United States of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 113th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 159 WASHINGTON, THURSDAY, APRIL 25, 2013 No. 58

House of Representatives

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

DESIGNATION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

WASHINGTON, DC,
April 25, 2013.

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

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

MORNING-HOUR DEBATE

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

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

CLIMATE CHANGE IS HERE

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

Mr. QUIGLEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today because last week my district experienced its second ''storm of the century'' in the last 3 years, its third since 2008. More than 7 inches of rain turned the streets of Hinsdale, Elmhurst, Franklin Park, and Albany Park into rivers.

Clearly, we need to revisit our definition of the 100-year storm; because, while some may doubt the reality of climate change, it is a fact that stronger, more destructive storms are pounding our region with distressing regularity and resulting in huge costs. While some don't believe in climate change, I hope they believe in funding flood control. We owe it to our constituents.

I spent most of this past weekend touring the flooded streets and basements throughout my district. Everywhere I went, I encountered residents who had lost their homes, their belongings, and their peace of mind. The residents I talked to wanted to know two things: What was their government going to do to help, and why was this happening again so soon after the horrific flooding of 2010?

I told people that my office would do everything it could to bring Federal disaster relief to their homes and businesses; but, unfortunately, Federal help for big States can be an uphill fight. Aid is based, in part, on a population-based formula that penalizes larger States like Illinois. Big States have to suffer more damage before meeting the aid threshold.

This process of rewarding aid is unfair, and we need to change it. I raised this concern last summer with my colleagues on the Transportation and Infrastructure Committee. I was pleased to see language in Superstorm Sandy legislation requiring FEMA to review its processes in rewarding disaster aid. But reviews and bill language are of little immediate consolation to people who have lost their homes or businesses. With 44 counties declared a disaster area after last week's flood, we don't need another study. The people of my district and others across the State need our help.

FEMA needs to act—and act without delay—to get Illinois back on its feet. Every town in my district has projects that will help lessen the impact of the next storm. Storm sewer improvements, berms, swales, planting more wetlands, permeable pavers, detention ponds, and the Deep Tunnel Project can lessen or even prevent disaster.

We need to find the funds for these local projects that will avert the next flood and ultimately save millions in tax dollars in damages. For the Chicago area, that means demanding the $35 million per year in Federal funding that is needed to complete the McCook and Thornton reservoirs. These reservoirs are part of a larger flood mitigation plan put in place over 20 years ago by the Army Corps of Engineers. The Federal Government is now holding up their completion because of budget issues.

Local budgets are just a start, though. We also need to address the question of why 100-year storms are recurring so often. Climate change is here, and we must address it now. With a sensible energy policy, development of alternative energy sources, and commonsense conservation, we can begin to confront one of the great challenges of our time. If we don't, then the storms of last week in the Midwest and last fall on the east coast will be the new normal, and that's a normal none of us can afford.

ARMY RESERVE BIRTHDAY

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

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to honor the United States Army Reserve, which celebrates 105 years of service defending our country this week.

These citizen-soldiers are actively engaged citizens in our communities and volunteers in the Army who are ready to step in and fulfill any mission. They are our friends, our family, our neighbors, coaches and teachers, police and firefighters. Reservists are in nearly every profession across every community in the Nation.

Printed on recycled paper.

Our Nation has now been at war for a decade, yet a smaller percentage of our citizens have been in the Armed Forces. The Army Reserve offers a reminder that our Nation rests on the strength of brave soldiers who volunteer to step forward and make tremendous sacrifices.

Today, I wish a special 105th birthday to all the men and women serving in the United States Army Reserve and welcome some of them to Capitol Hill to participate in Army Day, to remind us all of the sacrifices that they make every day to defend this country.

To the men and women of the United States Army Reserve, I salute you. Thank you.

END HUNGER NOW—CHILDHOOD HUNGER IN AMERICA

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

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to talk about the national shame of child hunger in America. I wish it didn't exist, but we can't ignore the fact that there are more than 16 million kids in America who are food insecure. Quite simply, that means more than 16 million children went hungry in 2011. That's unconscionable and that is unacceptable.

Hunger has no place in the richest, most prosperous nation on Earth. Letting anyone in this country go without food is bad enough, but letting children go hungry is more than heartbreaking; it's just plain wrong. Yet we let it happen every day in America—16 million children, Mr. Speaker. That means one in five kids in America go to bed hungry and wake up hungry at some point in their lives during the year. That means one in five kids don't know when their next meal is coming.

We are allowing more than 16 million kids to wake up hungry, go to school hungry, and go to sleep hungry. We are allowing more than 16 million kids to be deprived of proper nutrition, the nutrition contained in good, healthy food that helps children's minds and bodies properly develop. We are allowing more than 16 million kids to struggle at school and have problems with learning simply because they suffer from hunger.

Child hunger has many impacts. Kids who don't eat enough good, healthy food will not develop properly. They have more health problems and require more costly health care than children who don't have to worry about hunger. Sometimes the lack of food results in developmental problems and learning disabilities. Other times, hunger simply doesn't allow kids to concentrate. These problems can lead to under-education, which can have long-term effects, including a lifetime of low-paying jobs and even unemployment.

America has several antihunger safety net programs to deal with hunger. Some of these programs are specifically designed for children. SNAP, formerly known as food stamps, is the biggest antihunger program in the Federal Government. It does a good job, but there are still many ways that it can be improved.

Over many years, we have also created the National School Breakfast Program and the National School Lunch Program; and in order to meet increased demand, we now have after school snack and meal programs. But these programs are inadequate in many ways. The breakfast and lunch programs provide either a free or a reduced price meal. The free meal is available to those kids whose families are quite poor; but the reduced price meals are available to kids of families who are poor, but not poor enough to qualify for the free plan. This means there are days, and even weeks, when a child's family simply may not have enough money to pay for the reduced price meal. That's a serious problem.

Another problem is that breakfasts are typically served before school starts, meaning that poor kids have to get themselves to school early just to get a good meal. This can create a stigma where these kids get teased and bullied because they're poor, but it can also result in a pattern where these children don't have regular access to a school breakfast if their parents can't get them to school on time or if the school buses don't deliver them early enough to be able to benefit from this breakfast. Organizations like the EOS Foundation in Massachusetts and States like West Virginia are working to fix this by promoting Breakfast at the Bell programs, a solution I strongly support.

And then there are weekends, where schools aren't open. Food banks, churches, synagogues, mosques, and other antihunger organizations are filling that gap with food backpacks that are given out on Friday afternoons.

□ 1010

Mr. Speaker, as a candidate, then-Senator Obama pledged to end childhood hunger by 2015. It was a good idea then, and it's a good idea now. We worked hard, and many of us pushed for a comprehensive childhood hunger plan. We even wore those buttons to show our support.

Mr. Speaker, 2015 is only 2 years away. There is no way we are going to meet that goal, but it doesn't mean we should give up. Now is the time to redouble our efforts. Now is the time to make the pledge to end hunger now. And that's not just a clever tag line. No, Mr. Speaker, we can end hunger now if we start with the commitment to develop a comprehensive plan to do so.

That's why I continue to call for Presidential leadership on this serious matter. We need a White House Conference on Food and Nutrition to develop a comprehensive plan that will address all aspects of hunger in America, especially child hunger. We need this conference to bring all the stakeholders, like the Eos Foundation, the Governor, and other political leaders from West Virginia and other States and other organizations that are not typically in the antihunger movement. We need faith-based leaders, CEOs, leaders of food banks, pediatricians, schools, and nutritionists together in one room to develop a comprehensive plan, take assignments and make it work. If we do this, we can end hunger now.

Mr. Speaker, hunger is a political condition. We have everything we need to end it. We lack the political will.

I urge my colleagues to make this issue a priority. End hunger now.

CENSUS BUREAU ECONOMIC QUESTIONNAIRE

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

Mr. POSEY. Mr. Speaker, generally, we believe that what's good for the goose is good for the gander. That's why I was a little bit shocked when it was brought to my attention by a number of my colleagues that they received an economic census in the mail—a very complex, 14-page document asking them in very great detail about their business, about their suppliers, about their cost, about who they sell to, and who their customers are. These were received by mom-and-pop businesses, sometimes just mom businesses, no pop—one-person businesses. One said:

> It will take me two days to fill out this questionnaire. I have to work. If I don't work 2 days, my business will go down the drain.

I wondered how important this information was, so I wrote a letter to the Department of Commerce and the Census Bureau to ask just a few questions about it. I asked about their constitutional authority to do that, and they gave me their statutory authority. I'll talk about their letter in a minute. Then, while they didn't have time to answer my letter on a timely basis, they did have time to send another relatively harassing letter to the businesses threatening them with more penalties—a fine—and just scared the daylights out of them if they did not take time to return that form.

I finally got my response from them, and what I found was that they didn't answer all my questions. I asked them:

> Please provide me with the information describing the universe the economic census questionnaires were mailed to and how they were selected.

No answer.

One constituent who received a questionnaire was a sole proprietor with no other employees; another was a sole proprietor with two employees.

> Please provide me a summary, if you have one, as to how many of the businesses to which economic censuses were mailed were sole proprietors or small businesses or corporations? How many would you consider to be large corporations? Were there any Fortune 500 companies?

They didn't tell me.

Please tell me how many Federal employees from your agencies were involved in the development and execution of the economic census. Do you not need to count Postal Service time while delivering or returning the forms?

No answer.

Please provide me with the names of any Federal employees associated with the development of the economic census that have ever owned or operated any business whatsoever in the private sector.

They did not answer.

Please provide me with the identity of any Federal agency which has ever provided the kind of detailed financial information and operating information to citizens that you've requested from the people you are supposed to serve.

No answer.

The cost of completing the questionnaire will be costly for small business. How much do you anticipate the cost of labor will be to a business to comply with your request to complete the questionnaire?

No answer.

Please advise how the information gleaned from these questionnaires will be used.

They gave me some generalizations.

Please explain the benefit you anticipate the public will gain from the questionnaire.

Well, sort of. They said it would help them look at statistics.

Please provide me with a one-page summary of major activities performed by your agencies. Please cite the number of times you perform each activity and the cost of performing each activity on a unit cost basis. The aggregate cost of all performing activity should be equal to the exact amount of money that was passed through your agencies during a 1-year period.

Of course, they did not answer that.

They have no problem demanding that information from the private sector, but the government sector is completely unwilling to go through the least little amount of trouble to provide Congress with that same information.

We are often thought to believe that what's good for the goose is good for the gander, and so I will persist on trying to get answers to those questions for the constituents in my district, and hopefully for those in your districts that have also been interested.

AWARDING CONGRESSIONAL GOLD MEDAL TO PUERTO RICO'S 65TH INFANTRY REGIMENT

Mr. POSEY. Mr. Speaker, I would also like to say I am pleased to be here today and joined by Resident Commissioner PIERLUISI in support of a bill awarding the Congressional Gold Medal to Puerto Rico's 65th Infantry Regiment, also known as the Borinqueneers.

When the Korean war erupted in 1950, the soldiers of the regiment served in a segregated unit, despite President Truman's order desegregating the military 2 years earlier.

Army commanders doubted the effectiveness of these Puerto Rican troops, calling them ''rum and Coca-Cola soldiers.'' They were required to use separate showering facilities and ordered under penalty of court-martial not to speak Spanish. They were even told to shave their mustaches until ''they gave proof of their manhood.''

Despite this adversity, the Regiment embraced their Hispanic heritage, calling themselves "Borinqueneers" after the Taino word for Puerto Rico.

The Regiment served with distinction during the Battle of Chosin Reservoir in December 1950. Fighting alongside the 1st Marine Division, they covered one of the greatest strategic withdrawals in military history. Fighting in temperatures as low as Negative 37 degrees, the Borinqueneers were among the last defenders of Hungham harbor, and suffered tremendous casualties during the evacuation.

The Regiment later participated in numerous battles, conducting the last recorded battalion-size bayonet charge in Army history. Though they struggled with a grave shortage of trained non-commissioned officers and personnel policies that pushed it to the breaking point, they overcame these challenges, fighting valiantly, and earning the respect and admiration of their commanders.

The Borinqueneers are part of a proud tradition of service in the face of adversity that includes the Tuskegee Airmen, Montford Point Marines, Navajo Code Talkers and the Japanese-American 442nd Regimental Combat Team—all of whom have already received the Congressional Gold Medal.

I therefore rise in support of the Borinqueneers—the Forgotten soldiers of a Forgotten war—and urge all of my colleagues to join us by cosponsoring this legislation to ensure that the Borinqueneers receive their long overdue recognition.

SEQUESTER

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

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, sequester starts with ''S.'' That stands for ''stupid.'' It is an irrational policy with no common sense attached to it, and it is a policy that we are headlong pursuing as a result of the actions of the majority in this House. It is a policy that the President of the United States opposes, it is a policy that the majority in the United States Senate opposes, and it is a policy that all of the Members of the Democratic Party in this House oppose.

My friend on the floor here shakes his head, but he voted for a bill. It was called Cut, Cap, and Balance. And Cut, Cap, and Balance said we have a target, but if we don't meet it what happens? Sequester happens—sequester happens.

The Republicans passed that through this House long before any deal was made not to default on our national debt, which included a provision for sequester so that we would achieve Speaker BOEHNER's objective articulated March of 2011 on Wall Street that we would cut dollar for dollar the increase in the debt. That's why we have a sequester. It starts with ''S.'' It is a stupid policy. It is a negative policy. It is a policy that is hurting America.

CHRIS VAN HOLLEN, the ranking Democrat of the Budget Committee, offered an amendment four times to replace the sequester and achieve the same savings. It was rejected, not once, not twice, not three times, but all four times by the Republican majority. They wouldn't even allow it to be made in order to be put on this floor to have a debate on and a vote. This transparent new leadership that we were supposed to have wouldn't even allow a vote on this issue.

□ 1020

Now the Senate has passed a budget which the Republicans have been crying wolf about forever. The Senate passed a budget. It replaces sequester. It achieves the savings that we need to achieve over time. The Ryan budget was passed, which is tantamount to sequester. So now we're asking to go to conference, but we haven't gone to conference.

This week has been a lost week. You've heard about a lost weekend. This week, this House has done practically nothing. Now we're going to take 2 days, today and tomorrow, to consider a bill about helium that could be passed in 10 minutes, which is noncontroversial and passed out of committee by a voice vote.

Will we deal with sequester, which is causing America such grief right now? We will not.

It is a shameful performance by the Congress of the United States. It is an irresponsible performance by the majority leadership of this House that we will not have the opportunity to replace this irrational, stupid, noncommonsense policy we call ''sequester.''

Some Republicans say, well, this is the President's policy. That's baloney. It's not true. It's a fraud. The President is against this policy. The Senate Democrats are against this policy, and House Democrats are against this policy. If I were the majority leader, as I once was, this policy would not have gone into effect, and I want the American people, Mr. Speaker, to know that.

There were some who pretended, oh, it will have no effect. Well, it's having an effect on the flying public right now; and on the Food and Drug Administration, in overseeing food safety, it's going to have an effect. There are 70,000 children who qualify for Head Start who are not going to have a seat in Head Start.

Ladies and gentlemen of this House, we ought to be doing some real work this week, not putting bills on the floor and then taking them off the floor because, very frankly, the majority party can't get its act together. We're now having a helium bill on the floor for 2 days. We're not even going to vote on the helium bill today—we're going to vote on the rule—and at about 2:30 today, we're going to adjourn.

My, my, my. What a hard workday.

We're not dealing with the budget. We're not dealing with the budget conference. We're not dealing with getting this country on a fiscally sustainable path. We're not dealing with getting

rid of the sequester. We're dealing with a noncontroversial helium bill that could pass in 10 minutes in this House.

America, Mr. Speaker, is angry, and I don't blame them. I'm angry, too. America is disgusted with us. I don't blame them. I'm disgusted with us as well. I don't blame Mr. and Mrs. America for saying that Congress is not doing its work. They're right. We're not. We were sent here to serve the American people and our country and make it stronger, and we're not doing that. We're failing to come together and reach compromise and consensus for positive action in our country.

How sad, Mr. Speaker. How sad for our country. How sad for our people. How sad for our families. There are good people on both sides of this aisle, but we're not coming together to do our duty for America. How sad.

ELIZABETH SMART

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

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, several years ago in Salt Lake City, Utah, there was a happy family—a mom and a dad, six kids—happy as they could be. On the typical summer day of June 5, 2002, the kids and the family had their prayers. Two of the girls went up to their room. The older girl read to the younger girl. They went to sleep.

And then the nightmare began.

In the middle of the night, the older girl, who was a 14-year-old child, was awakened. The man who woke her up had a knife to her throat. The younger girl woke up, too, but was in fear and shock and terror and could not physically even move. So the kidnapper took the 14-year-old girl, climbed out the window with her, and at knifepoint, they left in the middle of the night. Finally, the younger girl was able to get some type of composure and tell her parents what had happened.

The police get involved, and they start looking for Elizabeth Smart, but they didn't find her that night, and they didn't find her the next day because Elizabeth Smart had been kidnapped by an individual who took her to a secluded place. The first thing he wanted to do, of course, was to abuse her—and he did. He sexually assaulted her, and he sexually assaulted her, and he sexually assaulted her. He tied her between two trees, Mr. Speaker, and sexually assaulted her. He did everything he wanted to do to her for 9 months.

That 14-year-old girl was gone, kidnapped—parents scared to death and worried about one of their six children. The police were looking, but they never found her, not for 9 months.

This evil person who kidnapped Elizabeth arranged a fake marriage to try to marry her even though he was married to another individual lawfully. So the wife, the abuser, and Elizabeth Smart stayed in hiding in the Salt Lake City area. The abuser occasionally would leave and take Elizabeth Smart with him, but he would tell her, ''If you ever scream and tell anybody, I will kill your family.''

She believed that. A 14-year-old girl obviously would believe that, so she never cried out because she didn't want anything bad to happen to her wonderful family. Meanwhile, Mom and Dad and the brothers and the sisters every day hoped—but no results in finding her.

When she would go out with the evildoer, forcibly, he would even put a wig over her head and a veil. He would disguise her so that, if people in the Salt Lake City area knew Elizabeth Smart, they wouldn't recognize her.

Finally, after 9 months, Elizabeth Smart was with the evildoer who sexually assaulted her—and with his wife—and a police car stopped. The police officer started questioning Elizabeth Smart. She didn't say anything because she remembered that the evildoer said he would kill her family. Unbeknownst to Elizabeth, her sister had given the police a sketch of the person who had kidnapped her. The police took Elizabeth Smart to the police station, and after a few minutes, in comes her father.

She was rescued after 9 months—The criminals went to prison.

Elizabeth Smart is now 27 years of age, and she has used this awful tragedy of being kidnapped and sexually assaulted as a child in order to help other sexual assault victims in this country. She started the Elizabeth Smart Foundation. A couple of weeks ago, she was in Houston. She spoke very forcefully to a group of women—several hundred—about being abused.

So, this Victims' Rights Week, Mr. Speaker, I want to honor Elizabeth Smart and all of those other sexual assault victims—especially children—who have been assaulted by evil people in this country, and let us remember to support them totally in their recovery.

And that's just the way it is.

□ 1030

AWARDING THE CONGRESSIONAL GOLD MEDAL TO THE 65TH INFANTRY REGIMENT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Puerto Rico (Mr. PIERLUISI) for 5 minutes.

Mr. PIERLUISI. Mr. Speaker, today Congressman BILL POSEY of Florida and I will introduce bipartisan legislation to award a Congressional Gold Medal to the 65th Infantry Regiment, a famed U.S. Army unit know as the Borinqueneers composed almost entirely of soldiers from the U.S. territory of Puerto Rico that overcame discrimination and earned praise and respect for its comeback performance in the Korean war.

The Congressional Gold Medal is considered the most distinguished form of recognition that Congress, acting on behalf of a grateful Nation, can bestow upon an individual or group in recognition of outstanding and enduring achievement. As our legislation states:

> The highly decorated 65th Infantry Regiment is deserving of this award because of its ''pioneering military service, devotion to duty and many acts of valor in the face of diversity.''

Between 1950 and 1953, the regiment participated in some of the fiercest battles of the Korean war; and its toughness, courage, and loyalty earned the admiration of those who had previously harbored reservations about Puerto Rican soldiers based on stereotypes.

One individual whose misconceptions were shattered was William Harris, who served as the regiment's commander during the early stages of the law. Harris recounts that he was reluctant to take command of the unit because, like many U.S. military leaders, he assumed that Puerto Rican soldiers were not as capable as other troops. Following the war, Harris recalled that his skeptical attitude did not survive first contact with the enemy and that, in fact, his experience ultimately led him to regard the men of the 65th as the best soldiers he had ever seen.

Another individual who came to hold the 65th in high esteem was General Douglas MacArthur. In March 1951, after months of heavy engagements with the enemy in which the 65th played a critical role, General MacArthur wrote the following:

> The Puerto Ricans forming the ranks on the gallant 65th Infantry on the battlefields of Korea by valor, determination and a resolute will to victory give daily testament to their invincible loyalty to the United States. They are writing a brilliant record of achievement in battle, and I'm proud, indeed, to have them in this command. I wish that we might have many more like them.

By the time fighting came to a close in Korea in July 1953, soldiers in the 65th had earned 10 Distinguished Service Crosses, about 250 Silver Stars, over 600 Bronze Stars, and nearly 3,000 Purple Hearts. As a collective, the regiment won numerous awards, including two Presidential Unit Citations, the Nation's highest unit-level recognition for extraordinary heroism. The unit's disproportionately high casualty rate underscored the fact that it had been serving on the front lines, face to face with the enemy at the very tip of the spear.

In a 2010 obituary that appeared in The New York Times for 87-year-old Modesto Cartagena, one of the most decorated soldiers from the regiment, it was observed that in Korea:

> Puerto Rican soldiers surmounted not only the Communist enemy, but also prejudicial attitudes.

This same point was made with particular eloquence in 2000 by Secretary Louis Caldera during a ceremony honoring the regiment when he said that the soldiers of the 65th were fighting to protect the people of South Korea, even as they struggled against the injustice

in the ranks of the military that they loved and served so well.

Mr. Speaker, in the face of unique challenges, the men of the 65th regiment served our Nation with great skill and tremendous grace. Their contributions to our country have been recognized in many forms. Streets and parks bear their name. Monuments and plaques memorialize their accomplishments. And cities and States have approved resolutions in their honor. I believe it is time that Congress pay tribute to the 65th, and so I ask my colleagues to join me in the effort to award the regiment with the Congressional Gold Medal.

END FORCED UNION DUES IN AMERICA

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

Mr. KING of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I'm here today to ask my colleagues to join me in supporting an end to forced union dues in America. I'm talking about the National Right to Work Act, which I recently reintroduced here in the 113th Congress as H.R. 946.

Every American should have the power to negotiate with their employer about the terms of their employment, but no American should be forced to pay union dues just to get or keep a job. However, when Congress enacted the National Labor Relations Act in 1935, it established monopoly bargaining, and that monopoly bargaining conscripts workers who want nothing to do with the union into paying union dues. That doesn't sound like the America that I know.

In 1947, Congress admitted this provision violated the rights of workers; but because the votes weren't there to fully repeal this provision, they opted instead to allow the States to opt out of the NLRA's monopoly bargaining statute. That was a provision that the States, though, had to pass laws to exempt themselves.

To date, 24 States have enacted these right-to-work laws; and because of that, they have been able to mitigate the negative effects of our misguided Federal labor law on their citizens and their economy. Iowa is one of those States.

But the fact remains that Congress created this problem in the first place by making forced unionization the default position for all States. Since Congress created this problem, it is Congress' responsibility to correct it. The National Right to Work Act does so without adding a single new word to the Federal Code by simply erasing the forced-dues clauses in the Federal statute.

While the votes weren't there to repeal this provision in 1947, they should be there today because we now have decades of data to compare forced-dues States and workplace-freedom States. The results of this nationwide experiment suggest that the National Right to Work Act would create a huge boost in our economy; and, therefore, I urge Congress to take up the National Right to Work Act.

IN HONOR OF MITCHELL DEE JONES

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

Mr. MATHESON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the life of an inspirational young man from my district. Mitchell Dee Jones from Herriman, Utah, passed away on March 2 of this year after a lifelong battle with Duchenne muscular dystrophy.

Mitch was a beloved son, brother, friend, and Latter-day Saint. He lived life to the fullest and loved others selflessly. In the very best ways, Mitch was a typical 10-year-old boy playing board games, building with Legos, four-wheeling, camping, and enjoying the outdoors in Utah with his family. His sense of humor, of adventure, and of devotion to his family touched thousands. Both in his life and in his passing, Mitch's dignity and gentleness, strength of spirit, and quiet resolve reveal his exceptional character.

I hope you will join me today in honoring the life of this very special young man who brought others together, who touched lives in a profound way, and who inspired us all.

Mitch's parents, Chris and Natalie Jones, have humbly shared their family's journey with our community in Utah and with countless others around the world. They opened their lives and Mitch's story so they might serve others, bringing an important awareness and a better understanding of their son's condition and that of others with Duchenne muscular dystrophy.

I urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to learn more about Mitch's story and about Duchenne muscular dystrophy by following his father's Facebook journal called ''Mitchell's Journey.''

This coming Monday, on April 29, the city of Herriman, Utah, will honor Mitch's life with the recognition of Mitchell Jones Day. Here in our Nation's Capital, we can join together to do the same by familiarizing ourselves with the disease that ultimately took Mitch's life.

Duchenne muscular dystrophy is a genetic muscular disorder that most often affects young boys and is characterized by a progressive muscle weakness and degeneration. It is typically diagnosed early in life and is usually fatal in the late teens or early twenties. For some, like Mitch, the disease progresses quickly and affects the voluntary muscles of limbs and torso and eventually the involuntary muscle function of the heart and lungs.

As legislators, it is stories like Mitch's that should remind us of the magnitude of our decisions about time and resources. The course we chart for our country is real for families like the Joneses in every congressional district. I believe as a country we have endless potential to improve outcomes of Duchenne muscular dystrophy and so many other diseases that our children face; and I think this should be a bipartisan effort.

As we work in service of our constituents, I hope we will all reflect on the Joneses in Herriman, Utah, and the priorities of real American families. These are citizens who inspire us to work harder, to do better, to solve problems, and to make a difference.

Mitch's legacy is one of love and compassion of an inspiring young man who faced every challenge with bravery and faith. Here in Congress we should strive to live and serve in the same way.

□ 1040

STRENGTHENING OUR STRATEGIC ALLIANCES

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

Mr. TURNER. Mr. Speaker, the American public always decries the partisan tone that happens here on this House floor, and I'm always amazed when people come down to the House floor and rail on Republicans and Democrats and try to place blame. I'm always particularly amazed when someone comes to the House floor and blames the Republicans for a bill that they voted for. I voted against sequestration, and I certainly agree with Mr. HOYER's current statements of how bad sequestration is. It just would have been nice if the consistency was there in the actual voting record besides just the attempt to blame Republicans.

This clearly was a project that was proposed by the President. I opposed it because I knew it was going to wreak havoc on our national security. And I wish those who now see its folly actually had voted against it when it was on the House floor.

But, Mr. Speaker, I'm here today to talk about energy security. It continues to play an important role in global relationships and dialogue. In my role as chairman of the U.S. delegation to the NATO Parliamentary Assembly, many foreign leaders and officials have expressed to me the need to diversify energy resources away from one source or from unstable regions.

As we all know, the United States is currently experiencing a surplus of natural gas production, helping to keep the price low compared with global rates. This is creating opportunities to boost job growth right here at home and for U.S. natural gas to compete in the global marketplace.

In fact, a recent Department of Energy commissioned report found that increasing exports of natural gas would have positive economic benefits for our country. In my home State of Ohio, exploration and development in the Utica Shale would have a $5 billion economic

impact and create or support nearly 66,000 jobs in Ohio by 2014.

Increasing natural gas exports would not only help reduce our trade deficit and create job opportunities for American workers but would also help key allies diversify their energy sources, bolster their energy and national security, and strengthen our strategic alliances. Many of our allies are heavily reliant on natural gas from either one country or from unstable regions and are paying significantly higher prices.

Several of the largest natural gas importers are also NATO members with strong national security ties to the United States. In recent years, several European countries have experienced natural gas supply disruptions from Russia, the largest supplier of natural gas to Europe. Turkey relies on 20 percent of its natural gas from Iran.

Earlier this year, Islamist militants attacked a natural gas facility in Algeria, which is the third-largest exporter of natural gas to Europe.

Japan, a strategic ally in Asia and already the world's largest importer of natural gas, may need to seek greater imports of natural gas as a result of the 2011 nuclear plant disaster. Japan already relies on 42 percent of its natural gas from Russia, the Middle East, and North Africa.

The surplus of U.S. natural gas production is already having an impact on global natural gas markets. Natural gas previously destined for the United States, but no longer needed as a result of our domestic increased production, has been diverted to other markets. For example, in 2012, nearly half of the natural gas supplied to Europe was purchased under spot contracts. Helping our allies diversify their energy resources is important to strengthening our partnerships and bolstering security.

Under section 3 of the Natural Gas Act, companies seeking to export natural gas must receive permits from the Department of Energy, which determines if such exports are in the public interest. Export permits to U.S.-free trade countries are automatically approved. Non-free trade countries must go through a process.

In general, when it comes to exporting U.S. goods, we often talk about barriers in other countries for U.S. producers that they must overcome to sell their products, but in this instance we have a domestic barrier that prevents us from exporting our natural gas to consumers willing and eager to buy.

There are currently 20 applications before the Department of Energy from companies seeking approval to export natural gas. As the DOE evaluates these applications, I hope it takes into consideration the domestic economic benefits.

I have authored bipartisan and bicameral legislation, H.R. 580, the Expedited LNG for American Allies Act, which would make approval of export licenses to NATO countries and Japan automatic. This bill creates a process that allows the addition of other foreign countries to this list if the Secretary of State deems, in consultation with the Secretary of Defense, that it would be in our national interest.

Exporting U.S. natural gas presents opportunities to create American jobs while helping to bolster our strategic alliances. I urge all of my colleagues to support this important bill that would have great economic impacts for the United States.

HONORING GOSPEL MUSIC PIONEERS

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

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, later on today, the President will join my fellow Texans in West, Texas, to mourn the loss of so many who died in a tragic plant explosion last week. Many of them were first responders. And many who will come to mourn and celebrate life and the life of West, Texas, are those who have been harmed and injured. I will join them in spirit, as I know my colleagues here today will.

That's why as I rise today to commemorate and salute two gospel music titans, it becomes even more appropriate to salute my friend, James ''Jazzy'' Jordan and Mr. Don Jackson, for they understand the value and message of gospel music.

Gospel music holds a special place in the American experience. Gospel music was a release from suffering and hardship, but it was also a form of praise and protest. I would like to thank Jazzy Jordan for understanding that as we introduced in 2008 the Gospel Music Heritage legislation that establishes September in the United States of America as Gospel Music Heritage Month.

We hope as we have faced these tragedies over the last couple of weeks that Americans, no matter what their religious background or nonreligious background, will find relief in this joyful and comforting music. Spirituals once sung by slaves transformed into gospel songs sung by free people who had their own space and place to express their emotions and tell their stories in music—those spirituals have been translated into gospel music.

Gospel music could express the joys and sorrows of so many people. All of us remember and have often sung the song ''Amazing Grace,'' created by one who saw this wonderful resilience of their life when they thought they had been lost. That is truly American and American gospel music.

We know the early founders: Thomas Dorsey, Mahalia Jackson, James Vaughan, James Cleveland, and now today Kirk Franklin, and Yolanda Adams, among so many. And then those who were influenced by gospel music: Sam Cooke, Al Green, Elvis Presley, Aretha Franklin, Whitney Houston, Little Richard, Buddy Holly, among many.

Jazzy Jordan understands that and is now head of The Jordan Webster Group, a film and music production house in Washington, D.C. A brilliant businessman, he has a great love of gospel music. We are grateful for his service to Verity Gospel Music Group, now known as RCA Inspiration. Mr. Jordan was a founding board member of the Gospel Music Heritage Foundation and cochair, with gospel music advocate Mr. Carl Davis of my district, of the Evolution of Gospel Celebration which kicks off Gospel Music Heritage Celebration in the Nation's capital. Mr. Jordan was executive producer for Gold, Platinum, Grammy, Stellar, and Dove award-winning projects. Throughout his career, he served as a creative producer and has marketed and promoted many awarding-winning CDs and gospel artists that have included Kirk Franklin, and as well worked with DJ Jazzy Jeff and Will Smith—''Fresh Prince.''

Oh, he knows music. And to tell you that he does, he has engaged and worked with the likes of Kirk Franklin, as I said, Marvin Sapp, Donnie McClurkin, Fred Hammond, Heather Kyle Walker, Donald Lawrence, Richard Smallwood, Byron Cage, John P. Kee, Jay Moss, Crystal Aikin, Deitrick Haddon, and DeWayne Woods. Mr. Jordan is truly one who lives his life in commemorating and cultivating and nurturing the gospel tradition, the gospel tradition which has now spread beyond the borders of this Nation.

He is joined by Mr. Don Jackson, the founder, chairman, and CEO of the 41-year-old Central City Productions, now the founder and organizer of the Stella Awards.

I am grateful that Mr. Jackson thought it was important to recognize those who excelled in gospel music. He graduated from Northwestern University and entered a career in media and broadcasting with a number of stations, WBEE and WVON, a top radio station in Chicago. As he founded Central City Marketing in 1970, his company over 41 years involved itself in encouraging and helping others promote their issues. He had involvement in promotion and sales and production of media and television.

□ 1050

But his first gospel music awards show in the United States, the Stellar Awards, was produced by his company. The Stellar Awards honors gospel music artists, writers, and industry professionals.

He is one who has featured so many artists, such as the Clark Sisters, Kirk Franklin, Da' T.R.U.T.H., Mary Mary, and many others.

Mr. Speaker, as I close, let me simply say, these two men are more than deserving of being American icons, and we congratulate them for loving, cherishing, and promoting gospel music.

Mr. Speaker, I rise to recognize two of America's pioneers in gospel music: Mr. James ''Jazzy'' Jordan and Mr. Don Jackson.

Jazzy Jordan and Don Jackson are titans in the field of Gospel Music. Over the last 30 years their combined efforts have elevated this unique American art form to national and international prominence.

Gospel music holds a special place in the American experience. Just as Jazz is well known far from our nation's shores, the spread of gospel music has also become popular around the world. Gospel music holds a unique place in the African experience—its roots are deep in the black church. For generations, gospel music could only be heard on Sunday mornings where African American people gathered to worship.

Church was a place where black people felt truly free and safe to express themselves. Gospel music was a release for suffering and hardship—it was a form of praise and protest. Spirituals once sung by slaves transformed into gospel songs sung by free people who had their own space—and place to express their emotions and tell their stories in music.

Gospel music could express the joys and sorrows of black people in ways that touched those who were not African American. There were lessons to be learned for the artists and the listeners. Famous jazz and rock-and-roll artists perfected their singing styles by visiting black churches to listen to gospel music.

Gospel music traditions produced many memorable voices and musical pioneers in the history of our country; singers like Thomas Dorsey, Mahalia Jackson, James Vaughan, Roberta Martin, Virgil Stamps, Diana Washington, James Cleveland, The Mighty Clouds of Joy, Kirk Franklin, Yolanda Adams, and The Winans among many others.

Gospel music has inspired and influenced other music art forms and artists that include Sam Cooke, Al Green, Elvis Presley, Marvin Gaye, Aretha Franklin, Whitney Houston, Little Richard, Ray Charles, Buddy Holly, Alan Jackson, Dolly Parton, Mariah Carey, Bob Dylan, and Randy Travis.

I stand in the well of the House to honor two men who are my friends who also are great contributors to the American experience by preserving and cultivating new converts to the gospel music. Through their efforts gospel music has in a very short time period expanded beyond the black church to a broader global audience.

Mr. James ''Jazzy'' Jordan is head of The Jordan Webster Group, a film and music production house in Washington DC. Mr. Jordan is a brilliant businessman with a love of gospel music, which he fully expressed in his leadership of the Verity Gospel Music Group now known as RCA Inspiration. Mr. Jordan is a founding board member of the Gospel Music Heritage Foundation and is Co-Chair along with Gospel Music Advocate Carl Davis of the ''Evolution of Gospel Celebration'' that Kicks off Gospel Music Heritage Celebration in the Nation's Capital.

Over his 30 year career, Mr. Jordan was executive producer for Gold, Platinum, GRAMMY®, Stellar and Dove award-winning projects. Throughout his career, Jordan has served as executive producer or has marketed or promoted many award-winning CDs for gospel artists that included Kirk Franklin and R. Kelly. He also, worked with DJ Jazzy Jeff and The Fresh Prince (Will Smith) on their album Parents Just Don't Understand, which sold over four millions copies; Salt N' Pepa on their Very Necessary album, which sold over five million copies; Joe on his tops selling CDs All That I Am, which was a platinum selling album, and My Name Is Joe, which sold over three million copies; and three of R. Kelly's CDs—R. Kelly, R. and TP–2.Com, which all sold more than three million copies.

The other person I want to recognize is Mr. Don Jackson, the founder, chairman and CEO of the 41–year-old CENTRAL CITY PRODUCTIONS a national television production, sales, and syndication Company based in Chicago, Illinois.

Mr. Jackson after graduating from Northwestern University entered a career in media and broadcasting with WBEE & WVON radio. He was someone to watch—and for good reason—he became youngest and first African American sales manager at WVON, the top radio station in the Chicago media market at the time. He had to work hard and be extremely smart to reach such notable success at such a young age.

In 1970, Mr. Jackson founded CENTRAL CITY MARKETING. His company for over 40 years has specialized in marketing, promotion, sales, and the production of media and television programs for African Americans. The first Gospel Music Awards show in the United States, the Stellar Awards, was produced by CENTRAL CITY MARKETING. The Stellar Awards honor Gospel Music Artists, writers, and industry professionals for their contributions to the Gospel Music Industry. The Stellar Awards program is syndicated in over 140 markets nationwide.

The Stellar Awards has featured well known gospel artists that include the Clark Sisters, Kirk Franklin, Da' T.R.U.T.H, Tye Tribbett, Mary Mary, Heather Headley, CeCe Winans, Marvin Sapp, Yolanda Adams, Donnie McClurkin, and Tamela Mann. Atlanta, Chicago, Houston, Los Angeles, Nashville, and New York have been the location of the Stellar Awards programs. Through his efforts, the spread of gospel appreciation is traveling far beyond our nation's shore and finding new converts every day.

Because of the efforts to these two men scholars now know—if you want to truly understand the black American experience—you must understand the music of that experience and a way to do this is through gospel music.

I ask my colleagues to join me in applauding the life achievements of Mr. Don Jackson and Mr. James ''Jazzy'' Jordan.

40 YEARS OF MEDIA MARKETING EXPERIENCE

Don Jackson is the founder, chairman, and CEO of 41-year-old CENTRAL CITY PRODUCTIONS, Inc., a national television production, sales, and syndication company based in Chicago, IL.

Mr. Jackson is a Chicago native who graduated from Marshall High School, where he played on the school's 1960 state championship basketball team. He also started on the 1961 Marshall basketball team, which won 3rd place in the state championship. He attended Northwestern University on a basketball scholarship and was captain of the University's 1965 Wildcat basketball team. Mr. Jackson earned his B.S. in Radio, TV, and Film from Northwestern in 1965.

After graduating from Northwestern, Mr. Jackson worked in the media and broadcast industries in sales at WBEE & WVON radio. He became the youngest and first African American sales manager at WVON, the top radio station in the Chicago market at the time.

In 1970, Mr. Jackson founded CENTRAL CITY MARKETING, INC. For over four decades the company has specialized in marketing, promotion, sales, and the production of media and television programs for African Americans.

Today, CENTRAL CITY PRODUCTIONS, INC., is the full-service company that produces, syndicates, and manages advertising sales for all of the company's local and national television programs. Central City Productions' mission is to develop, produce, and market television programming which is designed to communicate positive, uplifting images of Black people all over the world.

Under his guidance and vision, CCP has launched many new and unique television programs to Black Americans nationwide. Many of these programs have more than 30 years of consecutive airing over local and national television.

Mr. Jackson also gives back to the community as a member of several organizations. He is the former chairman of the board of the DuSable Museum of African American History. He has also previously served on the boards of Northwestern University, Junior Achievement of Chicago, Columbia College, Gateway Foundation and Chicago Transit Authority Board.

In addition, Mr. Jackson is the founder and a member of A.B.L.E. (Alliance of Business Leaders and Entrepreneurs), which is the first business organization bringing Black Leaders together in the business community to network, to address business issues and to provide a legacy for future African American entrepreneurs.

He has received numerous awards for his business accomplishments and community involvement. Mr. Jackson is married to Rosemary Jackson. The couple has two adult children and two grandsons, Donovan and Dain. Their daughter Rhonda is a graduate of Syracuse University, and their son Baba Dainja graduated from the University of Minnesota.

JAMES ''JAZZY'' JORDAN

James ''Jazzy'' Jordan is head of The Jordan Webster Group, a film and music production house in Washington DC. Projects to be released this summer are ''Your Husband Is Cheating On Us'' starring JD Lawrence, A reality TV series The Football Moms with Reggie Bush's mother Denise, Adrian Peterson's mother Bonita and others.

Mr. Jordan is also developing a theatrical film titled ''ColorBlind'' starring JD Lawrence and directed by Bill Duke, he is filming a new comedy TV series for Comedian Michael Colyar, taping this summer at The Howard Theater in DC.

He most recently was Executive Vice President/General Manager of Verity Gospel Music Group (VGMG). A division of Sony Music Entertainment, INC., it is the largest gospel music company in the world.

The VGMG roster of artists includes: Kirk Franklin, Marvin Sapp, Donald McClurkin, Fred Hammond, Hezekiah Walker, Donald Lawrence, Richard Smallwood, Kurt Carr, 21:03, Byron Cage, John P. Kee, J. Moss, Crystal Aikin, Deitrick Haddon, Dewayne Woods, and others.

Over his 30-year career, Jordan has worked in a variety of areas within the music industry, including retail, radio broadcasting and marketing. These experiences have given him a 360-degree view of the music business and uniquely equipped him to shepherd artists to success. Jordan was in charge of all operations for Verity Gospel Music Group, Jordan lent his business acumen and expertise to the consistently successful label. He has served as executive producer for Gold, Platinum, GRAMMY®, Stellar and Dove award-winning projects such as Hello Fear and The Fight Of My Life (Kirk Franklin), Thirsty and Here I Am (Marvin Sapp), Live

In London (Donnie McClurkin), Show Up (John P. Kee), and many others.

Jordan has held senior executive positions at Tommy Boy, RCA and PolyGram record labels. In 1995, he was named Vice President of Black Music Marketing at Jive Records. At Jive, Jordan not only played a vital role in the label's success in urban music, he also helped to launch Verity Records and catapult it into the most successful gospel record label to date.

Throughout his career, Jordan has served as executive producer or has marketed or promoted over 50 award-winning CDs for artists ranging from Will Smith to Kirk Franklin. He worked with DJ Jazzy Jeff and the Fresh Prince (Will Smith) on their album Parents Just Don't Understand, which sold over four millions copies; Salt N' Pepa on their Very Necessary album, which sold over five million copies; Joe on his tops selling CDs All That I Am, which was a platinum selling album, and My Name Is Joe, which sold over three million copies; and three of. Kelly's CDs—R. Kelly, R. and TP2.Com, which all sold more than three million copies.

A man of many interests and skills, in 2006 Jordan was one of only two African Americans to have ownership in an Indy 500 racecar (the other was NBA All-Star Carmelo Anthony). Jordan's car placed 12th in the race.

SEQUESTRATION AND THE BUDGET

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

Ms. WATERS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to discuss the impacts that sequestration is having on our country. Although I did not support the decisions that led to sequestration, I remain committed to protecting the American people from the most harmful and potentially dangerous outcomes related to sequestration.

Sequestration simply means budget cuts, extraordinary budget cuts. Every moment we spend here in Washington should be spent working to improve the lives and opportunities for the American people. To that end, we should be focused on legislation to avert sequestration and improve our economy.

As our minority whip said here this morning, we've passed a budget off the floor of the House. It's the Ryan budget, and it protects sequestration. It wants all of the cuts to take place. On the Senate side, they've passed a budget that does away with the onerous sequestration budget cuts. Now we need a conference committee, simply meaning, we need both sides to come together and resolve their differences and move on with having a budget for this country. But the Republicans are saying ''no.''

And as it was mentioned by our minority whip, we're here in Washington, D.C., fiddling while Rome burns. We're not taking care of any real business. They will not bring a conference committee together to resolve these differences.

The simplest way to describe the sequester is to say that this was an avoidable, self-inflicted wound. A vocal Republican opposition over the budget led to an agreement, which ultimately resulted in this sequestration decision.

Republican leadership has failed to bring to the floor this week measures to build our economy. We should be focused on salient measures designed to grow our economy and create jobs.

Republican leadership has also failed to fully address the issues arising from sequestration; although, it is clear that these cuts are arbitrary, indiscriminate, and far too blunt.

The American people may be aware of the obvious impacts of sequestration, such as the closing of national parks and the elimination of tours at the White House; however, Americans might not be aware of how sequestration can impact important parts of their lives and this economy.

Let's take air travel. Some of you have heard about what is going on in our airports. Imagine that you're trying to get to the airport to catch a flight to attend your daughter's wedding or graduation or to see about a sick relative, or you're a business traveler trying to meet a potential client for the first time. Well, sequestration could soon impact all of your travel plans.

Due to sequestration, the Federal Aviation Administration addressed the shortage in their funding by furloughing 47,200 employees and are expected to close certain airports. As a result, we're witnessing airplanes remaining on the tarmac for hours. The traveling public is expecting flight delays and cancellations at airports all across the country. The impact of sequestration is being felt by the thousands of travelers who utilize our airways every day. And, ladies and gentlemen, it's going to get worse.

Along with flight delays, airline travelers can expect increased wait times in airport security lines because the Transportation Security Administration has also had to furlough screening agents in response to sequestration.

I represent Los Angeles International Airport, which is the sixth busiest airport in the world and the third busiest airport in the United States. I understand the impact that flight delays will have, not only on those traveling for leisure, but also on the airline industry and business travelers.

These furloughs are problematic for airports of any size. The importance of the air traffic controllers at LAX and across the country cannot be understated. God forbid that there should be an accident that could have been averted. No explanation could possibly make amends for the resulting loss of life. This is simply unacceptable.

Ladies and gentlemen, I could talk about a lot more, national security, housing, health care, all of that, but the fact of the matter is this is unnecessary. I'm absolutely disappointed. I want this Congress to get on with the business of getting a budget and representing the people that sent them here to represent them.

NATIONAL SECURITY

Last week, we were all horrified to watch the bombings at the 117th Boston Marathon. We all applauded the valiant and successful efforts of law enforcement. Even so, the intelligence community who diligently worked with local law enforcement to ultimately capture a bombing suspect is not immune from the impacts of sequestration.

As a direct result of sequestration the National Intelligence Community could receive 4 billion dollars in cuts. Consider a recent statement from National Intelligence Director James Clapper. He stated ''sequestration forces the intelligence community to decrease all intelligence actions and functions without regard to the impact on our mission. It is my judgment, as our nation's senior intelligence officer, that sequestration jeopardizes our nation's safety and security, and this jeopardy will increase over time.''

We all watched on television as the Federal Bureau of Investigation, FBI, Hostage Rescue Team bravely apprehended the surviving Boston bombing suspect. It is at these moments the American public can witness the training and skill of FBI agents. Yet, even the FBI is not protected from sequestration.

Last month, FBI Director Robert Muller estimated that sequestration would decrease the FBI's budget by $550 million for this fiscal year. As 60 percent of the FBI's budget pays for personnel, Director Muller anticipates that he will have to plan for the possibility of furloughs in the FBI.

According to Director Muller ''any furlough would pose a risk to FBI operations particularly in the areas of counter terrorism and cyber.''

I believe the American people understand the importance of protecting our national security, especially at a time when our nation faces threats both foreign and domestic. But again, due to sequestration the FBI and other members of the national intelligence community who play a vital role in protecting our nation may be given shorter hours or furloughed. These are the sort of insidious impacts that unfortunately, may not get anyone's attention until something tragic happens. There are real life consequences if the sequester is not lifted.

PUBLIC HEALTH

The effect on public health could be equally devastating. Sequestration could cut $3.7 billion from funding for the Department of Health and Human Services. A myriad of programs will be negatively impacted by these cuts. For example, cuts to Community Health Centers could leave one million low-income and uninsured patients without basic health services.

If we do not act to end the effects of sequestration, there could be 45,000 fewer breast and cervical cancer screenings for low-income women. Further, nearly 485,000 seniors could lose access to disease prevention programs.

Even the gains we have made in HIV/AIDS awareness, screening, and care may also be hampered by sequestration. The anticipated cuts to HIV screening could result in 424,000 fewer HIV tests. Further, cuts to the AIDS Drug Assistance Program could leave 7,400 HIV/AIDS patients in need of treatment without life-saving AIDS medications. Finally, the National Institutes of Health would be cut by $1.6 billion. That's $1.6 billion less money available for cutting-edge research by scientists seeking cures for diseases like cancer, diabetes, and

Alzheimer's disease. These are only a handful of the unintended consequences of blind sequestration required cuts.

HOUSING

When it comes to housing—according to the Center on Budget and Policy Priorities, these cuts come at a time when the number of low-income families in need of housing assistance has been rising substantially. Currently, there are long waiting lists for vouchers in almost every community, and homelessness remains a persistent problem.

The United States Department of Housing and Urban Development estimates that about 125,000 individuals and families, including elderly and disabled individuals, may lose assistance and be at risk of becoming homeless. These effects, while not immediate, would be devastating to the millions of low- income families who depend on these federal programs for shelter, a basic life necessity.

Sequestration cuts would also result in more than 100,000 formerly homeless people, including veterans, being removed from their current housing or emergency shelter programs, putting them at substantial risk of becoming homeless.

WIC AND HEAD START

The sequester could also have a negative impact on federally funded programs that provide services to women and children. Essential programs like Head Start and Early Head Start may have to turn away up to 70,000 children and families. These families rely on their services for quality childcare and parenting education initiatives.

Even Women, Infants and Children, WIC, that provides nutritious food, counseling on healthy eating, and health care referrals to low-income pregnant and postpartum women, infants, and children under age 5 who are at nutritional risk faces cut. Secretary Tom Vilsack at the U.S. Department of Agricultures warned back in February that as a result of the sequester WIC will only be able to provide services for 600,000 of the 9 million low-income families currently served.

CONCLUSION

Mr. Speaker, sequestration has already taken a toll on families, businesses, and communities across the country. At a time when we are working to rebuild our economy, sequestration will cost American workers millions of dollars in lost wages and businesses billions of dollars in lost revenue.

Sequestration will have impacts that we might not consider here today. It will impact our national security efforts. It will impact our air travel and it will even impact the food we eat. We must work to avert these thoughtless cuts.

It is time for Republicans to stop refusing to move forward in our work to pass a budget that reflects our nation's values. It is time to do the right thing for the American people and lift the sequester.

SEQUESTER AND THE BUDGET

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

Mr. CÁRDENAS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to address the number of times that Congress has dropped the ball when it comes to our budget. But I'm also here to say that we can fix it.

Last year, Congress passed the only law I have ever seen that was designed to never be enforced. It's called sequestration.

Sequestration was actually designed to cut spending across the board in a way that was so offensive and so illogical that it could never survive as a law. It was a law that was meant to unify both sides of the aisle in an effort to develop a comprehensive deal to fix the economy and our deficit.

A responsible Congress could have stopped those ridiculous cuts. In fact, I agree with Senator MARK WARNER, who happens to be a former Governor, who had to balance his State of Virginia's budget, and I quote, he called this ''stupid.''

Mr. VAN HOLLEN, whom I work with on the Budget Committee, introduced commonsense legislation that would have responsibly reduced our deficit and ended the sequester. Unfortunately, the Republican majority refused to allow an up-or-down vote on this floor for that straightforward legislation. They doubled down on irresponsible policies based on an economic math that we now know is completely flawed.

It reminded me of a story. Two guys are in a lifeboat, and the one holding the oars says, ''This is a bad situation, and one of us ain't gonna make it.'' It doesn't take a genius to figure out who the guy with the oars is talking about.

All of us are in this lifeboat together, and we know where the majority stands. They're not rowing for the middle class. They're just fighting to protect millionaires and make sure their special interests keep their tax breaks.

We know families, businesses, and communities continue to be hurt by what we do or don't do here in Washington. You've all seen it. FAA furloughs are causing flight delays, just one example of how we're continuing to hurt our economy.

We can do better. We can write a legitimate, measured budget for this country.

Mr. Speaker, return this House to regular order. Our House has a budget. The Senate has a budget. Let's go to conference and start negotiating a real American budget. The American people deserve some certainty, and they certainly deserve to know what priorities are important to their elected representatives.

For those watching at home, why is a conference committee so important? Because there are vast differences between the budgets currently on the table. A conference committee negotiates, in full view of the public, on principles and priorities that set funding for the next fiscal year.

Let's talk about this like my Republican colleagues' favorite thing to talk about. Let's talk about it like people do at the kitchen table.

If paychecks are cut or an unforeseen emergency happens in a family, families don't just pay 10 percent less on their mortgage or require 10 percent less of the medications they depend on. Instead, we make smart cuts. We stop buying the things we don't need, but we don't stop educating our children. At least in my house, my wife and I don't decide what's important to us and ignore everyone else.

□ 1100

That doesn't work in families, and it doesn't work in Washington. We sit down like adults—at least we should in Congress—around some kitchen table and figure out what we can buy and what we can't. We work through today's needs and plan for our future. We don't stop investing in our families. Like Senator WARNER said, that would be stupid.

The House and the Senate need to get around the table—any table. If you can't find a table here in the Capitol, come to my kitchen table. We must create an American budget that invests in job growth and educating our future workforce. We can make cuts—but cuts that make sense. Let's root out the waste, fraud, and abuse and cut tax loopholes to make sure everyone pays their fair share.

The American people have shown us what to do. Let's get around a table. Let's name conferees and show the people who sent us here that we can be responsible and keep the promise of the American Dream a reality.

Ladies and gentlemen, I have been honored to be elected at the State legislative level in California, I have been honored to be a council member, and now, since January of this year, I have been a Member of this body. And I'm very, very disappointed. In business, at home, and in elected office, I've never seen a situation so stagnant, so stale and damaging to the people who sent us here to represent them.

HONORING NAZARINE J. BELLARDINI

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

Mr. OWENS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the life of a constituent and World War II veteran, Nazarine J. Bellardini of Norwood, New York.

Mr. Bellardini served the Nation in the Air Force during World War II. After he was honorably discharged in 1948, he returned home to upstate New York and married his wife, Caroline, in 1950.

Like so many World War II veterans, Mr. Bellardini helped build the modern middle class. After the war, Mr. Bellardini worked at the 7UP Bottling Company in Utica, New York. In 1957, he was initially employed at the State University of New York at Potsdam in the mailroom.

Mr. Bellardini retired from Potsdam as the plant superintendent for heating, ventilation, and refrigeration. His behind-the-scenes work was vital to the success of the thousands of students who attended SUNY Potsdam during his tenure.

In his retirement, Mr. Bellardini remained active as a member of the Potsdam Elks Lodge, the VFW, the American Legion, and the Knights of Columbus. He was also an avid hunter.

He will be greatly missed by those left behind, including his son, his sister, two daughters, six grandchildren, as well as four great-grandchildren.

Like so many of that generation, he lived by the motto: ''I was just doing my job.'' That is something we in Washington should clearly emulate.

I thank you for joining with me in honoring Mr. Bellardini's life and his service to our country.

IT IS NEVER OKAY TO DISREGARD OUR MOST BASIC PRIVACY RIGHTS

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

Mrs. HARTZLER. I rise today in response to a situation which is currently causing a great deal of concern among law-abiding citizens in my home State of Missouri.

We have learned, through the diligent work of State Senator Kurt Schaefer and others in State government, that the Missouri Department of Revenue, which issues concealed-carry permits in our State, has improperly allowed this sensitive, personal information to be shared with the Federal Government. This egregious disregard for privacy rights led last week to the resignation of the director of the State Department of Revenue.

While Missourians are pleased that this inappropriate sharing of information has been discovered, we are still trying to determine why information on who is legally licensed to carry concealed firearms was surrendered to Federal authorities in the first place.

I stand with Missouri's elected representatives as they pursue all legal avenues to learn why the Missouri Department of Revenue displayed such blatant disregard for the rights of our honest, law-abiding citizens.

RECESS

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

Accordingly (at 11 o'clock and 4 minutes a.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1200

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. POE of Texas) at noon.

PRAYER

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

Eternal God, we give You thanks for giving us another day. Lead us this day in Your ways, that our Nation might be guided along the roads of peace, justice, and goodwill.

Grant strength and wisdom to our Speaker and the Members of both the people's House and the Senate, to our President and his Cabinet, and to our Supreme Court.

Bless as well the moral and military leaders of our country, and may those who are the captains of business, industry, and unions learn to work together toward the mutual benefit of all.

Grant us the courage to develop a sound energy program for the good of all. Bestow on the Members of Congress the perseverance to provide a framework that protects the rights and concerns of all Americans in the wake of terrible violence in our land and the wisdom to forge a fair and equitable immigration reform, that together we might look ahead to ever greater goals for the continued growth of our Nation.

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

Amen.

THE JOURNAL

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

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

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Will the gentlewoman from California (Ms. BROWNLEY) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Ms. BROWNLEY of California led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

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

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

WORKING FAMILIES FLEXIBILITY ACT OF 2013

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

Mr. KLINE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today on behalf of the Minnesotans I serve who tell me simply: it's about time.

I rise today on behalf of a South St. Paul mom and dad who find it difficult to balance work and family and feel they are not spending enough time with their children.

I rise today on behalf of the Minnesota National Guard and all our brave men and women in uniform who are deployed while their spouses single-handedly juggle work and household responsibilities.

I rise today on behalf of a college student from Shakopee and millions like her working full-time while pursuing an undergraduate degree.

And I rise today on behalf of an Eagan couple, who, like more than 50 million working Americans, spend at least 8 hours a week providing care for aging relatives, a challenge when balancing the demands of a job.

Mr. Speaker, outdated Federal policy denies many workers the chance to spend more time with their children or care for an aging relative. Accordingly, the Education and Workforce Committee approved legislation last week that will fix this outdated policy and help more Americans balance family and work.

Mr. Speaker, Americans sacrifice a great deal to provide for their families, and I agree with my Minnesotan constituents and most Americans: it is about time.

DON'T DISCOURAGE CROSS-BORDER TRAVEL

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

Mr. HIGGINS. Mr. Speaker, I was alarmed to discover that the Department of Homeland Security's budget request proposed a study of the imposition of a fee—a tax—for passengers and pedestrians at our northern land border crossing.

Western New York is home to two rail and three vehicle crossings, including the Peace Bridge, the second busiest northern border crossing. Integrating the economies of western New York and southern Ontario is essential to our economic strength, and nationally 300,000 people cross our Canadian border by vehicle each day and spend an estimated $235 million.

Last year, the American and Canadian Governments signed a historic Beyond-the-Border agreement to bolster cross-border travel. The imposition of a border toll will discourage cross-border travel and goes against the spirit of this historic agreement.

Mr. Speaker, we should be encouraging increased economic activity between the United States and Canada, not stifling it. This proposal is completely unacceptable and must be withdrawn immediately.

SIMPLIFY AND STRENGTHEN FEDERAL SCHOOL AID PROGRAMS

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

Mr. WALBERG. Mr. Speaker, for many young people, higher education has become a very expensive dream because of rising costs. The average new graduate is struggling to pay off more than $25,000 in debt while hunting for a job in this stagnant economy.

While Washington can play a role in fixing the problem, we cannot look to

the Federal Government alone to fix this problem. Instead, we must work with State governments, schools, students, and parents to find a solution.

Within the past decade, costs have risen 66 percent beyond the rate of inflation. Instead of trying to work with schools, the Federal Government has been busy implementing policies that increase their costs. My colleagues and I on the Higher Education and Workforce Training Subcommittee are looking at how to simplify and strengthen Federal aid programs.

It's obvious more needs to be done to help students and families make the best decision possible about their education at a price they can afford. My goal is to continue to identify and remove unnecessary and costly burdens from this process and put the dream of higher education in reach of more students.

ENERGY SAVINGS AND INDUSTRIAL COMPETITIVENESS ACT

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

Mr. WELCH. Mr. Speaker, climate change, in my view, is real, it's urgent, and we must make progress or ignore it at our peril. But whether we agree or disagree, whether you're a climate change believer or denier, there are things that we can do together for the benefit of the environment and the economy.

We can focus the debate on energy efficiency; we can save money through making our homes and buildings more energy efficient; we can put people back to work and buy American products; and, in the process, we can cut down on harmful carbon emissions and make progress on climate change and strengthen our economy.

That is why I've joined with my friend from West Virginia, DAVID MCKINLEY, in introducing the Energy Savings and Industrial Competitiveness Act, which proposes practical solutions to bolster energy efficiency. This bill will speed our transition to a more energy efficient economy—increasing America's economic competitiveness in energy security—and build jobs.

By finding areas where we actually do agree and working together, we can make progress on the environment and on the economy.

MAKE LIFE EASIER FOR AMERICAN FAMILIES

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

Ms. JENKINS. Whether it's jobs or our Nation's debt, the economy is still the number one issue for hardworking Americans. But, instead of supporting initiatives like the Keystone pipeline, something that would create 20,000 jobs and help secure our energy supply, this administration continues to pursue the same failed economic policies. Their budget adds over $8 trillion to the debt, raises taxes by another trillion dollars, and they continue to support a burdensome health care law that does nothing to address the issue of rising costs.

The House is working on solutions to create a stronger, healthier economy with more jobs and opportunities for all Americans. We have passed legislation to replace the sequester, to balance the budget, to repeal the President's health care law, and we're working on reforming our broken Tax Code to make it more fair and efficient.

It's time for the administration to get on board: stop creating problems like politically motivated flight delays and start helping to make life easier for American families.

□ 1210

HONORING ALAMEDA COUNTY LEADERS

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

Mr. SWALWELL of California. Tomorrow, the Alameda County Labor Council will be hosting their annual Unionist of the Year awards dinner where local labor leaders will be recognized for their tireless advocacy on behalf of hardworking Americans.

One of these great leaders is Obray Van Buren, who will be honored with the Unionist of the Year award. Obray has been a member of the Plumbers and Steamfitters Local 342 for 30 years. Obray is also on the board of directors for Tri-CED Community Recycling, a company which gives many former offenders and at-risk youth a chance at life. This organization proudly serves both Hayward and Union City in my district.

Also honored will be California's Attorney General Kamala Harris, an Alameda County native who also, like me, served in the Alameda County District Attorney's Office and will be honored as the Warrior Woman of the Year. Attorney General Harris is committed to defending the interests of working families who are the backbone of our economy.

Other honorees include Rachel Bryan, Jason Gumataotao, Tanya Pitts, Tamara Perine, Bud Beal, and Christine Garrett.

Once again, congratulations to all honorees. Alameda County appreciates your efforts to ensure that worker rights and benefits are always protected.

REMEMBERING PRIVATE FIRST CLASS BARRETT L. AUSTIN

(Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I rise today with heavy heart to honor a military hero and one of my constituents, and a casualty of war. Private First Class Barrett L. Austin died on April 21 after being a casualty, I believe, of an IED while serving his country in Afghanistan. Barrett Austin was just 20 years old. He was assigned to A Company, 4th Brigade Special Troops Battalion, 3rd Infantry Division, out of Fort Stewart, Georgia. Private First Class Austin was a beloved son, husband, friend, and soldier from the Dacusville-Easley, Pickens County area of South Carolina.

My heart goes out to his wife, his parents, and all of those who called Barrett a friend. This true American hero has made the true sacrifice in defense of our great Nation, and we owe him our eternal gratitude. This Nation remains the greatest on Earth because of people like Barrett Austin, and we must never forget the true cost of the freedoms that we enjoy.

So on behalf of the Third District of South Carolina and the entire Nation, we thank you, Barrett, for your sacrifice. Our thoughts and prayers continue to be with the entire Austin family. May God bless them, and may God continue to bless America.

SUPPORTING SPECIALTY CROPS

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

Ms. DELBENE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to introduce a bipartisan resolution in support of specialty crops, with support from Members of Congress across the country. Specialty crops, such as fruits and vegetables, are a significant part of agriculture, with annual production valued at over $50 billion. This is about half of the value of all U.S. crops, but specialty crops aren't given the same attention or financial support as our traditional commodities.

Specialty crops are a major source of economic activity, jobs, and our Nation's food supply. Every State has at least some specialty crop production, and my district is no different. In Whatcom and Skagit counties, hundreds of specialty crops are grown, totaling millions in sales each year. Specialty crops grown on farms in Snohomish and King counties provide fresh, quality foods to our schools, restaurants, and farmers markets.

As Congress begins to consider another farm bill, it is important to acknowledge how vital specialty crops are to our country. I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting this resolution, and I look forward to continuing to work together to ensure that programs in support of specialty crops are highlighted and fully funded.

NATIONAL AUTISM AWARENESS MONTH

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

minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. MESSER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize National Autism Awareness Month. We once lived in a world where polio was an epidemic that killed kids and left others with debilitating paralysis. Thankfully, medical and scientific advances largely have eliminated the threat from this and many other dreaded diseases and conditions. Yet our understanding of autism remains an unsolved puzzle.

Mr. Speaker, autism affects too many children, including my nephew Trey, and strains families, as I know firsthand. It is time to commit ourselves as a Nation to solving this modern epidemic so autism can be prevented, treated, and cured tomorrow like polio is today.

HONORING SEAN SMITH

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

Mr. VARGAS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in honor of Sean Smith, an information technology specialist killed in the September 11, 2012, terrorist attack in Benghazi, Libya. Sean was called ''one of our best'' at the State Department by former Secretary of State Hillary Clinton.

Originally from San Diego, California, Sean enlisted in the Air Force in 1995. In 2002, he was awarded the Air Force Commendation Medal and joined the United States Foreign Service.

President Barack Obama stated:

> Sean Smith lived to serve, first in the Air Force, then at the State Department. He knew the perils of his calling. And there in Benghazi, far from home, he laid down his life in the service to all of us.

Sean was also a loving husband and a proud father. He was devoted to his wife, Heather, and to his two children, Samantha and Nathan.

Mrs. Smith said of her late husband:

> Sean supported the mission of diplomacy and served his country with pride and optimism.

I wish to offer my deepest condolences and the deepest condolences of this House to the Smith family. Please know that your family will continue to be in our prayers and our thoughts. And thank you and your late husband for your selfless service to our country. May God bless you.

TRUTH TELLING WITH FLIGHT DELAYS

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

Mr. RIBBLE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to give the American people some truth telling about what is going on with the FAA and flight delays. We have been told this is all the result of the sequester. And yet in 2001, there were about 30,000 takeoffs per day in the United States, and they did that with about $6 billion worth of funding. Today, takeoffs are only 20,000 a day, and they have $10 billion of funding. In 2001, there were 14,000 air traffic operators, and today there are 14,000 air traffic operators.

So if it's not a demand problem because demand went down, if it's not a people problem because they have the same people, and it's not a resource problem because they have about 100 percent more money, what is the problem?

I contend to you, Mr. Speaker, it's a political problem. It's time to tell the administration to stop playing politics with the American people.

GUN SAFETY

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

Mr. HIMES. Mr. Speaker, last week was a profoundly disturbing week for those of us from Connecticut and for Americans as a whole. When this body, when the institution of Congress failed to do anything to promote gun safety in the face of the tragedy at Newtown, this institution let the American people down.

When a Senator on the Republican side with an ''A'' rating from the NRA and a Senator from the Democratic side with an ''A'' rating from the NRA put forward a background check measure that fails, we fail.

Look, we can and we should debate what kind of weapons Americans should have a right to. We can and we should debate how many bullets can go into a magazine. There is no principled argument for why we should not check out someone who wants to buy a weapon. And yet, we couldn't make that argument in the Congress of the United States.

So as a result, some time soon, a terrorist will buy a gun at a gun show. Some time soon, a violent felon will buy a gun online. And as a result, Americans will die. And this institution will bear the blame. This was not a proud moment, Mr. Speaker, for the Congress of the United States.

KILAH DAVENPORT CHILD PROTECTION ACT

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

Mr. PITTENGER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today on behalf of the Kilah Davenport Child Protection Act. Just a year ago, a 3-year-old girl was rammed against a wall head first, suffering irreparable brain damage and being paralyzed for the rest of her life. When the DA went to prosecute, he found in North Carolina that the sentencing was limited to 4 to 7 years, a very minimum sentence for such an egregious act. Upon further review, we found that other States also have such minimum sentencing, some with no minimum whatsoever.

Mr. Speaker, our act would provide that there would be a minimum sentence of 10 years to receive Federal grants for child abuse. We commend this legislation to this respected body and ask for their support.

□ 1220

GET RID OF SEQUESTRATION

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

Ms. JACKSON LEE. The simple question is asked, why are we in such a dilemma of complexity and absolutely abandoning the American people? That's what sequestration is all about.

And I know it's hard to tell a story again, but sequestration came about because a whole sizeable population of Members, Republican Members, did not want to pay America's bills.

But we can, as a bipartisan, collective body that responds to America, avoid the loss of 2 million jobs and a .6 percent drag on the economy and $67.8 million lost for primary and secondary education in Texas, $51 million lost for education of children with disabilities, and 4,800 Head Start seats lost. We can come together.

We can pass H.R. 900, which gets rid of the sequestration, or we can call for the budget conferees to, once and for all, address the question of America.

The reason why we have a slowdown of FAA, it's because the people are furloughed. You can have 50,000 FAA air traffic controllers; but if they're furloughed, they can't work.

Let's work on behalf of the American people—have the budget conferees now pass H.R. 900, get rid of the sequestration.

THE SENATE IMMIGRATION BILL PROVIDES COVER FOR TERRORISTS

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

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Mr. Speaker, the Senate immigration bill provides cover for suspected terrorists and others who would do us harm. After 6 months, it legalizes millions of people in the country illegally. They can then get work permits, Social Security cards, and driver's licenses. This gives them a legitimate cover to travel and plot attacks.

And mass legalization will encourage others to enter the country illegally so they too can obtain cover documents.

Any immigration bill should put the safety of Americans first. We should go slowly before giving amnesty to millions of illegal immigrants long before we have secure borders.

SIBLING VISAS

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

Ms. CHU. Twenty-four years, a quarter century. Imagine not being able to

see your brother or sister for 24 years. That's how long our sibling visa backlogs can be right now in our broken immigration system.

The Senate immigration bill does many good things to fix this broken system and reduces the backlog of family visas. This means that all those families who have been waiting for so many years can finally be reunited. But for the future it gets rid of the sibling category entirely.

What this means is that if someone immigrates here and becomes a citizen, she can petition for her parents to come in short order; but because this bill gets rid of the sibling category, the 22-year-old brother with Down syndrome would have to be left behind to be all by himself. That's not right.

Fixing our broken immigration system is so important. But let's make sure that immediate family members can be reunited.

RAISING AWARENESS ABOUT THE ATROCITIES COMMITTED BY KERMIT GOSNELL

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

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to raise awareness about the grave atrocities committed by Kermit Gosnell against innocent lives at his Philadelphia abortion clinic. Witnesses called the clinic a ''house of horrors'' and described a procedure known as ''snipping,'' in which the backs of babies' necks are cut with scissors to ''ensure fetal demise.''

Abortion clinics across our Nation take the lives of 1.2 million babies every year. This is murder, and it must be stopped. We have the responsibility to protect the unborn, as well as the sanctity of all innocent human life.

These wholesale murder clinics continue to take innocent lives. The prosecution of Kermit Gosnell is a positive step toward stopping our Nation's slide toward unrestricted abortions.

CLIMATE CHANGE SOLUTIONS

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

Mr. HUFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, across this country, we are seeing the ruinous effects of climate change, from more powerful storms in the East, to persistent drought and catastrophic wildfires in the West.

We are not powerless in the face of this threat. We know what we have to do: slow our emissions of greenhouse gases, deploy clean energy solutions.

But we also must do another thing. We must manage our forest lands to be part of the solution instead of part of the problem. Healthy forests can actually help remove carbon dioxide from the environment, from the atmosphere.

We sometimes hear about technologies that, in the future, may be able to do this, may be able to capture and store carbon dioxide; but we have natural infrastructure that can do it right now. And a great example of that is from my own district in California, the Pacific Forest Trust.

They've been working for over 20 years with landowners, as well as local, State and Federal officials, to conserve and manage forests to capture carbon. Their work with forest conservation easements is paying off for wildlife, for landowners, and also for our climate.

Their Van Eck forest in Humboldt County was the first forest emissions reduction project registered under California's climate change law.

PLAYING POLITICS WITH THE SEQUESTER

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

Mr. BUCSHON. Mr. Speaker, I'm here to comment on the administration playing politics in an attempt to maximize the impact of his sequester on the American people and, in this case, the aviation system and the traveling public.

The FAA's operating budget has grown by nearly 110 percent, more than double in the last 17 years, as domestic flights are down 27 percent. The FAA's share of the sequester represents $600 million of their $16 billion annual budget, about 5 percent.

Does anyone out there believe a Federal Government bureaucracy can't find this level of savings without affecting the American people? Well, I don't.

Rather than furloughing air traffic controllers to make a political point, the FAA should cut wasteful and unnecessary spending.

Mr. Speaker, these cuts should not significantly impact the aviation system, but the administration is failing to show leadership and is trying to score political points.

RECOGNITION OF NATIONAL MINORITY HEALTH MONTH

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

Mr. BERA of California. Mr. Speaker, I have the pleasure of being cochair of the Congressional Asian Pacific American Caucus on Healthcare with my colleague from California, Representative BARBARA LEE, who happens to be here in the Chamber as well.

I'd like to take this opportunity to recognize National Minority Health Month. Despite medical advances that save many lives in our country, there's been limited progress in ending the racial and ethnic disparities in health.

Groups like Asian Americans, Native Hawaiians, and Pacific Islanders have higher rates of diabetes, certain types of cancer and obesity, conditions that are expensive to treat and have lasting consequences.

In my district of Sacramento County, we have a large Hmong population. Some cancer rates in the Hmong are 16 times higher than in the White population, and their cancer is much more likely to be diagnosed at a later stage.

That's one reason why this month I introduced the bipartisan resolution recognizing National Minority Cancer Awareness Week with my colleague, Representative RODNEY DAVIS. We must invest in research, innovation, and diagnosis to end this disparity. I celebrate National Minority Health Month.

HONORING MONTANA'S WORLD WAR II VETERANS

(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, I rise today to recognize the 86 Montana World War II veterans who recently made their way to Washington, D.C., as part of the Big Sky Honor Flight. I'm so proud that the Honor Flight program exists, and I'm deeply thankful to all the volunteers that made this possible.

As the son of a U.S. Marine, I have a deep appreciation for the sacrifices our veterans have made in service to our Nation. But I was struck by something that one of our Montana World War II vets said while sitting before the World War II monument just this past Monday. He said this: ''At the end of my life, I look around this memorial and I see the power of this Nation.''

It's true. The monuments that line our National Mall do remind us of the strength and perseverance of the United States.

But, Mr. Speaker, I look at our veterans and our servicemembers, from the members of the Greatest Generation to the men and women serving our Nation today, and in them I see the power of this Nation, founded in a commitment to freedom and an unwavering dedication to service.

□ 1230

IN OPPOSITION TO THE FULL FAITH AND CREDIT ACT

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

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, today I rise in opposition to the Full Faith and Credit Act, H.R. 807. This bill would allow the Secretary of the Treasury to take all necessary actions to ensure U.S. public debt obligations are paid when due and allows the Secretary to forego obligations not related to public debt. What this means, essentially, is all foreign debt will take precedence over repaying important domestic programs, such as Social Security. We should pass legislation that Social Security be paid for first, not

the foreign debt. Social Security is not contributing one penny to our national debt. We must remember that it's one of the most important commitments that America has made to its citizens.

The U.S. Government has purchased credit known as ''special obligations'' from Social Security. The credits are backed by ''the full faith and credit of the U.S. Government,'' with the promise to redeem these credits. I support repaying the Social Security trust fund before any other debt is paid. Pay Social Security first before we pay other countries.

REPEALING HEALTH CARE LAW

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

Mr. WESTMORELAND. Mr. Speaker, it was 3 years ago when President Obama and congressional Democrats pushed through their government takeover of health care. In those 3 short years, the law has already cost the American people over $2 trillion and has raised taxes another $1 trillion—and the law isn't even fully enacted yet. And what do we have to show for it? Higher government spending, higher taxes, higher deficits, higher health insurance premiums, and a lower quality of health care.

Companies all over the country are being forced to cut costs by laying off current employees or cutting their hours, putting on hold hiring new employees, and halting expansion. That is bad for American workers and bad for our economy.

House Republicans are committed to defunding, delaying, and dismembering ObamaCare and will continue to fight for the American people to get rid of this terrible law and replace it with real reforms that will make our health care stronger. As one senior Democratic Senator said, ObamaCare is a ''train wreck.''

FUNDING THE NATIONAL INSTITUTES OF HEALTH

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

Mr. COHEN. Many people have been concerned about the sequester and the effects it has had on airplane flights. And I am, too. People are delayed a half hour, an hour, or whatever, and that's bad. But the biggest thing people ought to be upset about the sequester is the fact that it takes $1.6 billion out of the National Institutes of Health.

Mr. Speaker, each person in this room at one time will face a rendezvous with destiny. Whether that rendezvous is cancer, heart disease, stroke, Alzheimer's, AIDS, diabetes, or Parkinson's, the National Institutes of Health is working for cures and treatments. By taking $1.6 billion from what is our personal Department of Defense, we are going to put certain people at risk for death and for trauma. That is wrong. There is no more important funding that we do than the National Institutes of Health. That's our opportunity to save people's lives.

I will introduce a bill to take that funding out of the sequester. I ask my colleagues in a bipartisan manner to put the people first. The real enemy is disease. Fund the National Institutes of Health fully.

ENOUGH IS ENOUGH

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

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, the greatest amount of opportunity, the greatest amount of success for the greatest number of people—ensuring that the American Dream lives for all—that's what we want. That's our goal. And our constituents know that the path to that goal demands real solutions.

Sadly, all we hear from the President and the other side is to just stay the course. More failed policies, more debt, more taxes, less American energy, more government control of health care, more dependency on government, less economic growth. That's their plan. And it simply isn't working for American families.

And now the President is forcing air travel delays, blaming the action on the sequester. The FAA is spending right now exactly what it spent in 2010. So these are Obama flight delays. The truth is that any spending reduction at the FAA could easily be gained by cutting waste, not necessary services.

President Obama, stop playing politics with the American people. We in Congress are used to it, but the public doesn't deserve it. Enough is enough.

CONGRATULATING OAK PARK UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT

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

Ms. BROWNLEY of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate one of Ventura County's most distinguished school districts, Oak Park Unified School District, for winning the Sustainability Award from the U.S. Department of Education. Oak Park Unified was one of just 14 school districts in the entire Nation to receive this award, which recognizes schools and school districts for their exemplary efforts in reducing energy usage, promoting better health care, and providing better quality environmental education to their students.

Oak Park Unified Elementary School students are taking produce from their school garden and greenhouse to a local free clinic where they explain the impacts of diabetes to their patients and how to grow and enjoy healthy foods. Last year, another team of students sponsored the district-wide Week of Whales and won the Presidential Environmental Youth Award.

I am so honored to represent the Oak Park Unified School District and am proud of their dedication to sustainability and to protecting the environment.

NATIONAL SEXUAL ASSAULT AWARENESS AND PREVENTION MONTH AND NATIONAL DNA DAY

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

Mr. PEARCE. Mr. Speaker, April is National Sexual Assault Awareness and Prevention Month. In fact, today is National DNA Day, where we commemorate the discovery of DNA's double helix and the subsequent scientific advancements.

DNA has revolutionized public safety and criminal justice in this country. It helps solve unsolved crimes. Since its inception in 1994, the DNA database system has solved more than 200,000 cold cases that provided closure to over 200,000 families. It assists prosecutors in taking criminals off the streets. It also exonerates the innocent, having freed more than 300 convicted criminals.

Katie Sepich was a 22-year-old graduate student at New Mexico State University in my district. In August of 2003, she was brutally raped, burned, strangled to death, and abandoned at a dumpsite. But Katie Sepich was a fighter, having the DNA of her offender under her fingernails. Through DNA, they were able to find and convict her offender and put him in jail.

The bill, which was signed into law here in this Congress last year, helps the State collect evidence. DNA has transformed our justice system and provided closure for families.

FLOODING IN ILLINOIS

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

Mrs. BUSTOS. I rise today to talk about the recent flooding that has impacted families across my region. From Rockford to the Quad Cities to Peoria, Illinois, and in so many towns in between, communities large and small are suffering due to this month's record flooding. Among the worst hit areas of my region is London Mills, which is in the far southern part of my congressional district. Many there are suffering.

Amanda Franklin of London Mills lost her home, many of her possessions, and even her children's drawings that she has held onto since they were in kindergarten.

Bethene Weber, who is 78 years old, lost her home of almost half a century to the flooding.

There are far too many heartbreaking stories from across my region.

While keeping in mind those who are still recovering, I'd like to thank the first responders, the relief workers, and others who have volunteered their time and their energy to help those in need. Illinoisans are generous and compassionate, as well as resilient and hardworking. I have no doubt we will recover from this flooding. But, Mr. Speaker, this type of disaster could happen anywhere. As we continue to debate the issues of the day, I call on all of us to keep in mind the people who are suffering and be there for them in their time of need.

□ 1240

OUTRAGE OVER AIR TRAFFIC CONTROL FURLOUGH

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

Mr. GIBBS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today, as I am outraged by the actions that this White House is putting on the American public, unnecessary hardship in their furloughing of air traffic controllers. This is not necessary.

Out of a $10 billion operating budget, they have almost $3 billion of nonpersonnel operation costs that they can make cuts there first. It would include $500 million for consultants, $325 million for supplies and travel, and $143 million to address their 46 fleet of aircraft. Aircraft travel in this time period is down 27 percent. This is unnecessary.

Today we hear reports of air traffic controllers reporting that they've been instructed by management to make it as tough as possible on the traveling public. This is nothing but political rhetoric to gain and put pressure on the Congress to pass more tax increases. I think it's a despicable attitude for this White House, and we should address it with the American public. It's despicable and it's outrageous.

MINORITY HEALTH MONTH

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

Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD. Mr. Speaker, on behalf of Congresswoman LEE and myself, I rise to commemorate April as the 13th annual Minority Health Month.

Before 2001, there was no national conversation about health disparities. Since then, the Congressional Tri-Caucus has been tireless in efforts to educate Congress and the country about the disproportionate burden of premature death and preventable illness in our minority communities.

Due to the advocacy of the Tri-Caucus, the ACA contained groundbreaking policies to reduce disparities, such as expanding Medicaid eligibility, increasing resources for community health clinics, and institutionalizing Federal efforts to achieve health equity.

In spite of these important advancements, more must be done. It is critical to adequately fund proven health equity programs and pass the next steps of the Tri-Caucus Health Equity bill, which, on behalf of the Tri-Caucus, I will introduce this fall.

Health justice will be achieved when every man, woman, and child in America has an equal opportunity to live a healthy life, regardless of who they are or where they live.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE

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

APRIL 25, 2013.

Hon. JOHN A. BOEHNER,
The Speaker, The Capitol, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Pursuant to the permission granted in Clause 2(h) of rule II of the Rules of the U.S. House of Representatives, the Clerk received the following message from the Secretary of the Senate on April 25, 2013 at 9:15 a.m.:

Appointments:

Advisory Committee on the Records of Congress.

National Advisory Committee on Institutional Quality and Integrity.

With best wishes, I am

Sincerely,

KAREN L. HAAS,
Clerk.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 527, RESPONSIBLE HELIUM ADMINISTRATION AND STEWARDSHIP ACT

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 178 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 178

Resolved, That at any time after the adoption of this resolution the Speaker may, 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. 527) to amend the Helium Act to complete the privatization of the Federal helium reserve in a competitive market fashion that ensures stability in the helium markets while protecting the interests of American taxpayers, 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 Natural Resources. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. In lieu of the amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on Natural Resources now printed in the bill, it shall be in order to consider as an original bill for the purpose of amendment under the five-minute rule an amendment in the nature of a substitute consisting of the text of Rules Committee Print 113-9. That amendment in the nature of a substitute shall be considered as read. All points of order against that amendment in the nature of a substitute are waived. No amendment to that amendment in the nature of a substitute shall be in order except those printed in the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution. Each such amendment may be offered only in the order printed in the report, may be offered only by a Member designated in the report, shall be considered as read, shall be debatable for the time specified in the report equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question in the House or in the Committee of the Whole. All points of order against such amendments 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. Any Member may demand a separate vote in the House on any amendment adopted in the Committee of the Whole to the bill or to the amendment in the nature of a substitute made in order as original text. 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.

SEC. 2. On any legislative day during the period from April 27, 2013, through May 3, 2013—

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

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

SEC. 3. The Speaker may appoint Members to perform the duties of the Chair for the duration of the period addressed by section 2 of this resolution as though under clause 8(a) of rule I.

SEC. 4. The Committee on Education and the Workforce may, at any time before 5 p.m. on Tuesday, April 30, 2013, file a report to accompany H.R. 1406.

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

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

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. I further ask that all Members have 5 legislative days during which they may revise and extend their remarks.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. This resolution provides a structured rule for the consideration of H.R. 527, the Responsible Helium Administration and Stewardship Act. It makes several amendments in order, which were compliant with the rules of this House. In fact, four of the five amendments suggested to the Rules Committee will be presented.

The only one that was rejected is one that was duplicative of one that was added in here. So everything that the Members cared enough about to file in an appropriate way have been accommodated for the discussion we will have be having today on this particular bill. It provides for 1 hour of general debate, with 30 minutes equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Natural Resources. It's a very fair and good rule.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to stand before the House today in support of this rule and the underlying piece of legislation, H.R. 527, the Responsible Helium Administration and Stewardship Act, as opposed to the irresponsible helium administration and stewardship act one could assume coming from the other body.

The underlying legislation is a bipartisan bill and enjoys a broad base of support on both sides of the aisle, including the sponsor, the chairman of the Natural Resources Committee, Mr. HASTINGS of Washington, and the Natural Resources Committee ranking member, Mr. MARKEY. In fact, H.R. 527 was favorably reported out of the Committee on Natural Resources on February 14 on a voice vote, and there were no dissenting votes.

I'd like to thank the chairman of the Natural Resources Committee, the gentleman from Washington (Mr. HASTINGS), for his work on this commonsense bill and approach.

Mr. Speaker, helium is an essential and vital element and a commodity that we all depend on in countless ways. It's used widely in the scientific community, but also in the health care industry. It's vital to the proper functioning of MRI equipment in hospitals. It's vital in the production of electronics, such as microchips and superconductors. Helium is essential for science. It's essential for our NASA space program. Helium is a byproduct of natural gas production.

In short, we have heard from people for a long time that what Congress needs to do is come together and work in a bipartisan way, find a compromise and present a solution that can actually solve some of the problems we're facing. This is exactly what this particular bill does do.

□ 1250

This is exactly what this particular bill does do.

The leadership, both Republicans and Democrats on the committee, have crafted a bill in which they have come together and presented a compromise. We should be happy with this day. We should be celebrating this particular bill on the floor because it's a perfect example of government done right.

When an elderly lady will call my district office and complain that her Social Security check has not arrived, the most important issue of government to her is her Social Security check. To me and my staff, the most important issue of government for us should be getting her Social Security check. I do not have the arrogance to try and tell her that, look, take the broad view of government, your issue is so small in conjunction to everything we're doing, it should be ignored until we do something more complicated first. No. You find the problem and you solve that particular problem.

This is one of the situations we have here today. The concept of helium is a potential problem if we don't change the law that regulates it. It will affect people in the manufacturing sector and in the health care sector. It will hurt real people.

What we should celebrate is the fact that today Republicans and Democrats have come together and done what the people have requested and found a problem and suggested a good, commonsense solution to a problem in a rational and reasonable way. That is what we have before us today, Mr. Speaker.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MCGOVERN. I want to thank the gentleman from Utah (Mr. BISHOP) for yielding me the customary 30 minutes, and yield myself such time as I may consume.

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

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I want to begin by thanking the majority for bringing up a bipartisan bill. It's not often that this majority works in a bipartisan way on legislation. In fact, it's a rarity. But, in this case, Chairman HASTINGS worked with Ranking Member MARKEY to produce a bill that should pass the House with very, very little opposition.

In fact, we have a streamlined process here in the House for noncontroversial bills like this. It's called the suspension calendar. This is a perfect bill for the suspension calendar. We could be done with this bill in 40 minutes. We could debate, vote, and send it to the Senate so they could send it to the President.

But, instead, the majority is stretching this bill out over 2 days—2 days, Mr. Speaker, to consider a bill that isn't controversial and will pass overwhelmingly, 2 days to consider this bill when there are so many other urgent challenges that this majority continues to ignore, 2 days on the Responsible Helium Administration and Stewardship Act. That's a lot of hot air even for this House. So while we're spending a ridiculous amount of time on this bill, the Republican majority continues to ignore the economy.

The gentleman from Utah is right when he says that this could potentially be a problem if we don't address this issue of helium, but that's not until the end of the fiscal year. We have some major problems right now this very second that the majority of this House continues to ignore, challenges that impact our constituencies all over this country.

This sequester that my friends on the other side embraced is still going into effect. We've already seen cuts to programs like Meals on Wheels and on food pantries and WIC recipients and Head Start facilities, just to name a few.

I would like to enter into the RECORD, Mr. Speaker, a news item that appeared on a Fox affiliate out in Utah entitled, ''Sequestration forces food pantry closure.''

We started hearing reports about airport delays because of the sequester's impact on the FAA. And I really got a kick out of my Republican colleagues coming down here kind of expressing their astonishment that there were airport delays as a result of sequestration. They actually had the temerity to complain about those delays.

I asked my friends on the other side of the aisle: What did you think would happen when you voted for unnecessary, arbitrary, senseless across-the-board cuts? My Republican friends remind me of Claude Rains in ''Casablanca.'' They are shocked—shocked—that voting to slash funding for air traffic controllers would result in their flights being delayed.

Well, I want my friends to understand one thing. There are consequences to their actions. There are consequences to the sequestration.

The truth, Mr. Speaker, is that deficit reduction is an important goal, but deficit reduction alone is not an economic policy. We know that mindless austerity budget cuts like this stupid sequester are not going to help our economy grow and help people get jobs and help get our economy back on the kind of footing we all want it to be on.

When Bill Clinton was President, when he rescued the economy in the 1990s, he did so through job creation, investing in our economy. We expanded the tax base by increasing the workforce, bringing more revenue into the Federal Government and thereby reducing the deficit.

And here's the funny thing. Despite the apocalyptic gloom and doom of some on the other side of the aisle, believe it or not, the deficit is actually shrinking faster than expected. And the best thing we can do is to help speed up that process by investing in our people and creating jobs. We should be promoting growth through infrastructure projects and job-training programs. We should be creating long-term demand through research and development, not cutting the National Institutes of Health's research budget, not cutting the National Science Foundation. We should be supporting these areas that create innovation and opportunity. We should be investing in our young people, preparing our students for the 21st century economy, but we're not doing any of that today—any of that today.

And, yes, the bill before us that we're dealing with right now is fine, no problems. Yes, Republicans and Democrats worked together on this in a way that

is sadly uncommon for this current Congress, but we aren't doing enough to solve our biggest problems.

Tomorrow, when we adjourn after this overlong debate on this helium bill, we're going to take another week off—the sixth week of recess that this House of Representatives has taken since January—the sixth weeklong recess with all that's going on. With all of the difficulty that people all across this country are dealing with because of the sequestration, we're taking another week off.

Mr. Speaker, I think we should do more, we can do more, we must do more, and we certainly can do better. So while I have no problem with this bill, and while, if we don't deal with this helium issue come the end of the fiscal year there may be a problem, we'll deal with it fast enough. Right now there are urgent issues that we need to face, not just airline delays. There are people in this country who have fallen through the cracks. There are people in this country struggling who are seeing their benefits slashed because of the sequestration. There are research facilities all across this country that are terminating important medical research programs because of the sequestration. We ought to deal with that.

And one other thing, Mr. Speaker. My friends on the other side of the aisle a few weeks ago made a big hooha and sent all kinds of press releases about how they were going to force the House and the Senate to pass budgets, otherwise we would lose our salaries.

Well, the House passed a budget, a lousy budget, but the House passed a budget. The Senate passed a budget, as well. So you have two budgets. Why doesn't the House move to go to conference? Why aren't we trying to reconcile the differences between the House and the Senate to try to get our budgetary situation under control? We're not doing that. We're not doing anything, quite frankly, that we need to do at this moment.

So I would urge my colleagues, this is a fine bill, vote for it, bipartisan support. Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. MARKEY, it's all good, but we're spending 2 days on this? Give me a break.

I reserve the balance of my time.

[From fox13now.com, Mar. 29, 2013]

SEQUESTRATION FORCES FOOD PANTRY CLOSURE

(By Zach Whitney)

MURRAY, UT.—For months, the threat of sequestration has had organizations tightening their budgets. But as those federal cuts take effect, it appears those in need are taking the biggest hit.

Salt Lake Community Action Program closed its Murray food pantry last week. The food pantry was one of five locations that serve over 1,000 people every month. Now those people will have to go somewhere else, with even less to go around.

''The potential is for a perfect storm where there's less help available and it's harder for people to get by,'' says Crossroads Urban Center Executive Director Glenn Bailey.

Crossroads Urban Center relies on private donations for funding, but says they're prepared for a potential increase in traffic as sequestration cuts begin to impact other parts of the valley.

''There's a lot of uncertainty as far as groups that have something to do with providing a social safety net,'' says Bailey. ''That certainly includes food pantries. Particularly if they have significant government funding.''

The closure of the SLCAP food pantry in Murray is a big hole in that safety net. Neighborhood Pantry Manager Mary Anderson says the federal cuts left them little choice.

''The pantries have had to take a 10 percent budget cut,'' Anderson says. ''We operate on Community Development Federal Block Grants, which are government programs.''

Customers from the Murray pantry are being diverted to SLCAP's pantry on Redwood Road. But Anderson says it's a big inconvenience for a group of people who are already struggling.

''The need has been increasing a lot,'' says Anderson. ''Over 200% [in the past five years]. But also our other programs.''

Anderson says the organization's Head Start program has also taken a significant cut due to sequestration. Affordable housing programs are another on the chopping block. Bailey says that perpetuates the problem, since those are typically the people who also rely on the food pantry.

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

I wish to thank the gentleman from Massachusetts for his kind words about the process that we are doing here. It is nice to be complimented on a bill which we have done correctly and done right. I would suggest, though, that it is wise of us to actually bring it here to the floor, rather than put it on a suspension calendar.

There were several Representatives that wished to have a chance to speak to this and amend it. We are dealing with amendments to this particular bill, which is, once again, why you bring it to the floor, otherwise they would be closed from that process.

□ 1300

I also appreciate his comments about sequestration. I am very happy that he mentioned that because, not only did I vote against the original law that established it, but I voted twice for solutions to it well before sequestration was ever established. Both of those bills passed in a bipartisan way and were sent over to the Senate. The Senate responded by doing nothing, which is typical of a lot of things that simply happen around this place.

In 1925, when the issue of helium was first addressed by Congress, we made a mistake. The idea at the time was that dirigibles would be the source of aviation for the future, and therefore helium was extremely successful. It's not the first time we've been wrong. The fact that we have steps leading out the east side of this Capitol Building, going in that direction, is because, when this was originally laid out and established and built, everyone knew that Washington, D.C., would grow to the east. We've been wrong from the very inception of this governmental city. But in 1925, the Federal Government enacted legislation which created a Federal Helium Reserve, and the Federal Government basically has had a monopoly on the helium market ever since.

After World War II, the demand for helium increased dramatically, so Congress passed the Helium Act in 1960 to provide incentives for the private natural gas industry to strip helium from its natural gas wells and sell it to the government, which then placed it in the Federal Helium Reserve, eventually leading to a supply large enough to supply all of the U.S. Federal and domestic needs as well as the ability to sell some overseas. The 1960 legislation required that the Federal Government set prices on the sale of helium, which would cover the costs of the Federal Government for its purchase and storage.

Since the 1990s, the Federal demand for helium has dropped significantly while the private demand has increased. So, in 1996, Congress passed the Helium Privatization Act, which was intended to lead to the phasing out of the Federal role in helium production and storage with a view towards allowing market forces to work within the private sector for its production and reducing the cost to the Federal Government. The 1996 law required the government to price helium, not on market prices, but only on the minimum price necessary to recover $1.3 billion in Federal debt that was incurred to build this helium reserve.

The Federal Government will be able to pay off that $1.3 billion debt sooner than was anticipated—another cause for celebration. That doesn't happen very often in this government either; but unless the particular law we have on the books now is amended, it will close the reserve, leaving no new domestic sources of helium. The industry would be forced to look overseas to such producers as Algeria and Qatar and Russia to fill their needs.

In essence, if we do not deal with this particular bill, there will be a harm that will impact real people. I'm sorry that fixing this harm is not good enough for some, but it is something that needs to be done, and it needs to be done in an open way, which will allow us to discuss some amendments people wish to present towards this particular bill.

The National Academy of Sciences issued a report in 2010 which addressed this issue, as did the General Accounting Office. H.R. 527 is based largely upon the recommendations of these reports, and it makes revisions to the law to continue the effort to divest the Federal Government from its current role as a monopoly on helium production in an orderly, three-phased process. A new approach will better incorporate market forces into the production and the sale of helium, and it will ensure the future supply of helium to the Federal Government and to private users; and it will ensure that it will not be interrupted.

It is important that Congress take a proactive step through the passage of this legislation in order to avoid disruptions in our helium supplies worldwide; and it would have, if we did not, a far-reaching negative consequence. This legislation is a model of how important bipartisan legislation which addresses real issues and real problems for real people can, indeed, be achieved in Congress. It's a good bill and a fair rule.

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

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

I would just like to remind my colleagues that, again, as we are debating this bill—which I'm not saying we shouldn't pass—even with all of the amendments, we could probably spend, maybe, a total of an hour on this bill and get all of those things taken care of. I have no problem with passing the bill.

What I do have a problem with is the fact that this Republican majority continues to ignore the economy. This Republican majority continues to ignore the very, very harsh consequences of the sequestration that they thrust upon this country, that they voted for, that they will not allow us to bring up an alternative to fix.

I want to read for my colleagues and insert into the RECORD an article that appeared in The Washington Post on April 3. It's entitled, ''Cancer Clinics are Turning Away Thousands of Medicare Patients. Blame the Sequester.''

It reads:

Cancer clinics across the country have begun turning away thousands of Medicare patients, blaming the sequester budget cuts.

Oncologists say the reduced funding, which took effect for Medicare care on April 1, makes it impossible to administer expensive chemotherapy drugs while staying afloat financially. Patients at these clinics would need to seek treatment elsewhere, such as at hospitals that might not have the capacity to accommodate them.

When the gentleman says that he's sorry that this helium bill isn't good enough for some, he's right. It isn't good enough for me. It isn't good enough for the majority of people on my side of the aisle who believe that we ought to be fixing this problem that many cancer patients are facing right now, that we ought to be fixing the problem of the delays in our airlines, that we ought to be fixing the problems of these budget cuts to programs like WIC—that's the Women, Infants, and Children program—and food banks. I could go right down the list.

So there are urgent things for us to do, not to spend 2 days on helium—that is totally unnecessary—and then take another week off, to adjourn for another week, while all of these cuts continue to go into effect, these cuts which have a really nasty and negative effect on our economy. We ought to be doing our job here, not kicking the can down the road.

[From the Washington Post, Apr. 3, 2013]

CANCER CLINICS ARE TURNING AWAY THOUSANDS OF MEDICARE PATIENTS. BLAME THE SEQUESTER.

(By Sarah Kliff)

Cancer clinics across the country have begun turning away thousands of Medicare patients, blaming the sequester budget cuts.

Oncologists say the reduced funding, which took effect for Medicare on April 1, makes it impossible to administer expensive chemotherapy drugs while staying afloat financially.

Patients at these clinics would need to seek treatment elsewhere, such as at hospitals that might not have the capacity to accommodate them.

''If we treated the patients receiving the most expensive drugs, we'd be out of business in six months to a year,'' said Jeff Vacirca, chief executive of North Shore Hematology Oncology Associates in New York. ''The drugs we're going to lose money on we're not going to administer right now.''

After an emergency meeting Tuesday, Vacirca's clinics decided that they would no longer see one-third of their 16,000 Medicare patients.

''A lot of us are in disbelief that this is happening,'' he said. ''It's a choice between seeing these patients and staying in business.''

Some who have been pushing the federal government to spend less on health care say this is not the right approach.

''I don't think there was an intention to disrupt care or move it into a more expensive setting,'' said Cathy Schoen, senior vice president of the Commonwealth Fund, which recently released a plan for cutting $2 trillion in health spending. ''If that's the case, we're being penny-wise and a pound-foolish with these cuts.''

Legislators meant to partially shield Medicare from the automatic budget cuts triggered by the sequester, limiting the program to a 2 percent reduction—a fraction of the cuts seen by other federal programs.

But oncologists say the cut is unexpectedly damaging for cancer patients because of the way those treatments are covered.

Medications for seniors are usually covered under the optional Medicare Part D, which includes private insurance. But because cancer drugs must be administered by a physician, they are among a handful of pharmaceuticals paid for by Part B, which covers doctor visits and is subject to the sequester cut.

The federal government typically pays community oncologists for the average sales price of a chemotherapy drug, plus 6 percent to cover the cost of storing and administering the medication.

Since oncologists cannot change the drug prices, they argue that the entire 2 percent cut will have to come out of that 6 percent overhead. That would make it more akin to a double-digit pay cut.

''If you get cut on the service side, you can either absorb it or make do with fewer nurses,'' said Ted Okon, director of the Community Oncology Alliance, which advocates for hundreds of cancer clinics nationwide. ''This is a drug that we're purchasing. The costs don't change and you can't do without it. There isn't really wiggle room.''

Okon's group has sent letters to legislators urging them to exempt cancer drugs from the sequester or, as a back-up, only shave 2 percent off the money they receive to administer the medications.

Doctors at the Charleston Cancer Center in South Carolina began informing patients weeks ago that, due to the sequester cuts, they would soon need to seek treatment elsewhere.

''We don't sugar-coat things, we're cancer doctors,'' Charles Holladay, a doctor at the clinic, said. ''We tell them that if we don't go this course, it's just a matter of time before we go out of business.''

Cancer patients turned away from local oncology clinics may seek care at hospitals, which also deliver chemotherapy treatments.

The care will likely be more expensive: One study from actuarial firm Milliman found that chemotherapy delivered in a hospital setting costs the federal government an average of $6,500 more annually than care delivered in a community clinic.

Those costs can trickle down to patients, who are responsible for picking up a certain amount of the medical bills. Milliman found that Medicare patients ended up with an average of $650 more in out-of-pocket costs when they were seen only in a hospital setting.

It is still unclear whether hospitals have the capacity to absorb these patients. The same Milliman report found that the majority of Medicare patients—66 percent—receive treatment in a community oncology clinic, instead of a hospital.

Non-profit hospitals will likely have an easier time bearing the brunt of the sequester cuts. A federal program known as 340B requires pharmaceutical companies to give double-digit discounts to hospitals that treat low-income and uninsured patients.

Eastern Connecticut Health Network began preparing for additional volume after a local oncology practice sent out notice that it would stop seeing certain cancer patients.

''What we're trying to do in the hospital is prepare for this,'' ECHN spokesman Eric Berthel said. ''We're making sure we have access to the pharmaceutical companies and that we have appropriate staff on hand. We're hoping the oncology practice will be successful in renegotiating this. It's so fresh, so we're pretty unsure.''

Some cancer clinics are counting on the federal government to provide relief, and continuing to see patients they expect to lose money on.

''We're hoping that something will change, as legislators see the impact of this,'' Ralph Boccia, director of the Center for Cancer and Blood Disorders in Bethesda, Md., said. ''I don't think we could keep going, without a change, for more than a couple of months.''

An analysis prepared by his clinic estimates that, if the full 2 percent cut takes effect, between 50 and 70 percent of the drugs it administers would become money losers.

Boccia estimates that 55 percent of his patients are covered by Medicare, making any changes to reimbursement rates difficult to weather.

''When I look at the numbers, they don't add up,'' he said. ''Business 101 says we can't stay open if we don't cover our costs.''

At this point, I yield 3 minutes to the ranking member of the Committee on Natural Resources' Subcommittee on Energy and Mineral Resources, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. HOLT).

Mr. HOLT. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend from Massachusetts, a superb Member of Congress, Mr. MCGOVERN. I join him in saying that this legislation represents an unwarranted delay on what should be a noncontroversial piece of legislation.

H.R. 527 is a bill carefully written by Chairman HASTINGS, in consultation with me and with Ranking Member MARKEY, with Representative FLORES,

and with many individuals and organizations that depend on a reliable, fairly priced supply of helium. Now, most Americans give no thought to our supply of helium; but a reliable supply of helium is essential for health care imaging, for electronics manufacturing, and for many, many other activities important to Americans today and in the future.

In line with the recommendations of the National Academy of Sciences, which my friend from Utah mentioned, the bill succeeds in averting a global helium crisis that would result from the closure of the Federal Helium Reserve at the end of this fiscal year. The bill also fixes the mechanism for helium pricing so that we can now provide a fair market price to users and a positive return to taxpayers. So I support the bipartisan agreement represented here in H.R. 527.

Yet by bringing this legislation to the floor under a rule, which is really not necessary, with amendments and by scheduling a debate today, which will end, maybe, an hour or two from now—and amendments tomorrow, which will take an hour or so, stretched over 2 days—the leadership has created a deliberate, irresponsible delay. We could have dispensed with this in 10 minutes. My colleague said 60 minutes—okay. Let's be generous—60 minutes—but we could have dispensed with this.

Instead, we spend 2 days on this, and in the 2 days we spend on this, we are not considering legislation to create jobs, to provide education and training for workers, to consider a conference on the budget resolutions of the House and the Senate, or legislation to undo the sequester imposed by the Republican majority and now affecting airport delays and Head Start limitations and lost food inspections and delayed medical research and so many other things. The bill could have been considered and adopted under a suspension of the rules, but instead we are here debating a rule.

It's an important issue. We've proposed a workable solution. There is no controversy that I know of on this, so let's pass H.R. 527 without delay and get on to all of these other issues. It's not as if there aren't important problems facing this country.

□ 1310

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

I appreciate the words that were given by the gentleman from New Jersey. He is far too modest. You are a cosponsor of this bill. It's a good bill. It was worked out well. This is not an unwarranted delay bill. This is an important bill that solves problems for real people.

Once again, even though I think what you have done with your bill is a very good job, there are others in this body who are not on the Natural Resources Committee who would disagree, and that is why they have proposed amendments. The only way to allow those amendments to be discussed on the floor is not through suspension, but going through regular order.

I appreciate also the comments that were made by other speakers as to issues that we're taking. I do take one sense of umbrage at the idea that we're going on a vacation again. I do not know how some people try to view the district work period—to some it may be a vacation, but for me it is not. When I go back to the district, at that time, I'm constantly in meetings and going to places to meet with constituents and find out how the actions and ideas of this body impact real people.

I note just in the history of Congress there occasionally have been Speakers who did not like to allow people to go back and talk to their constituents. You have the opportunity, if you're here all the time, of hiding from constituents and not necessarily having that interface. So, one Speaker, every time that particular Speaker allowed Members to go back and interface with the districts and the constituents in the districts, they always came back with a different opinion that had to be remolded and reshaped.

Some people don't like the idea of actually interfacing. Some people think if we never go back and talk to our constituents, that we're hiding from them. That is why the district work period, to me, is not a vacation. It's not a recess from what we're doing. It's a chance to actually expand what we're doing so when we come back here we make wiser decisions, or at least have a true understanding and implication of what it does and how Congress impacts the real workings that deal with real people. I appreciate that.

I also appreciate, once again, the concepts of sequestration. The gentleman from Massachusetts, I think, makes some nice points about sequestration. I think he's in the wrong spot, though. This body has, numerous times before sequestration went into effect, passed laws to blunt the impact of sequestration to solve the problem. We need to talk to our friends on the other side of this building who refuse to even discuss any of those bills that were passed in this body to solve the problem before it hit. It was a great speech, wrong people. You need to be talking to an element that is a lot more elderly than we are over on this side, and I say that with grey hair.

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

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

Let me respond to my friend from Utah by simply saying that I think going on a week-long recess while people are being furloughed, while cuts in medical research go forward, while we see cuts in programs like WIC and cuts in programs like food banks and scientific research, I think going on recess with all of this happening, quite frankly, is unconscionable. That's running away from our responsibility here in this Congress and running away from our responsibility to our constituents.

The Democrats have had an alternative to sequestration. Mr. VAN HOLLEN has tried on countless occasions to have the Rules Committee allow him the opportunity to bring his alternative to the floor. He's been turned down every single time.

Again, I really appreciated my Republican friends who came down here and were upset about the flight delays. They're upset about the flight delays because, quite frankly, that impacts them directly. What was missing from their outrage were the cuts in WIC, the cuts in food banks, the cuts in medical research and the furloughs. Why aren't they complaining about that as well? Maybe because it doesn't affect them directly.

But I think the idea of leaving here for a week with this sequestration in play is an absolute disgrace, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Mr. Speaker, once again, a nice conversation. We need to have that conversation with my friends in the Senate. We've already sent two bills over there they haven't addressed. I don't know how many more we need to address, but it would be nice if the Senate did something.

With that, I yield as much time as she may consume to the gentlelady from Florida (Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN), a member of the Rules Committee.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. I thank the gentleman for the time.

I so agree with what the gentleman has been discussing, which is the difference between recess and district work period. It is so important for Members of Congress to maintain close attention and close ties with the constituents we so proudly represent. If we don't go back home, if we don't meet with constituents, if we don't talk to the Lions Clubs and the Rotary Clubs and Chambers of Commerce and everyday people who come to our congressional offices every day seeking help and remedy from the bureaucracy of the Federal Government, we would really not know what is going on in our congressional districts.

Many people prefer to move up to D.C., and they get the Beltway fever and they rarely go back home. I think that's the wrong approach. I value the time that we get to be in our district so we can be in touch with our constituents. I'm lucky enough that Miami is not too far from D.C. We have many flights every day, and so I'm able to go home every weekend to be with my constituents. But it's difficult to really plan very much without knowing for sure that you're going to be home for an extended period of time, so I value the district work period.

This Saturday, for example, what is my day like? Well, we have a student award ceremony where we're giving

awards to every student who has gotten good grades, who's had good attendance, who's been most improved throughout the year. Then we'll also be having an art competition at another local school. I'll be meeting with human rights activists who have come from Cuba to talk about the deteriorating human rights condition. We'll be having a get-together with the Dade County Farm Bureau. It's a very extended day that can only be possible when we have these district work periods.

On the issue of sequestration itself, as the gentleman, my colleague on the Rules Committee, has pointed out time and time again, the House has dealt with the sequestration problem not once, but twice. We have passed bills and given them to the Senate. And I agree with the gentleman from Utah when he says it's time for the Senate to do its job. We have sent them the legislation. It's time for them to debate it, send it back to us, and let's have a conference and see on what points we can or cannot agree.

But if we keep passing bill after bill and the Senate just sits on its hands—as it likes to do—and doesn't pass meaningful legislation, doesn't even care to debate it, it's very difficult for us to get ourselves out of this sequestration jam.

We are willing to work with the Senate, and we've made that point very clear. And the way that we deliver that message very clearly is by sending not one, but two bills over to the other body. We would like those bills to be debated, and we would like them to settle on legislation that we can both agree on that will not be a perfect bill, but will address some of the major holes that we have with sequestration, whether it's airport delays—whether they're real or manufactured—whether they're problems of people accessing the social service safety net that we want to provide for the most needy of our constituency.

So I thank the gentleman for the time so that I can highlight that this is not recess, that this is district work period. I don't know how others handle their week at home, but I can tell you I've got a full calendar, and it means working hard for the people in this job that I really hold in such high esteem. I never forget that the people I work for are the people with whom I'm going to meet next week, and those are my constituents, the residents of the 27th District of Florida.

So we can't be successful Members of Congress unless we're in touch with the people we represent. I enjoy that opportunity. Of course, I get to go back to a lovely district like Miami, Florida. But whatever district you represent, it's important to be in touch with our constituents so they can tell us their needs, and then we can come back here and fight so their needs are addressed in legislation like the legislation we sent to the Senate not once, but twice, dealing with these sequestration cuts and the devastating impacts it has on our community.

So I thank the gentleman from Utah for his time. I hope that people understand, especially our constituents understand, the value of district work periods and that it will keep us more attuned to our constituency and better able to address the needs that they are facing each and every day.

We know that those needs are great. There is no way that we're saying, There is no problem with sequestration; this is fine. Nobody is saying that. These are real problems. We need to solve them. We have a plan to do it, and we've done it twice.

So I thank the gentleman for the time, and I will continue to try to work in a bipartisan manner in our Rules Committee, as well as in our Foreign Affairs Committee, to see what we can do to make our Nation safer, to secure our future for the next generation.

I'm proud to have with me here, Madison, a young lady who is from St. Louis, Missouri. Today is Take Our Children to Work Day. Madison is not my child, but she belongs to all of us; and I want to make sure that the future for Madison is a bright future where she doesn't graduate from college with terrible debt, where she has a lot of opportunities available to her, where she knows that every path is available and open to her, that there will be no problem for her, whether she's male or female, what nationality, what religion, what ethnic background. This is the land of opportunity and this is the land of equality. I want that for all of the children of the United States of America. And I think having Madison here with me today is a very important point to say to my colleagues: We want a bright future for Madison. We don't want to have her be shouldering this massive debt that we're piling onto the next generation.

□ 1320

If we continue to be not careful stewards of the taxpayer dollars, that's what we'll be passing off to Madison—insurmountable debt and a huge problem for her as she advances in her career.

So I thank the gentleman from Utah for the opportunity so we can highlight the next generation of Americans, the Madisons, who are going to inherit, we hope, a better society. And if we do our job right, they will be able to inherit that better society.

I thank the gentleman for the time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. WOMACK). Members are advised to not make reference to persons on the floor as guests of the House.

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

I want to thank the gentlelady from Florida for her comments. I appreciate the fact that she has a beautiful district in southern Florida, and I appreciate the fact that she's going to spend her recess going to a student awards ceremony to honor kids who have a good attendance record.

But with all due respect, Mr. Speaker, I think my colleague's time, and in effect all of our time, would be better spent trying to solve the sequestration problem, trying to avoid deep cuts in medical research that will cost jobs, that will delay advancements in medical science, that perhaps could find cures for diseases like Alzheimer's or Parkinson's or diabetes. By the way, if we found a cure for one of those diseases, it would help make Medicare and Medicaid solvent forever and ever and ever. So investment actually does pay off.

I appreciate the fact that she brought a guest on the floor here today, a young student. But I would simply say that the sequestration cuts education. Sequestration actually cuts education. It will be more difficult to fund our schools. It will be more difficult to be able to provide students with the financial aid that they need to go to college because of the sequestration.

So with all due respect about all of the wonderful things that my colleagues will be doing during their recess, it is still a recess. It is a week that we are not dealing with the budget. It is a week we are not dealing with sequestration.

And by the way, I understand that it has become fashionable to blame the Senate for everything, but when it comes to the budget, the House has passed a budget. The Senate has passed a budget. We're waiting for the House to go to conference. So we're going to vote in a little while, and then that's it for the day. We're done. We're done for the day. Why aren't we going to conference with the Senate on a budget? Why are we not doing something meaningful?

So with that, Mr. Speaker, I again respect the itinerary of my colleague from Florida, but I'll tell you, there are lot of workers who are being furloughed who are expecting us to come to some sort of solution so they don't lose a week or a month's pay, which will make it more difficult for them to pay their mortgage and their utility bills, and for their kids. This is urgent, and we're not dealing with it.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. SLAUGHTER), the distinguished ranking member of the Committee on Rules.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise again today, as I have ever since we started this term in January, to talk about the lack of work that this House of Representatives has produced and how absolutely devastating it is to the public and how angry they are that week after week we do absolutely nothing here of any importance.

One-House bills—this week, I think, is a prime example of that. We came in, went into the Rules Committee, put a

rule that we knew would not go to the Senate, and we knew the President would veto it. But we spent time on it until suddenly some groups got very angry about it and said, Well, you'd better not vote for that. It was pulled off the floor yesterday after we'd done the rule. And everybody who voted for the rule is already on record that they wanted that bill to pass. I think that's important. If they were trying to escape making some conservative groups mad, they've done that already.

But FRANK PALLONE, Representative PALLONE from New Jersey, who was managing that bill for the Democrats, got no notice at all that the bill was not going to be taken up, and was standing here almost open-mouthed when he found out he had nothing to do.

Now this bill we have here today could have been done on suspension without any question. There's nothing here—helium. This whole thing is filled with hot air.

And the sequestration—I've said and said as recently as yesterday that Congressman VAN HOLLEN has come to the Rules Committee three times, and four times he has tried to get a bill on the floor which would take away sequestration and would provide all of the money by other means, sensitive ways to cut, that sequestration is going to take. But no, he didn't have a chance to do it.

So now we're going to worry about airplanes, which is important because I live in a district that does not necessarily have the best flight schedules, but I'm also concerned about the cancer patients in this country who are not getting their shots because of sequestration. I'm worried about the at least 70,000 young kids who have been cut out of Head Start because of sequestration.

The answer for us here is to make Van Hollen in order for tomorrow and take away sequestration and follow his bill, and we'll get the same amount of money.

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

Mr. MCGOVERN. I yield an additional 1 minute to the gentlewoman.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Sequestration was an awful thing. The whole idea of it made absolutely no sense. And it was so stupid that I think that most Members in this House really thought they'd never see it; that nobody in here would be dumb enough to do that. Mr. MCGOVERN and I were smart enough to vote against it, weren't we, JIM? So if you voted for it, it's your bill. But let me tell you, we need to get rid of sequestration. We have a chance to do that tomorrow. Obviously for the optics of the thing, we have to stay here and do something because we haven't done anything this whole week. If we're going to do something, make it meaningful. Let's take away sequestration. Let's get people back to work. The people who are on unemployment who are barely making it, poor souls, because they can't find a job because the economy is so bad, are having that cut as well.

We have done enormous harm with this folly, and we have an opportunity to heal it. Let VAN HOLLEN's bill come to the floor tomorrow. In a bipartisan way, let's discuss that with our leadership and your leadership, bring that out here, and bring this thing to a close.

What we're suffering now and what people are seeing now with flight delays is only a small piece of it. Every day it's going to get worse. And we will rue the day we had all of these opportunities with Mr. VAN HOLLEN to get rid of it, and certainly we will rue the day if we don't make it in order for tomorrow when we're apparently trying to make work.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Mr. Speaker, if one needs an MRI, this helium bill is extremely significant. If one needs to use microchips, this helium bill is significant. This bill solves problems of real people. And I recognize that we have other issues that people wish to discuss. That's great. This one is one that we should do now and get it over to the Senate and see if once again the Senate actually will do something, at least on this issue, which has bipartisan support. It's a good bill.

I'm going to reserve the balance of my time, but I'm ready to move on as soon as the other side is.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I'll close, but I would be interested to know whether anybody on the other side can tell me when we might go to conference on the budget? The House has passed a budget. The Senate has passed a budget. I thought the whole point of getting the Senate to pass a budget was to go to conference and try to work out the differences. I don't know whether anybody on the other side of the aisle has any information on when we might go to conference. It's the House's responsibility to ask for a conference. I'm just trying to get a sense. If not today, will it be tomorrow? Surely it won't be next week because we're on break next week. Anybody?

Okay, thank you for that informative answer.

Mr. Speaker, let me close by saying I have no problem with this helium bill. There is value to passing this bill. It doesn't have to be passed today. It could be passed anywhere up until the end of this fiscal year, but I'm fine with passing it today. It's not controversial. This could pass really quickly, but we are stretching it over 2 days for reasons that none of us can quite fathom.

□ 1330

But the problem is not with the helium bill. The problem is with what we're not doing. And as we speak, there are people who are losing their jobs. There are people who are being furloughed. There are cancer patients who are not getting access to their treatments. There are poor women who benefit from the WIC program who are not getting that benefit. There are food banks that are being closed all around this country.

There is medical research that is being curtailed. There is scientific research that is being curtailed, all while we speak. And all this is vitally important to our economy. All this is vitally important to our economy. And yet we're doing nothing. We're doing nothing. We're just going to kind of wait it out.

And what we're saying on this side of the aisle is we ought to do something. We ought to be debating what is urgent right now before the American people, and that is the cuts that are impacting them as a result of sequestration. That's what we should be talking about right now. That's what we should be debating. I don't know why that's such a controversial idea.

But we're not. We're going to do this bill, which is not urgent, and we're going to go home for a week, the sixth week of recess since January, the sixth week of recess.

And, again, I appreciate the fact that we all have busy schedules when we go home—I do as well—but the idea of leaving here while people are being furloughed, while families are being hurt, I just find unconscionable.

And so our complaint is with the fact that we're not addressing the central issue before the American people today, and that is these devastating cuts. And I would like to think that we could get some clue from somebody that, at some point in the near future, we would be able to deal with it.

Just one final point. My friends on the other side of the aisle embrace this idea of sequestration, so my friends own it. I think it's your responsibility to at least provide us the forum to find a way out of it.

I will close by saying, Mr. Speaker, that, again, we have no problem with the helium bill. We could do this in an hour, with all the amendments. That's how noncontroversial it is.

But the idea that we're stretching it over 2 days, and we're not dealing with these devastating cuts and sequestration, I think, is just wrong.

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

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Mr. Speaker, I have enjoyed being held accountable for the Senate's inaction on some of these issues. However, we do have a bill before us that is a good bill, that solves a real problem, and that helps real people. And I promise you that if we use this bill, or if we pass this bill, which has amendments that suggests that there has to be some controversy applied, that if, indeed, we were to pass this bill we would make the desert bloom.

Mr. Speaker, in a moment, I will offer an amendment to the rule. The amendment will provide suspension authority for potential consideration of additional measures prior to the district work period next week where we will be meeting with people.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. BISHOP OF UTAH

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment to the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

At the end of the resolution, add the following:

SEC. 5. It shall be in order at any time through the legislative day of April 26, 2013, for the Speaker to entertain motions that the House suspend the rules as though under clause 1 of rule XV.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time, and I move the previous question on the amendment and on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

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

The amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the resolution, as amended.

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

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 231, nays 177, not voting 24, as follows:

[Roll No. 124]

YEAS—231

Aderholt
Alexander
Amash
Amodei
Bachmann
Bachus
Barber
Barletta
Barr
Benishek
Bentivolio
Bera (CA)
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Bonner
Boustany
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Broun (GA)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Cantor
Capito
Carney
Carter
Cassidy
Chabot
Chaffetz
Coble
Coffman
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Cook
Costa
Cotton
Crawford
Crenshaw
Culberson
Daines
Davis, Rodney
DeFazio
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Duckworth
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellmers
Farenthold
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fleming
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gabbard
Garcia
Gardner
Garrett
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gibson
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Grimm
Guthrie
Hall
Hanna
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings (WA)
Heck (NV)
Herrera Beutler
Holding
Horsford
Hudson
Huelskamp
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
Maffei
Marino
Massie
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul
McClintock
McHenry
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
Meadows
Meehan
Messer
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Mullin
Mulvaney
Murphy (FL)
Murphy (PA)
Neugebauer
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Olson
Owens
Palazzo
Paulsen
Pearce
Perry
Peters (CA)
Petri
Pittenger
Pitts
Poe (TX)
Pompeo
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
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Sinema
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Southerland
Stewart
Stivers
Stockman
Terry
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walorski
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (IN)

NAYS—177

Andrews
Barrow (GA)
Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Bustos
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Cárdenas
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu
Cicilline
Clarke
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Conyers
Cooper
Courtney
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
Deutch
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Enyart
Eshoo
Esty
Farr
Fattah
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Fudge
Gallego
Garamendi
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Hahn
Hanabusa
Hastings (FL)
Heck (WA)
Higgins
Himes
Hinojosa
Holt
Honda
Hoyer
Huffman
Israel
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
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)
Maloney, Carolyn
Maloney, Sean
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McNerney
Meeks
Meng
Michaud
Moore
Moran
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Negrete McLeod
Nolan
O'Rourke
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters (MI)
Peterson
Pingree (ME)
Pocan
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rahall
Rangel
Richmond
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schrader
Schwartz
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Speier
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Titus
Tonko
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watt
Waxman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—24

Barton
Brady (TX)
Burgess
Conaway
Connolly
Cramer
Flores
Granger
Grayson
Hensarling
Johnson (GA)
Lynch
Marchant
Markey
Miller, George
Nunnelee
Polis
Rush
Schneider
Schock
Sessions
Stutzman
Williams
Young (FL)

□ 1356

Ms. CASTOR of Florida and Mrs. NAPOLITANO changed their vote from ''yea'' to ''nay.''

So the resolution, as amended, was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ANNOUNCEMENT OF CLASSIFIED BRIEFING REGARDING SYRIA AND NORTH KOREA

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

Mr. CANTOR. Mr. Speaker, today, the administration has confirmed that the Assad regime in Syria has crossed a dangerous, game-changing red line, using chemical weapons against its own citizens.

The Syrian conflict has raged for many months, and nearly 100,000 Syrian civilians have been killed. The conflict now threatens to spill over Syria's borders, destabilizing key American allies. This dangerous conflict threatens American national security interests in the region.

I wanted to take this opportunity, Mr. Speaker, to urge Members to attend the classified briefing that the administration will be providing tomorrow morning at 9:30 a.m. in the CVC auditorium. Secretary of State Kerry, Deputy Secretary of Defense Ash Carter, Vice Chairman of the Joint Chiefs Admiral Sandy Winnefeld, and Deputy Director of National Intelligence Robert Cardillo will be there to brief Members on the situations in both Syria and in North Korea.

With that, Mr. Speaker, I'd like to say to Members that we won't be having another vote in this series.

□ 1400

APPOINTMENT AS MEMBER OF HIT POLICY COMMITTEE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair announces the Speaker's appointment, pursuant to section 13101 of the HITECH Act (Pub.L. 111–5), and the order of the House of January 3, 2013, of the following individual on the part of the House to the HIT Policy Committee:

Mrs. Gayle Harrell, Stuart, Florida

HOUR OF MEETING ON TOMORROW

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

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

There was no objection.

REMOVAL OF NAMES OF MEMBERS AS COSPONSORS OF H.R. 1445

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that Representatives RUNYAN, GRIMM, LOBIONDO, and BISHOP of New York be removed as cosponsors of H.R. 1445.

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

There was no objection.

RESPONSIBLE HELIUM ADMINISTRATION AND STEWARDSHIP ACT

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on the bill H.R. 527.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 178 and rule XVIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill, H.R. 527.

The Chair appoints the gentleman from Kansas (Mr. YODER) to preside over the Committee of the Whole.

□ 1403

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 527) to amend the Helium Act to complete the privatization of the Federal helium reserve in a competitive market fashion that ensures stability in the helium markets while protecting the interests of American taxpayers, and for other purposes, with Mr. YODER in the chair.

The CHAIR. Pursuant to the rule, the bill is considered read the first time.

The gentleman from Washington (Mr. HASTINGS) and the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. HOLT) each will control 30 minutes.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself as much time as I may consume.

Today, I rise in support of H.R. 527. This bill is necessary to protect our economy from the impending helium shortage and to inject free-market principles into our Federal helium program.

The Federal Helium Reserve was first created after World War I, when we imagined a world where blimps would be the future of air travel and vital to our national security efforts. Although this effort took a different course, that didn't stop the Federal Government from spending money on this program and stockpiling helium continuously through the 1980s. By the 1990s, it became clear that the Reserve had a declining usefulness and had racked up a $1.3 billion debt.

In response, Congress in 1996 passed legislation to implement reforms to the program and require the sale and privatization of the Reserve by 2015, or when the debt was paid off, whichever came first.

However, since this original decision to close the Reserve, both the demand and uses for helium have dramatically changed. This has created a situation where the Reserve's debt will be paid off sooner than expected—nearly 2 years earlier—in October of this year. But, while the debt will have been paid off, there will still be helium in the Reserve. By law then, the current Federal helium program will end and the Bureau of Land Management, or BLM, will no longer have the authority to sell the remaining 11 billion cubic feet of helium. It's important to note, too, Mr. Chairman, that the Reserve contains half of our U.S. domestic supply and 30 percent of the world's helium supply.

If Congress fails to act before October, we will artificially drop the helium supply and cause a global helium shortage that will cost jobs and severely disrupt our economy. Despite what many think, helium is not just used for party balloons. It is essential to our 21st century economy. Without helium we wouldn't have lifesaving MRI machines, computer chips, fiber optic cables, or other devices used for defense needs.

The bill before us today is truly a bipartisan plan that I'm pleased to have worked on with the lead Democrat on the Natural Resources Committee, Mr. MARKEY from Massachusetts, as well as our other colleagues on the committee, Mr. FLORES of Texas and Mr. HOLT of New Jersey.

First, this bill would implement a new operating system for the Federal Helium Reserve over the next decade that would include semiannual auctions. This will ensure that we prevent a helium shortage and that the Reserve stays open until nearly all of the helium supply is sold.

□ 1410

Second, it will build on the reforms made in 1996 and inject more free market principles into the sales process to get a better and fairer return for American taxpayers.

Over the last decade, the Federal Government has been selling helium from the Reserve significantly below market price. As you can see from this chart—and this is based on BLM data—the new demands for helium have caused the market price to rise much higher than the Federal Government's pricing formula and much faster than BLM's ability to track market prices.

So, as a result, this has cost taxpayers tens of millions of dollars. This has been confirmed by reports and testimony from both the Government Accountability Office, the GAO, and the Department of the Interior Inspector General. The big gap is right here. This is what we are selling it for, and this is what the market price is.

In addition, the current program restricts sales to only a few companies through an allotment system that is essentially an oligarchy for Federal helium. Nearly 100 percent of our helium supply is being put into the hands of four refiners that directly benefit from the low Federal pricing formula while other competitors are locked out. The current cheap price of helium gives an unfair market advantage to these handful of companies.

Implementing semiannual helium auctions will inject much-needed competition into the program and help establish a fair market price for helium. According to the CBO, this bill will bring in over $340 million to the Treasury over the next 10 years. The bill also includes important reforms to increase transparency and to prevent supply disruptions.

Now, Mr. Chairman, over 20 groups representing the end users of refined helium—and these are high-tech manufacturers of semiconductors, aerospace technologies, medical devices, chemicals, fiber optics, and scientific research—all have called for the passage of this legislation. Although this bill enjoys broad bipartisan support, I do want to take a moment to directly address some concerns that have been raised throughout this legislative process.

First, doing nothing is not an option. While I recognize that many people don't believe that the Federal Government should be in the helium business—and I would agree—we must recognize the realities of our current situation. Helium is too essential to our economy to essentially cut off the valve at the Reserve. We need this bill to protect our economy from severe disruptions and to provide additional time for the new development of alternative domestic helium resources so that our country and economy are prepared for when the Reserve does close. However, this bill will make sure that we are building on the reforms of the 1996 act and that we are managing and selling the helium in a more responsible manner.

Second, maintaining the status quo is not an option. Under conditions in the current law, the entire program comes to an end this October. Simply authorizing the continuation of the current program does nothing to address the current issues with the Federal pricing formula and the need to implement free market reforms. We cannot keep selling helium to a handful of companies. Instead, we need an open helium market that encourages more bidders, more competition, and more accurate pricing in order to get the best return for the taxpayers.

What we need then, Mr. Chairman, is no more lucrative handouts, no more government picking winners. What we need is good ole American competition.

Finally, this bill will do absolutely nothing to interfere with private business contracts, and it will not create instability within the helium market. With or without this legislation, the existing helium program and existing contracts all will end in October of this year. This bill violates no contracts because none will exist when certain conditions in current law expire, which we think will be this October. This is why Congress must act before October to establish a new helium program to finalize the sell-off of the helium from the Reserve.

The bill will protect our economy from a harmful helium shortage and implement much-needed reforms to update the Federal Helium Program so that it better reflects the uses and demands for helium in the year 2013.

Mr. Chairman, this is a good bill, and it's a bipartisan bill. I'm glad I had support in working with my colleagues across the aisle on the committee, and I urge the passage of this legislation.

With that, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HOLT. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I rise in support of H.R. 527, and I begin by commending and thanking Chairman HASTINGS for his outstanding bipartisan leadership on this legislation and on other things before the committee. This bill was drafted in close cooperation with the Democratic minority, and I thank the chairman of the committee. He worked with Ranking Member MARKEY and me and with Representative FLORES; and we've put together, I think, a solid piece of legislation. The legislation is an example of how we can work together. I wish it were moving faster on the floor today and tomorrow, but it is a cooperative undertaking.

As the chairman said, helium is critical for magnetic resonance imaging, MRI machines; for NASA rocket operation; for high-tech manufacturing; and for all sorts of scientific research. For many of these applications, there is no replacement for helium with its truly unique properties. Farsighted legislators established a Federal stockpile many decades ago, which was good; and as important uses of helium were recognized over the decades, we can be thankful that the stockpile existed.

The frenzy of privatization under the Gingrich era in Congress has now made this legislation necessary. Our Nation's Federal Helium Reserve supplies nearly half of the helium used in the United States; and if Congress fails to pass this legislation, by the end of the current fiscal year, the Interior Department's authority to continue operating the Reserve will expire. If this is allowed to happen, nearly half of America's helium supply would be cut off overnight, creating truly a crisis in health care, in research, in electronic manufacturing, and in many other areas. That's the immediate problem that this legislation would solve; but there is a second, potentially more severe, problem to be addressed.

At the current withdrawal rates, we have only 5 to 7 years of helium available from the Reserve. Reviews by the National Academy of Sciences, