people, at least, that stayed home—the electorate should have gotten larger—9 million people that stayed home altogether. Why were they not energized? Why didn't Barack Obama energize them? Why didn't Mitt Romney energize them? We need to know the answers to those questions just to begin this discussion.

Another one would be, how important was the immigration issue to people in this country? Not important enough that the Presidential candidates would make a debate issue out of it or campaign on it. So it wasn't on the radar screen of the Presidential candidates, who have the most extensive and expensive polling of anybody in the country.

So why was that an issue? I'd point out Republicans lost an even larger share of the Asian vote than they did the Hispanic vote, but what was the list of priorities that they had, and was immigration at the top? No, actually, it was fifth or sixth along the line.

Like everybody else, we are all human beings and we're all deserving of respect and we're all created in God's image. But people think the same way, regardless of what their race or ethnicity. They want to take care of their families. They worry about jobs and the economy. They want to have safe streets. They want good education. They want opportunity. They should want lower taxes and less government intrusion into our lives. But that same poll yielded a bit of a surprising result to many of the advocates that had spun the yarn the morning after the election that the constituency that they were losing was, naturally, Republicans. Because I'll say this: we know they are good family people, they're good faith people, they're good entrepreneurs and they can start a business with less and make it go very, very well with that network of family and work ethic. That's what we see in front of us. But if you ask the question in a setting that is the perspective of a good and effective and thorough, objective poll, you'll find out that Hispanics are about 2-to-1 in favor of larger, more government involvement, more government services, which results in higher taxes.

Well, that's the other party that advertises we need more government, more taxes, more government services. They do that because they are in the business of expanding the dependency class in America. They want, Mr. Speaker, more Americans to be dependent upon government, even if we have to borrow the money from the Chinese and the Saudis in order to provide these ''services'' because it empowers their electoral base and empowers them here in this Congress.

We're on the other side of this issue, Republicans. We want to expand personal responsibility. We want to expand all of the human potential that we possibly can. We want this American vigor to be unleashed and to grow this economy and to grow our gross domestic product. They are two competing ideologies. One is John Maynard Keynes, who believed you could borrow money and hand it to people and ask them to spend it, and somehow that spending would create this giant, endless chain letter that would stimulate the economy. The other side comes out of the Adam Smith side, or you might say the Austrian economic side, that believes that you need production on the production side of our economy for it to grow and has less emphasis on the consumption side, and if you let people invest capital and get a return on that capital investment, they will do their best and contribute and the economy will grow. That's a competing philosophy that's different between Republicans and Democrats. Republicans want to empower the individual. And to empower the individual, you have to respect and appreciate and encourage this free enterprise economy that had built the United States.

Mr. Speaker, if you take a naturalization test there are a series of flash cards, a stack of them that you can get from Citizenship and Immigration Services so that a legal immigrant can study to be naturalized as an

American citizen. These glossy flash cards are read, and they will have on them questions like, Who's the Father of our Country? Snap it over and it's George Washington. Who emancipated the slaves? Republican Abraham Lincoln. Actually, it just says Abraham Lincoln on the other side, Mr. Speaker. What's the economic system of the United States of America? Flip that flash card over and it says free enterprise capitalism.

This is not a secret. We want people to be empowered by freedom, by God-given liberty, not dependent upon some political party that's going to hand out the largesse of government at the expense of other people and actually at the expense of borrowing money from foreign countries to drive us into debt of now nearly $16.8 trillion in national debt.

So the cynical effort to expand the political base erodes the rule of law, erodes free enterprise, puts America in debt. So now that the babies that were born today in the United States of America owe Uncle Sam more than $53,000 each. That's what we have and that's what we're dealing with. And we have a country that we need to pull back from the brink of bankruptcy. We're moving in that direction under I think good, strategic leadership here in the House. We have a budget that we've approved that balances. And it's too long for me. I don't want to wait that long—10 years. But meanwhile, the President's budget balances exactly never and drives us deeper and deeper into debt and raises taxes, Mr. Speaker.

So how do we bring out the greatness of America? The greatness of America was described by Ronald Reagan when he talked about the shining city on the hill. But Ronald Reagan never spoke about the shining city on the hill as being our destiny. He spoke about it as the America that we were and presumably the America that we are. I will argue that our job is to refurbish the pillars of American exceptionalism, to strengthen us in all of those pillars. We know what they are. They're very clear. Many of them are in the Bill of Rights. Freedom of speech is a pillar of American exceptionalism. I'm exercising it at this moment, Mr. Speaker. Freedom of speech, religion, the press and assembly; the right to keep and bear arms; the right to face your accuser in a court of law and be tried by a jury of your peers; single, not double jeopardy; the right to property; the right to see that the enumerated powers that are exclusively to the United States Congress, those other powers devolve to the States or the people respectively. Those are some of the pillars. I mentioned free enterprise capitalism as another pillar of American exceptionalism. But wrapped up within this, within this Constitution that I carry in my jacket pocket, is the supreme law of the land, our Constitution, and we would not be America if we didn't have all of these pillars that I have described and also have the rule of law.

Now why would thinking people that were elected to come to this United States Congress and make good value judgments and good policy judgments, why would they be so willing and some of them eager to sacrifice the rule of law in an effort to cynically reach out and ask for a vote? Why would someone vote for someone who's willing to sacrifice the rule of law? It defies my logic application, Mr. Speaker. And amnesty is a sacrifice of the rule of law. And once you give it, once you grant it, it's almost impossible to restore it.

I remember when Ronald Reagan signed the Amnesty Act of 1986. And I was not in politics at the time. I was operating my construction company that was 11 years old at the time, raising three young sons, struggling through the farm crisis decade of the eighties. But I'm watching the news, and I'm seeing this debate take place that we have 800,000 to a million that are in the United States illegally. Generally, most of them at that time came across the southern border and stayed. And there was such a big problem that we needed to address it—800,000 to a million that were here illegally then.

So Ronald Reagan, I think under great persuasive pressure from some of the Cabinet members around him, conceded that he would sign that 1986 Amnesty Act. And when he did that, my frustration level went over the top. I believed that in spite of all the pressure that was brought on Ronald Reagan as President, he would see clearly that you can't sacrifice the rule of law in order to solve a problem that came about because of not enforcing the law, and that the promise of enforcement in the future was not going to be upheld adequately to compensate for the amnesty that they were granting in that bill.

Now the promise was this: every employer was going to have to fill out for each applicant an I–9 form. That I–9 form had—I gave it shorthand and called it name, rank, and serial number, but other data, too, of the job applicant. I remember my fear that the INS, the Immigration and Naturalization Service of the time, would come into my office and go through my files and audit me and make sure that I had every I–9 form exactly filed right, and I want to make sure I didn't miss it with anyone.

□ 1730

We religiously followed the new 1986 Amnesty Act requirements that there would be I–9 forms. We expected that there would be enforcement and penalties for employers that violated that because the premise was the Federal Government, enforced by the Justice Department at the time, would be there to audit employers and enforce the rule of law. That was the full-blown premise that came with Ronald Reagan's signature on the Amnesty Act of 1986.

I don't have any doubt that Ronald Reagan intended to follow through on the enforcement of the Amnesty Act. I can tell you that I followed my part. I've still got some of those records in my dusty files back there somewhere. Many other employers were concerned that they would not be able to follow the letter of the law. It didn't work out that way. They didn't show up in office after office, company after company. And after 20 years of the Amnesty Act that was 800,000 to 1 million. Because of document fraud and just a misestimation of the numbers, that 800,000 to 1 million became 3 million people that were granted amnesty in that act that was signed by Ronald Reagan in 1986.

Now, what did we learn from that, Mr. Speaker? And those who fail to learn from history are condemned to repeat it. Well, I have this document that's written by Attorney General Ed Meese, who was Ronald Reagan's Attorney General at that period of time and charged with enforcing the immigration law that was passed in Amnesty in '86. This is an op-ed that he wrote, published in Human Events on December 13, 2006. Among his dialogue here is this—and I'll read some of it into the RECORD, Mr. Speaker. I think it's worth our attention. It's Attorney General Ed Meese writing of Ronald Reagan's Amnesty Act.

From the article, he says:

> Illegal immigrants who could establish that they had resided in America continuously for 5 years would be granted temporary resident status, which could be upgraded to permanent residency after 18 months and, after another 5 years, to citizenship. It wasn't automatic. They had to pay application fees. They had to learn to speak English. They had to understand American civics, pass a medical exam and register for military selective service. Those with convictions for a felony or three misdemeanors were ineligible.

Mr. Speaker, this language is almost verbatim the language that was plugged into the 2006 Amnesty Act and into what is likely to come out of the Senate.

I would be happy to yield for an announcement.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Ms. Curtis, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate has passed a bill of the following title in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 716. An act to modify the requirements under the STOCK Act regarding online access to certain financial disclosure statements and related forms.

COMPREHENSIVE IMMIGRATION REFORM—CONTINUED

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman may proceed.

Mr. KING of Iowa. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I had to pause for a minute there. I was concerned that might be the Amnesty Act coming over from the United

States Senate, but I'm relieved to know that it might be a few more days.

Picking up where I left off, I had made the point and read into this RECORD, Mr. Speaker, the language that was used in the 1986 Amnesty Act is almost identical to the language that was copied and pasted into the 2006 Amnesty Act that they called ''comprehensive immigration reform'' because they knew the word ''amnesty'' would sink the bill then. Now they know that ''comprehensive immigration reform'' is code words for amnesty. The American people figured that out in short order.

I will continue with the op-ed written by Attorney General Meese in 2006. He said, as I remarked:

> If this sounds familiar, it's because these are pretty much the same provisions that were included in the Comprehensive Reform Act of 2006, which its supporters claim is not amnesty. In the end, slight differences in process do not change the overriding fact that the 1986 law and the recent Senate legislation both include an amnesty. The difference is that President Reagan called it what it was.

We had an honest man in the White House who called it what it was. I continue from Attorney General Meese:

> The lesson from the 1986 experience is that such an amnesty did not solve the problem. There was extensive document fraud; the number of people applying for amnesty far exceeded the projections. And there was a failure of political will to enforce new laws against employers. After a brief slowdown, illegal immigration returned to high levels and continued unabated, forming the nucleus of today's large population of illegal aliens. So here we are, 20 years later, having much the same debate.

Mr. Speaker, we're here right now having the same debate that we had in 2006, which was, according to Attorney General Meese, the same debate we had in 1986.

What would President Reagan do? I often ask that. Actually, I'd like to wear a wristband, What Would Ronald Reagan Do?

Attorney General Meese continues:

> What would President Reagan do? For one thing, he would not repeat the mistakes of the past, including those of his own administration. He knew that secure borders are vital and would now insist on meeting that priority first. He would seek to strengthen the enforcement of existing immigration laws. He would employ new tools—like biometric technology for identification, and camera sensors and satellites to monitor the border—that make enforcement and verification less onerous and more effective.

That sounds like some things that a number of us have been advocating for some time.

Then Attorney General Meese continues—and I skip down a little ways:

> To give those here illegally the opportunity to correct their status by returning to their country of origin and getting in line with everyone else.

Now, Mr. Speaker, it's appalling to me to think that the advocates—I understand the other side of the aisle; I understand the political motivation of the people on the other side of the aisle—expand the dependency class, expand those who can vote for those who want to expand the dependency class. I understand those motives. They are not good motives. They undermine American exceptionalism, but I understand them.

On our side of the aisle, I don't understand—and I think it's because a lot of our own people don't have this figured out. They're looking for someone else to lead them, and they're looking for perhaps an easy way. But every proposal that has been brought forward here out of, let's say, the Gang of Eight or the ''secret gang'' in the House seems to have with it instantaneous legalization of 11, 12, 13—20 million people, all of them, with the exceptions of those who have been convicted of or perhaps charged with a felony, those who have been convicted of three serious misdemeanors. That goes right back to this language of the '86 Amnesty Act: ''Those with convictions for a felony or three misdemeanors were ineligible,'' according to Attorney General Meese.

So nothing has changed here, except we have a lot more Republicans that think instantaneous legalization—and they'd argue that it's not a path to citizenship. I happen to have this little quote from one of the Gang of Eight where he made us this point, which is he says that a green card is not a path to citizenship. The reason they have to say that is because the path to the green card is a path to citizenship if the green card is a path to citizenship.

There has been an awful lot of misinformation that's put out here and erroneous conclusions drawn, unexamined by the American public that has forgotten, perhaps, about the 2006 Amnesty Act or the 1986 Amnesty Act.

I see the gentleman from California, who was engaged in the Reagan administration and knew Ronald Reagan as well as anybody in this United States Congress, is here on this floor. I would be happy to yield so much time as he may consume, even if he consumes it all. But I would suggest it looks like it's 4 to 5 minutes left.

I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. ROHRABACHER. Thank you very much.

First of all, I would like to make sure that those people who are reading the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD or those people who are watching this presentation on C–SPAN, or our colleagues who are in their offices, watching from their offices, should take note of the courage and the hard work that Congressman KING has put into this issue. And it is not because Congressman KING or those of us who have worked with him on this issue have any animosity towards anyone else. Congressman KING is a strong Christian and knows that hatred and animosity is not a positive virtue.

But to the same degree, what is, then, Congressman KING's motive? Why does he put up with this? Why does he work so hard? Because he loves the people of the United States of America. That's our job. We were elected by the people of the United States to watch out for them and to watch out for their families. That doesn't mean that we don't like people in other countries. That doesn't mean that we don't like or have some animosity towards someone who has come here from another country, and even those who come here illegally. But our first loyalty and our first consideration and our heart-felt support has to be for those people who are Americans, whether they were born here or whether they came here as legal immigrants and are now part of our American family.

□ 1740

There is nothing wrong with supporting your family. That doesn't mean you're being selfish by not selling your car or giving away your children's birthright to some other person down the block. No, you should be taking care of your family. And we Americans are a family that's made up of every race, every religion, and every ethnic group.

The people who are the real racists in this whole debate are the ones who want to, first of all, tie illegal immigration with legal immigration. The fact is that they say, well, look, the immigrants, this and that. The fact is, when you want to put those same groups together, that is not what this debate is all about.

Mr. KING and I know full well that what's happening here today is an effort to take, not people who have come to our country legally, not to change their status legally, that's not my effort, that's not Mr. KING's effort, but the effort that's going on is to take 11 million to 20 million people who are in our country illegally, whose presence oftentimes is a threat to the well-being of people that have elected us to watch out for their interests, meaning the American people in our country, that the only issue is what are we going to do with those 11 to 20 million people.

If we continue to take away from those American citizens, those seniors or those kids in school, with our very limited dollars right now, and we have 22 million people who are out of work, and we continue to take away from them and give benefits and jobs to people who come here illegally, who are not part of our family, we can expect even more and more and more people to come here until it is a disaster, which it already has been a disaster for many middle-income and lower-income Americans. It will be a disaster to them.

What we are trying to do is help secure the well-being of our people. As I say, I think that's done out of love. It's done out of the idea that you don't basically give away everything to somebody who is down the street when your own family needs some food. That's not being selfish.

I recently have been through some hardship in my family, in terms of

medical hardship. I've been able to visit and see what our hospitals are like. Our hospital system in the United States and our health care system is stretched to the breaking point. We're stretched to the breaking point. We cannot afford, if we try, to take care of all of the people in the world who can come here, whether they come here illegally or not. If someone has come here illegally, we cannot afford to take care of all of their health needs without actually hurting our own people. That's what this whole debate is about.

I was down in El Salvador. Ask Congressman KING. I was in El Salvador about 3 years ago. And I'll never forget, my wife and I were sitting there at the airport, and in about 20 minutes there's a direct flight between LAX, Los Angeles, and El Salvador and back. We were there in El Salvador waiting to go back to LAX. Twenty minutes before the flight took off, out come the wheelchairs, and about 20 infirm seniors are wheeled into that plane. None of them were Americans. They were, obviously, all El Salvadorans.

Now, no one can tell me today that those people, if they're still alive, are not consuming enormous amounts of health care dollars that should be going to take care of our own people. That doesn't mean that I have any animosity towards them. I wish the people of El Salvador well.

We need to make sure that we are watching out. The fundamental issue today is whose side are you on, or who's watching out for the people of the United States? And I would ask all of us to join Congressman KING in making sure that the American people are not damaged by this irresponsibility that we have towards people from another country who have come here illegally.

Mr. KING of Iowa. I thank the gentleman from California for coming to the floor. I thank you, Mr. Speaker, and I yield back the balance of my time.

[From Human Events, April 11, 2013]

REAGAN WOULD NOT REPEAT AMNESTY MISTAKE

(By Edwin Meese)

What would Ronald Reagan do? I can't tell you how many times I have been asked that question, on virtually every issue imaginable.

As much as we all want clarity and certainty, I usually refrain from specific answers. That's because it is very difficult to directly translate particular political decisions to another context, in another time. The better way to answer the question—and the way President Reagan himself would approach such questions—is to understand Reagan's principles and how they should apply in today's politics, and review past decisions and consider what lessons they have for us.

Immigration is one area where Reagan's principles can guide us, and the lessons are instructive.

I was attorney general two decades ago during the debate over what became the Immigration Reform and Control Act of 1986. President Reagan, acting on the recommendation of a bipartisan task force, supported a comprehensive approach to the problem of illegal immigration, including adjusting the status of what was then a relatively small population. Since the Immigration and Naturalization Service was then in the Department of Justice, I had the responsibility for directing the implementation of that plan.

President Reagan set out to correct the loss of control at our borders. Border security and enforcement of immigration laws would be greatly strengthened—in particular, through sanctions against employers who hired illegal immigrants. If jobs were the attraction for illegal immigrants, then cutting off that option was crucial.

He also agreed with the legislation in adjusting the status of immigrants—even if they had entered illegally—who were law-abiding long-term residents, many of whom had children in the United States. Illegal immigrants who could establish that they had resided in America continuously for five years would be granted temporary resident status, which could be upgraded to permanent residency after 18 months and, after another five years, to citizenship. It wasn't automatic. They had to pay application fees, learn to speak English, understand American civics, pass a medical exam and register for military selective service. Those with convictions for a felony or three misdemeanors were ineligible.

If this sounds familiar, it's because these are pretty much the same provisions included in the Comprehensive Reform Act of 2006, which its supporters claim is not amnesty. In the end, slight differences in process do not change the overriding fact that the 1986 law and the recent Senate legislation both include an amnesty. The difference is that President Reagan called it for what it was.

LESSON OF 1986

The lesson from the 1986 experience is that such an amnesty did not solve the problem. There was extensive document fraud, and the number of people applying for amnesty far exceeded projections. And there was a failure of political will to enforce new laws against employers. After a brief slowdown, illegal immigration returned to high levels and continued unabated, forming the nucleus of today's large population of illegal aliens.

So here we are, 20 years later, having much the same debate and being offered much the same deal.

What would President Reagan do? For one thing, he would not repeat the mistakes of the past, including those of his own administration. He knew that secure borders are vital, and would now insist on meeting that priority first. He would seek to strengthen the enforcement of existing immigration laws. He would employ new tools—like biometric technology for identification, and cameras, sensors and satellites to monitor the border—that make enforcement and verification less onerous and more effective.

One idea President Reagan had at the time that we might also try improving on is to create a pilot program that would allow genuinely temporary workers to come to the United States—a reasonable program consistent with security and open to the needs and dynamics of our market economy.

And what about those already here? Today it seems to me that the fair policy, one that will not encourage further illegal immigration, is to give those here illegally the opportunity to correct their status by returning to their country of origin and getting in line with everyone else. This, along with serious enforcement and control of the illegal inflow at the border—a combination of incentives and disincentives—will significantly reduce over time our population of illegal immigrants.

Lastly, we should remember Reagan's commitment to the idea that America must remain open and welcoming to those yearning for freedom. As a nation based on ideas, Ronald Reagan believed that there was something unique about America and that anyone, from anywhere, could become an American. That means that while we seek to meet the challenge of illegal immigration, we must keep open the door of opportunity by preserving and enhancing our heritage of legal immigration—assuring that those who choose to come here permanently become Americans. In the end, it was his principled policy—and it should be ours—to ''humanely regain control of our borders and thereby preserve the value of one of the most sacred possessions of our people: American citizenship.''

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. KING of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 45 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Friday, April 12, 2013, at 10 a.m.

OATH OF OFFICE MEMBERS, RESIDENT COMMISSIONER, AND DELEGATES

The oath of office required by the sixth article of the Constitution of the United States, and as provided by section 2 of the act of May 13, 1884 (23 Stat. 22), to be administered to Members, Resident Commissioner, and Delegates of the House of Representatives, the text of which is carried in 5 U.S.C. 3331:

> ''I, AB, do solemnly swear (or affirm) that I will support and defend the Constitution of the United States against all enemies, foreign and domestic; that I will bear true faith and allegiance to the same; that I take this obligation freely, without any mental reservation or purpose of evasion; and that I will well and faithfully discharge the duties of the office on which I am about to enter. So help me God.''

has been subscribed to in person and filed in duplicate with the Clerk of the House of Representatives by the following Member of the 113th Congress, pursuant to the provisions of 2 U.S.C. 25:

ROBIN L. KELLY, Second District of Illinois.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

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

1029. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Clothianidin; Pesticide Tolerances [EPA-HQ-OPP-2011-0860; FRL-9378-6] received March 26, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

1030. A letter from the Chief Counsel, FEMA, Department of Homeland Security,

transmitting the Department's final rule — Final Flood Elevation Determinations [Docket ID: FEMA-2013-0002] received March 26, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Financial Services.

1031. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Disapproval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; Colorado; Revision to Definitions; Common Provisions Regulation [EPA-R08-OAR-2011-0036; FRL-9284-4] received March 26, 2012, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1032. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; Arkansas; Prevention of Significant Deterioration; Greenhouse Gas Tailoring Rule Revisions [EPA-R06-OAR-2012-0639; FRL-9795-4] received March 26, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1033. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; Ohio; Particulate Matter Standards [EPA-R05-OAR-2012-0088; FRL-9783-5] received March 26, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1034. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; Virginia; Transportation Conformity Regulations [EPA-R03-OAR-2013-0082; FRL-9795-6] received March 26, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1035. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans and Operating Permits Program; State of Missouri [EPA-R07-OAR-2012-0749; FRL-9795-2] received March 26, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1036. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans; Texas; Reasonably Available Control Technology for the 1997 8-Hour Ozone National Ambient Air Quality Standard [EPA-R06-OAR-2012-0100; FRL-9795-3] received March 26, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1037. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Significant New Use Rules on Certain Chemical Substances; Technical Amendment [EPA-HQ-OPPT-2012-0842; FRL-9382-2] (RIN: 2070-AB27) received March 26, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1038. A letter from the Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Fisheries of the Northeastern United States; Atlantic Herring Fishery; Adjustment to 2013 Annual Catch Limits [Docket No.: 121022572-3075-02] (RIN: 0648-XC318) received March 27, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

1039. A letter from the Acting Deputy Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Pollock in the West Yakutat District of the Gulf of Alaska [Docket No.: 120918468-3111-02] (RIN: 0648-XC536) received March 27, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

1040. A letter from the Acting Deputy Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Fisheries of the Caribbean, Gulf of Mexico, and South Atlantic; Coastal Migratory Pelagic Resources of the Gulf of Mexico and South Atlantic; Trip Limit Reduction [Docket No.: 001005281-0369-02] (RIN: 0648-XC553) received March 27, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

1041. A letter from the Acting Deputy Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Pollock in Statistical Area 630 in the Gulf of Alaska [Docket No.: 120918468-3111-02] (RIN: 0648-XC550) received March 27, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

1042. A letter from the Acting Deputy Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Pacific Cod by Catcher Vessels Using Trawl Gear in the Bearing Sea and Aleutian Islands Management Area [Docket No.: 121018563-3148-02] (RIN: 0648-XC552) received March 27, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

1043. A letter from the Deputy Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Atlantic Highly Migratory Species; Atlantic Bluefin Tuna Fisheries; General Category Fishery [Docket No.: 120306154-2241-02] (RIN: 0648-XC506) received March 27, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

1044. A letter from the Acting Deputy Director, Office Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Fisheries of the Caribbean, Gulf of Mexico, and South Atlantic; Gulf of Mexico Reef Fish Fishery; 2013 Accountability Measure for Gulf of Mexico Commercial Gray Triggerfish [Docket No.: 120417412-2412-01] (RIN: 0648-XC510) received March 27, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

1045. A letter from the Acting Deputy Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Reallocation of Pollock in the Bering Sea and Aleutian Islands [Docket No.: 1112077037-2141-02] (RIN: 0648-XC543) received March 27, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

1046. A letter from the Program Manager, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the Department's final rule — National Practitioner Data Bank (RIN: 0906-AA87) received April 4, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1047. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Eurocopter France Helicopters [Docket No.: FAA-2012-0795; Directorate Identifier 2008-SW-53-AD; Amendment 39-17395; AD 2013-05-23] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received March 26, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1048. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Bombardier, Inc. Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2012-0641; Directorate Identifier 2011-NM-258-AD; Amendment 39-17378; AD 2013-05-06] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received March 26, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1049. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Airbus Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2012-1160; Directorate Identifier 2012-NM-096-AD; Amendment 39-17381; AD 2013-05-09] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received March 26, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1050. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Rolls-Royce Deutschland Ltd & Co KG Turbojet Engines [Docket No.: FAA-2012-1006; Directorate Identifier FAA-2012-NE-28-AD; Amendment 39-17392; AD 2013-05-20] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received March 26, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1051. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Rolls-Royce Deutschland Ltd & Co KG Turbofan Engines [Docket No.: FAA-2012-1100; Directorate Identifier 2012-NE-29-AD; Amendment 39-17385; AD 2013-05-13] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received March 26, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1052. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Eurocopter France Helicopters [Docket No.: FAA-2013-0240; Directorate Identifier 2011-SW-060-AD] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received March 26, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1053. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Activation of Ice Protection [Docket No.: FAA-2009-0675; Amendment No. 121-363] (RIN: 2120-AJ43) received March 26, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1054. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Type Certification Procedures for Changed Products [Docket No.: FAA-2001-8994; Amdt. No. 21-96] (RIN: 2120-AK19) received March 26, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1055. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Standard Instrument Approach Procedures, and Takeoff Minimums and Obstacle Departure Procedures; Miscellaneous Amendments [Docket No.: 30889; Amdt. No. 3524] received March 26, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1056. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Standard Instrument Approach Procedures, and Takeoff Minimums and Obstacle Departure Procedures; Miscellaneous Amendments

[Docket No.: 30890; Amdt. No. 3525] received March 26, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1057. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Rolls-Royce Deutschland Ltd & Co KG Turbofan Engines [Docket No.: FAA-2012-1031; Directorate Identifier 2012-NE-31-AD; Amendment 39-17391; AD 2013-05-19] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received March 26, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1058. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Rolls-Royce Deutschland Ltd & Co KG Turbofan Engines [Docket No.: FAA-2012-1167; Directorate Identifier 2012-NE-36-AD; Amendment 39-17396; AD 2013-06-01] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received March 26, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

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. SMITH of Texas: Committee on Science, Space, and Technology. H.R. 756. A bill to advance cybersecurity research, development, and technical standards, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. 113–33). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. SMITH of Texas: Committee on Science, Space, and Technology. 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; with an amendment (Rept. 113–34). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

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 Ms. WATERS (for herself, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. AL GREEN of Texas, and Mr. CUMMINGS):

H.R. 1483. A bill to amend the Federal Deposit Insurance Act to provide requirements for appropriate Federal banking agencies when using independent consultants in carrying out a consent order, to grant SIGTARP authority to provide oversight of such consultants, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. HUIZENGA of Michigan:

H.R. 1484. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to make publicly available on the official Medicare Internet site Medicare payment rates for frequently reimbursed hospital inpatient procedures, hospital outpatient procedures, and physicians' services; 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. LOBIONDO:

H.R. 1485. A bill to amend the National Flood Insurance Act of 1968 to modify the phase-in increases in flood insurance premium rates for certain properties, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. RAHALL:

H.R. 1486. A bill to prohibit the Secretary of the Treasury and the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency from devising or implementing a carbon tax; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. MCDERMOTT:

H.R. 1487. A bill to amend titles XVIII and XI of the Social Security Act to establish an exception from the physician self-referral prohibition and a safe harbor from Federal antikickback and other sanctions for incentive payments made by hospitals to physicians under certain incentive payment programs; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania (for himself, Mr. LOEBSACK, Mr. JONES, Mr. BISHOP of Utah, and Mr. BARLETTA):

H.R. 1488. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide that the waiting period for disability insurance benefits shall not be applicable in the case of a recovering service member; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York (for himself and Mr. GIBSON):

H.R. 1489. A bill to amend the National Dam Safety Program Act to identify and ensure the safety of dams in need of repair and rehabilitation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. MILLER of Florida:

H.R. 1490. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to prohibit the recording of a patient in a facility of the Department of Veterans Affairs without the informed consent of the patient; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Ms. BONAMICI (for herself, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, Mr. DEFAZIO, Mr. SCHRADER, Mr. SMITH of Washington, Mr. FARR, Mr. HONDA, Ms. SPEIER, Mr. THOMPSON of California, Ms. CHU, Mr. LARSEN of Washington, Mrs. CAPPS, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Ms. LEE of California, Mr. KILMER, Mr. HUFFMAN, Mr. HECK of Washington, and Ms. DELBENE):

H.R. 1491. A bill to authorize the Administrator of the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration to provide certain funds to eligible entities for activities undertaken to address the marine debris impacts of the March 2011 Tohoku earthquake and subsequent tsunami, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, and in addition to the Committee on Natural Resources, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. MCDERMOTT (for himself, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mrs. CAPPS, Mr. FARR, Ms. NORTON, Mr. JONES, Mr. RUSH, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Ms. SINEMA, Mr. ENYART, Mr. CICILLINE, Ms. BORDALLO, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Mr. VARGAS, Mr. GRIJALVA, Ms. LEE of California, and Mr. MCNERNEY):

H.R. 1492. A bill to establish the Commission on America and its Veterans; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, and in addition to the Committee on 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. COLLINS of Georgia (for himself, Mr. WESTMORELAND, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Mr. BISHOP of Utah, Mr. CRAMER, Mr. HOLDING, Mrs. ELLMERS, Mr. YOHO, Mr. STUTZMAN, Mr. SOUTHERLAND, Mr. PERRY, Mr. BACHUS, Mr. COBLE, Mr. GARDNER, Mr. GRAVES of Georgia, Mr. MEADOWS, Mr. GOWDY, Mr. GOHMERT, Mr. BENTIVOLIO, Mr. WENSTRUP, Mr. PRICE of Georgia, Mr. GINGREY of Georgia, Mr. BROUN of Georgia, Mr. DAINES, and Mr. KINGSTON):

H.R. 1493. A bill to impose certain limitations on consent decrees and settlement agreements by agencies that require the agencies to take regulatory action in accordance with the terms thereof, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GIBSON (for himself, Mr. CONNOLLY, Ms. NORTON, Mr. GRIFFIN of Arkansas, Mr. CICILLINE, Ms. KUSTER, Mr. STIVERS, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Ms. SHEA-PORTER, Mr. GRIMM, Mr. OWENS, Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York, Ms. MENG, Ms. BORDALLO, Mr. CASTRO of Texas, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, Mr. WALZ, Mr. POE of Texas, and Mr. COURTNEY):

H.R. 1494. A bill to direct the Secretary of Defense to review the operation of certain ships during the Vietnam Era, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services, and in addition to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. GOSAR (for himself, Mr. SALMON, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, and Mr. SCHWEIKERT):

H.R. 1495. A bill to prohibit the further extension or establishment of national monuments in Arizona except by express authorization of Congress; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. GRAVES of Georgia (for himself, Mr. SCHRADER, Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Mr. POE of Texas, Mr. WESTMORELAND, Mr. LAMALFA, Mr. CRAWFORD, Mr. LATTA, Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. SOUTHERLAND, Mr. STUTZMAN, Mr. YOHO, Mr. VALADAO, and Mr. BROUN of Georgia):

H.R. 1496. A bill to require the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency to withdraw the proposed order published in the January 19, 2011 Federal Register (76 FR 3422) pertaining to the pesticide sulfuryl fluoride; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. HUNTER (for himself, Mr. MILLER of Florida, Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina, Mr. MCCLINTOCK, Mr. JONES, Mr. LAMALFA, Mr. ROE of Tennessee, Mr. NUNNELEE, Mr. LATTA, Mr. CALVERT, Mr. CHABOT, Mr. COBLE, Mr. VARGAS, Mr. PETERS of California, Mr. ISSA, and Mr. KLINE):

H.R. 1497. A bill to amend title 36, United States Code, to ensure that memorials commemorating the service of the United States Armed Forces may contain religious symbols, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. JEFFRIES (for himself, Ms. MOORE, Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico, Mr. POCAN, and Mr. MCDERMOTT):

H.R. 1498. A bill to extend the interest rate for Federal Direct Stafford Loans; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. JEFFRIES (for himself, Mr. GRIMM, and Mr. CROWLEY):

H.R. 1499. A bill to ensure that homeowners who have mortgages insured by the FHA, or owned or guaranteed by Fannie Mae or Freddie Mac, and whose homes are located in major disaster areas are notified of any forbearance relief in connection with such disaster that is offered or recommended by the FHA, the Federal Housing Finance Agency, the Federal National Mortgage Association, or the Federal Home Loan Mortgage Corporation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. CARTWRIGHT (for himself, Ms. NORTON, Mr. RANGEL, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Ms. CLARKE, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mrs. NEGRETE MCLEOD, Ms. BROWN of Florida, Mr. ELLISON, Mr. O'ROURKE, Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. DELANEY, Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. VARGAS, Mr. FATTAH, Mr. CAPUANO, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Mr. NOLAN, Mr. VELA, Mr. MCINTYRE, Mr. HINOJOSA, and Mr. YOHO):

H.R. 1500. A bill to amend section 9A of the Richard B. Russell National School Lunch Act to require that local school wellness policies include a requirement that students receive 50 hours of school nutrition education per school year; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. JEFFRIES (for himself, Mr. CROWLEY, and Mr. ISRAEL):

H.R. 1501. A bill to direct the Secretary of the Interior to study the suitability and feasibility of designating the Prison Ship Martyrs' Monument in Fort Greene Park, in the New York City borough of Brooklyn, as a unit of the National Park System; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas (for himself, Mr. RENACCI, Mr. TIBERI, Mr. REICHERT, Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania, Mr. REED, Mr. GRIFFIN of Arkansas, Mrs. BLACK, Mr. SMITH of Nebraska, Mr. BOUSTANY, and Mr. SCHOCK):

H.R. 1502. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to prevent concurrent receipt of unemployment benefits and Social Security disability insurance, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KING of Iowa (for himself and Mr. HUELSKAMP):

H.R. 1503. A bill to repeal a certain rule relating to nutrition standards in the national school lunch and school breakfast programs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. LANGEVIN (for himself and Mr. CICILLINE):

H.R. 1504. A bill to amend the Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act to add Rhode Island to the Mid-Atlantic Fishery Management Council; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York (for herself, Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, Ms. BASS, Mr. RUPPERSBERGER, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. SARBANES, Mr. HOLT, Mr. PASCRELL, Ms. SCHWARTZ, Mr. CONNOLLY, Mr. DEUTCH, Ms. BROWN of Florida, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Mr. NADLER, Mr. MORAN, Mr. CICILLINE, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. KING of New York, Ms. FRANKEL of Florida, and Mr. WEBER of Texas):

H.R. 1505. A bill to ensure that the courts of the United States may provide an impartial forum for claims brought by United States citizens and others against any railroad organized as a separate legal entity, arising from the deportation of United States citizens and others to Nazi concentration camps on trains owned or operated by such railroad, and by the heirs and survivors of such persons, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary, and in addition to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. MARKEY (for himself, Mr. BISHOP of New York, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Ms. BONAMICI, Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, Ms. CHU, Mr. CLAY, Mr. CONYERS, Ms. EDWARDS, Mr. ELLISON, Ms. ESHOO, Mr. FARR, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Mr. HOLT, Mr. HONDA, Mr. HUFFMAN, Mr. KEATING, Ms. LEE of California, Mr. LEWIS, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. MORAN, Mr. NADLER, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Ms. NORTON, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. POCAN, Mr. POLIS, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Mr. RANGEL, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Ms. SPEIER, Mr. TIERNEY, Mr. WAXMAN, and Ms. WILSON of Florida):

H.R. 1506. A bill to reduce the number of nuclear-armed submarines operated by the Navy, to prohibit the development of a new long-range penetrating bomber aircraft, to reduce the number of intercontinental ballistic missiles operated by the Department of Defense, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. MARKEY (for himself, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. BURGESS, Mrs. CAPITO, Ms. SPEIER, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Ms. TSONGAS, Ms. NORTON, Mr. FATTAH, Ms. MOORE, Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York, Mr. RUNYAN, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. ROSKAM, Mr. GARAMENDI, Mr. TIERNEY, Mr. ISRAEL, and Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas):

H.R. 1507. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to increase diagnosis of Alzheimer's disease and related dementias, leading to better care and outcomes for Americans living with Alzheimer's disease and related dementias; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. MARKEY:

H.R. 1508. A bill to provide for the issuance of an Alzheimer's Disease Research Semipostal Stamp; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, 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. MORAN (for himself, Mr. CONNOLLY, Mr. WOLF, and Mr. MCKINLEY):

H.R. 1509. A bill to establish a 5-year demonstration program to provide skills to classroom teachers and staff who work with children with autism spectrum disorders; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. NEUGEBAUER (for himself, Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. GOODLATTE, and Mr. WILLIAMS):

H.R. 1510. A bill to improve and extend certain nutrition programs; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mrs. NOEM:

H.R. 1511. A bill to amend the Healthy Forests Restoration Act of 2003 to promote timely emergency rehabilitation and restoration of Federal forest land impacted by catastrophic events, to redirect for a 5-year-period funding normally made available for land acquisition to mechanical forest treatment and salvage operations due to catastrophic events, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture, and in addition to the Committee on Natural Resources, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. PEARCE:

H.R. 1512. A bill to prohibit the further extension or establishment of national monuments in New Mexico except by express authorization of Congress; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. PERRY (for himself, Mr. MARINO, Mr. BARLETTA, and Mr. GERLACH):

H.R. 1513. A bill to revise the boundaries of the Gettysburg National Military Park to include the Gettysburg Train Station and certain land along Plum Run in Cumberland Township, to limit the means by which property within such revised boundaries may be acquired, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. SARBANES:

H.R. 1514. A bill to amend the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 to authorize competitive grants to prepare and train school principals on effective core competencies and instructional leadership skills; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. SIRES (for himself and Mr. DIAZ-BALART):

H.R. 1515. A bill to amend the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 to codify the cooperative agreement, known as the Health Technologies program, under which the United States Agency for International Development supports the development of technologies for global health, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi (for himself, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee, Ms. BORDALLO, Ms. BROWN of Florida, Ms. CLARKE, Mr. PIERLUISI, Mr. MICHAUD, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Ms. HAHN, Mr. SABLAN, Mr. KINGSTON, and Mr. ELLISON):

H.R. 1516. A bill to amend title 14, United States Code, to modify the process for congressional nomination of individuals for appointment as cadets at the Coast Guard Academy, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. WALBERG:

H.R. 1517. A bill to amend titles II and XVIII of the Social Security Act to establish a Social Security Surplus Protection Account in the Federal Old-Age and Survivors Insurance Trust Fund to hold the Social Security surplus and a Medicare Surplus Protection Account in the Federal Hospital Insurance Trust Fund to hold the Medicare surplus, to provide for suspension of investment of amounts held in such Accounts until enactment of legislation providing for investment of the Trust Funds in investment vehicles other than obligations of the United States, and to establish a Social Security and Medicare Part A Investment Commission to make recommendations for alternative forms of investment of the Social Security and Medicare surpluses; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WHITFIELD (for himself, Mr. LOBIONDO, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. COHEN, Mr. PITTS, and Mr. MORAN):

H.R. 1518. A bill to amend the Horse Protection Act to designate additional unlawful acts under the Act, strengthen penalties for violations of the Act, improve Department of Agriculture enforcement of the Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mrs. CAPITO (for herself, Mr. RAHALL, and Mr. MCKINLEY):

H. Res. 151. A resolution recognizing the sesquicentennial of West Virginia statehood; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. MICHAUD (for himself and Mr. HARPER):

H. Res. 152. A resolution celebrating the anniversary of the enactment of Public Law 87-788, commonly known as the McIntire-Stennis Cooperative Forestry Act; to the Committee on Agriculture.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XII,

Mr. KING of New York introduced a bill (H.R. 1519) for the relief of Alemseghed Mussie Tesfamical; 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 Ms. WATERS:

H.R. 1483.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I Section 8 of the Constitution of the United States of America.

By Mr. HUIZENGA of Michigan:

H.R. 1484.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 3 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. LOBIONDO:

H.R. 1485.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution

By Mr. RAHALL:

H.R. 1486.

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. MCDERMOTT:

H.R. 1487.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The Congress enacts this bill pursuant to Article I Section 8 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania:

H.R. 1488.

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 1, which states ''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;''

And

Article I, Section 8, Clause 14 of the United States Constitution which gives Congress the power ''to make Rules for the Government and Regulation of the land and naval Forces;''

By Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York:

H.R. 1489.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, §8, clause 18

By Mr. MILLER of Florida:

H.R. 1490.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, section 8 of the Constitution of the United States.

By Ms. BONAMICI:

H.R. 1491.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8

By Mr. MCDERMOTT:

H.R. 1492.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8

By Mr. COLLINS of Georgia:

H.R. 1493.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 1 of the United States Constitution, Article I, Section 8 of the Unitcd States Constitution, including, but not limited to, Clauses 1, 3 and 18, and Article III of the United States Constitution, Section 2.

By Mr. GIBSON:

H.R. 1494.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

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 foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by the in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.

By Mr. GOSAR:

H.R. 1495.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The constitutional authority of Congress to enact this legislation is provided by Article IV, section 3, clause 2 (relating to the power of Congress to dispose of and make all needful rules and regulations respecting the territory or other property belonging to the United States).

By Mr. GRAVES of Georgia:

H.R. 1496.

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.

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. HUNTER:

H.R. 1497.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The Constitutional authority for the War Memorial Protection Act is found in Section 3, Clause 2 of Article IV, which states in part that ''the Congress shall have power to dispose of and make all needful Rules and Regulations respecting the Territory and other Property belonging to the United States.'' Constitutional authority is also found in Clause 18 of Article I, Section 8, which states that Congress has the authority 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. JEFFRIES:

H.R. 1498.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article 1, Section 8, Clause 18 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. JEFFRIES:

H.R. 1499.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article 1, Section 8, Clause 18 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. CARTWRIGHT:

H.R. 1500.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8 of the U.S. Constitution relating to the power of Congress to lay and collect taxes, duties, imposts and excises, to pay the debts and provide for the common defense and general welfare of the United States)

By Mr. JEFFRIES:

H.R. 1501.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article 1, Section 8, Clause 18 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas:

H.R. 1502.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clause 1 of section 8 of article I of the Constitution, to ''provide for the common defense and general welfare of the United States.''

By Mr. KING of Iowa:

H.R. 1503.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This legislation repeals a rule made by an Executive agency pursuant to an act of Congress. This bill is intended to correct the agency's errant interpretation of Congress' intent as expressed in the authorizing legislation, and, as such, follows the responsibility that Congress has, under Article 1, Section. 1, to exercise all legislative powers of the United States.

By Mr. LANGEVIN:

H.R. 1504.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, section 8, Clause 1 of the Constitution of the United States grants Congress the authority to enact this bill.

By Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York:

H.R. 1505.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3, which reads: ''To regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with Indian Tribes.''

By Mr. MARKEY:

H.R. 1506.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1 Section 8.

By Mr. MARKEY:

H.R. 1507.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1 Section 8.

By Mr. MARKEY:

H.R. 1508.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1 Section 8.

By Mr. MORAN:

H.R. 1509.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This legislation is authorized by Article 1, Section 8, Clause 1, which grants Congress authority regarding Defence [sic] and general Welfare of the United States.

By Mr. NEUGEBAUER:

H.R. 1510.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1

The Congress shall have Power to lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts and Excises, to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defence and general Welfare of the United States; but all Duties, Imposts and Excises shall be uniform throughout the United States.

By Mrs. NOEM:

H.R. 1511.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 4, Section 3: 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. PEARCE:

H.R. 1512.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 4, Section 3, Clause 2 of the Constitution of the United States grants Congress the power to enact this law.

By Mr. PERRY:

H.R. 1513.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article IV, Section 3, and Article I, Section 8, clause 18

By Mr. SARBANES:

H.R. 1514.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the U.S. Constitution under the General Welfare Clause.

By Mr. SIRES:

H.R. 1515.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Pursuant to clause 3(d)(1) of rule XIII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the Committee finds the authority for this legislation in article I, section 8 of the Constitution

By Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi:

H.R. 1516.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The U.S. Constitution including Article 1, Section 8.

By Mr. WALBERG:

H.R. 1517.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, 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 1, Section 8, Clause 3—To regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes;

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 14—To make Rules for the Government and Regulation of the land and naval Forces.

By Mr. WHITFIELD:

H.R. 1518.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3

The Congress shall have Power To regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes.

By Mr. KING of New York:

H.R. 1519.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 6

The Congress shall have Power . . . To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 3: Mr. ROHRABACHER.

H.R. 36: Mr. LATTA, Mr. RIBBLE, Mr. SCALISE, and Mr. BUCSHON.

H.R. 38: Mr. CHABOT, Mr. POSEY, Mr. ENGEL, and Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois.

H.R. 93: Mr. GARAMENDI.

H.R. 137: Mr. JEFFRIES, Mr. PERLMUTTER, and Mr. GARAMENDI.

H.R. 138: Mrs. DAVIS of California, Mr. JEFFRIES, and Mr. GARAMENDI.

H. R. 141: Mrs. DAVIS of California and Mr. GARAMENDI.

H.R. 146: Mr. OWENS.

H.R. 164: Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Ms. DELAURO, Mr. HORSFORD, and Mr. BEN RAY LUJÁN of New Mexico.

H.R. 184: Mr. FOSTER.

H.R. 185: Mr. OLSON.

H.R. 217: Mr. SENSENBRENNER.

H.R. 227: Mr. GARAMENDI.

H.R. 236: Mr. GARAMENDI.

H.R. 258: Mr. MURPHY of Florida and Ms. BONAMICI.

H.R. 268: Mr. HASTINGS of Florida.

H.R. 301: Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas.

H.R. 310: Mrs. LUMMIS.

H.R. 324: Mr. GARCIA, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, and Mr. SERRANO.

H.R. 332: Mr. GARAMENDI, Mr. TIERNEY, and Mrs. NAPOLITANO.

H.R. 357: Mr. HOLT, Mr. LATTA, Mr. BILIRAKIS, and Mr. AMODEI.

H.R. 358: Mr. ELLISON.

H.R. 359: Mr. MORAN.

H.R. 367: Mr. BRIDENSTINE and Mr. COBLE.

H.R. 404: Mr. GARAMENDI, Mr. COURTNEY, and Mrs. NAPOLITANO.

H.R. 410: Mr. BURGESS.

H.R. 421: Mr. HOLT.

H.R. 426: Mr. LYNCH.

H.R. 437: Mrs. DAVIS of California, Mr. JEFFRIES, Mr. ELLISON, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, and Ms. NORTON.

H.R. 455: Mr. BLUMENAUER, Ms. LEE of California, and Mr. RANGEL.

H.R. 460: Mr. GERLACH.

H.R. 474: Mr. BLUMENAUER.

H.R. 481: Mr. COOK, Mrs. NEGRETE MCLEOD, and Mr. O'ROURKE.

H.R. 486: Mr. GRIMM.

H.R. 519: Mr. PAYNE, Mr. DEFAZIO, Ms. CLARKE, and Mr. TIERNEY.

H.R. 543: Mrs. BEATTY, Mr. KIND, and Ms. SHEA-PORTER.

H.R. 556: Mr. BUCHANAN.

H.R. 575: Mr. BOUSTANY.

H. R. 627: Mr. GALLEGO, Mr. STOCKMAN, Ms. ESTY, Mr. KLINE, and Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California.

H.R. 630: Mr. PASCRELL, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Mr. PETERS of Michigan, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Ms. DELAURO, Mrs. LOWEY, and Mr. TIERNEY.

H.R. 633: Mr. GRIJALVA.

H.R. 647: Mr. GOODLATTE and Mr. WILSON of South Carolina.

H.R. 649: Mr. CARTWRIGHT, Mr. HOLT, Mr. CONYERS, and Ms. LEE of California.

H.R. 654: Mr. COURTNEY.

H.R. 671: Mr. MURPHY of Florida.

H.R. 675: Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas.

H.R. 690: Mr. FINCHER.

H.R. 695: Mr. GARY G. MILLER of California and Mrs. LUMMIS.

H.R. 730: Mr. JONES, Mr. BENTIVOLIO, Mr. STIVERS, Ms. CHU, Mr. WESTMORELAND, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. KINZINGER of Illinois, Mr. LONG, Mr. BENISHEK, and Mrs. HARTZLER.

H.R. 742: Mr. GIBSON.

H.R. 755: Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California.

H.R. 760: Mr. LOWENTHAL, Mr. MASSIE, and Mr. RADEL.

H.R. 763: Mr. TERRY, Mr. SCHWEIKERT, Mr. MILLER of Florida, Mr. HUIZENGA of Michigan, Mr. RIGELL, Mrs. ROBY, Mr. STUTZMAN, and Mr. RENACCI.

H.R. 783: Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas.

H.R. 792: Mr. TERRY, Mr. WITTMAN, and Mr. SCHRADER.

H.R. 795: Mrs. HARTZLER.

H.R. 798: Mr. MICHAUD.

H.R. 799: Mr. YOUNG of Alaska and Mr. RUNYAN.

H.R. 800: Mr. WITTMAN.

H.R. 808: Mr. HONDA.

H.R. 813: Mr. HOLT, Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico, and Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio.

H.R. 818: Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania.

H.R. 847: Mr. RUIZ and Mr. HUFFMAN.

H.R. 850: Ms. HERRERA BEUTLER, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Mr. HECK of Washington, Mr. PITTS, Mr. GARDNER, Mr. COLE, and Mr. GINGREY of Georgia.

H.R. 864: Mr. MEEKS, Mr. ENGEL, and Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas.

H.R. 888: Mr. GARDNER, Mr. KINZINGER of Illinois, Mr. LATHAM, and Mr. BROUN of Georgia.

H.R. 896: Mr. PERLMUTTER.

H.R. 924: Ms. PINGREE of Maine and Mr. KIND.

H.R. 940: Mr. PERRY.

H.R. 942: Mr. HASTINGS of Washington, Mr. HARPER, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, and Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California.

H.R. 948: Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin.

H.R. 959: Mr. BENISHEK, Mr. JONES, Mr. CASSIDY, Mr. LATTA, Mr. LONG, and Mr. BENTIVOLIO.

H.R. 960: Mrs. LOWEY.

H.R. 961: Mr. RANGEL, Mr. SARBANES, Ms. SCHWARTZ, and Mr. ANDREWS.

H.R. 962: Ms. CLARKE.

H.R. 988: Mr. PASCRELL and Mr. HOLT.

H.R. 1001: Mr. BACHUS and Mr. GARCIA.

H.R. 1008: Mr. SENSENBRENNER and Mr. TIERNEY.

H.R. 1015: Mrs. ELLMERS, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. JONES, and Ms. GRANGER.

H.R. 1020: Mrs. ELLMERS.

H.R. 1024: Mr. POE of Texas.

H.R. 1026: Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia.

H.R. 1038: Mr. SHERMAN and Mr. GIBBS.

H.R. 1039: Mr. BROUN of Georgia.

H.R. 1063: Mr. ROSS.

H.R. 1070: Mr. SCHNEIDER, Mr. MAFFEI, Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York, Ms. SPEIER, Mr. KENNEDY, Mrs. CAPPS, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Ms. NORTON, Ms. BONAMICI, and Mr. HASTINGS of Florida.

H.R. 1077: Mr. CRAWFORD and Mr. OWENS.

H.R. 1078: Mr. NUNNELEE.

H.R. 1091: Mr. KLINE, Mr. BENISHEK, and Mr. GIBBS.

H.R. 1093: Ms. MCCOLLUM, Ms. BROWN of Florida, Mr. VEASEY, Mr. JOYCE, Mr.

QUIGLEY, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. TIBERI, Ms. SPEIER, Mr. RUSH, Mr. ROYCE, Mr. TIERNEY, and Mr. KILMER.

H.R. 1094: Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN, Mr. RUIZ, Ms. ESTY, Mr. RUNYAN, and Mr. HUFFMAN.

H.R. 1128: Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio.

H.R. 1130: Mr. MILLER of Florida.

H.R. 1141: Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN.

H.R. 1143: Mr. COBLE and Mr. GRIFFITH of Virginia.

H.R. 1144: Mr. CRAMER.

H.R. 1146: Mr. WITTMAN.

H.R. 1148: Mr. GIBBS.

H.R. 1149: Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio.

H.R. 1151: Mr. LOWENTHAL, Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA, Mr. DESJARLAIS, and Mrs. ELLMERS.

H.R. 1154: Mr. COHEN.

H.R. 1164: Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin.

H.R. 1199: Mr. KEATING, Mrs. NEGRETE MCLEOD, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Mr. HONDA, Ms. EDWARDS, Mr. BEN RAY LUJÁN of New Mexico, Ms. BONAMICI, Mr. PAYNE, Ms. MOORE, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Mr. GIBSON, Mr. GRIMM, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. FARR, Mr. QUIGLEY, Mr. PERLMUTTER, and Mr. SCHNEIDER.

H.R. 1209: Mr. MARCHANT, Mr. MCCAUL, Mr. BURGESS, Mr. CULBERSON, Mr. POE of Texas, Mr. GOHMERT, Mr. BRADY of Texas, Ms. GRANGER, Mr. FARENTHOLD, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. DOGGETT, Mr. VEASEY, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Mr. HINOJOSA, Mr. CUELLAR, Mr. AL GREEN of Texas, Mr. BARROW of Georgia, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. COLLINS of Georgia, Mr. LONG, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. COOK, and Mr. GRIJALVA.

H.R. 1218: Mr. RADEL.

H.R. 1240: Mr. LOWENTHAL, Mr. KIND, and Mr. HASTINGS of Florida.

H.R. 1247: Mr. OWENS and Mr. RANGEL.

H.R. 1249: Mr. JONES, Mr. LUETKEMEYER, Mr. COLLINS of New York, Mr. KINGSTON, and Mr. GIBBS.

H.R. 1250: Mrs. CAPITO, Mr. PERLMUTTER, Mr. STOCKMAN, Ms. SPEIER, and Mr. JONES.

H.R. 1288: Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio and Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas.

H.R. 1304: Mr. BROUN of Georgia.

H.R. 1312: Mr. GOWDY.

H.R. 1313: Mr. LYNCH and Mr. SCHRADER.

H.R. 1317: Ms. MCCOLLUM and Mr. OLSON.

H.R. 1318: Mr. YARMUTH.

H.R. 1319: Ms. BROWNLEY of California.

H.R. 1322: Mr. CONYERS.

H.R. 1331: Mr. POE of Texas and Ms. JENKINS.

H.R. 1345: Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania.

H.R. 1351: Ms. TSONGAS and Mr. BERA of California.

H.R. 1354: Mr. SCHOCK, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. DELANEY, and Ms. NORTON.

H.R. 1395: Mr. VARGAS, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. SERRANO, Mr.RANGEL, and Mr. ELLISON.

H.R. 1406: Mr. BURGESS, Mr. KINGSTON, Mr. COLE, Mr. PAULSEN, Mr. MCHENRY, Mr. ROONEY, Mr. JORDAN, Mr. TERRY, Mr. SMITH of Texas, Mr. ADERHOLT, Mr. ISSA, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Mr. MCCLINTOCK, Mr. MARCHANT, Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania, Mr. LATTA, Mr. CONAWAY, Mr. HUDSON, Mr. GRIFFIN of Arkansas, Mr. TIBERI, Mr. POSEY, Mr. MILLER of Florida, Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky, Mr. BOUSTANY, Mr. ALEXANDER, Mr. GRAVES of Missouri, Mr. SESSIONS, Mrs. LUMMIS, Mrs. BACHMANN, Mr. MCCAUL, Mr. ROYCE, and Mr. BRIDENSTINE.

H.R. 1414: Mr. OWENS, Mr. NADLER, Mr. GARAMENDI, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, and Ms. MCCOLLUM.

H.R. 1417: Mr. CUELLAR, Mr. POE of Texas, Mr. KING of New York, and Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina.

H.R. 1418: Mr. PITTENGER and Ms. SINEMA.

H.R. 1424: Mr. HORSFORD, Mr. SWALWELL of California, Mr. NOLAN, Mr. MURPHY of Florida, and Mrs. KIRKPATRICK.

H.R. 1433: Mr. KIND, Mr. FOSTER, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. MATHESON, and Mr. SMITH of Washington.

H.R. 1441: Mr. COBLE.

H.R. 1448: Mr. PEARCE.

H.R. 1476: Mr. COBLE.

H.J. Res. 20: Mr. NEAL.

H.J. Res. 21: Mr. NEAL.

H. Con. Res. 4: Mr. PEARCE.

H. Con. Res. 23: Mr. HALL.

H. Con. Res. 24: Mr. KINGSTON, Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia, Mrs. HARTZLER, and Mr. BENISHEK.

H. Con. Res. 27: Mr. ELLISON, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, Mr. KIND, and Mr. MCINTYRE.

H. Con. Res. 28: Mr. SWALWELL of California, Mr. HUFFMAN, Mr. HONDA, Mr. O'ROURKE, and Mr. CARSON of Indiana.

H. Res. 36: Mr. WOMACK, Mr. GARDNER, Mr. SHUSTER, and Mrs. WALORSKI.

H. Res. 71: Mr. YOUNG of Alaska.

H. Res. 75: Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio.

H. Res. 90: Mr. QUIGLEY.

H. Res. 97: Mr. BENISHEK and Mr. FITZPATRICK.

H. Res. 106: Mr. LANKFORD, Mr. COLE, Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois, and Mr. KING of Iowa.

H. Res. 108: Ms. LEE of California.

H. Res. 119: Mr. LAMBORN, Mr. KINGSTON, Mr. BRIDENSTINE, and Mr. SALMON.

H. Res. 133: Mr. ROSS.

H. Res. 134: Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio.

H. Res. 148: Mr. HIMES and Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas.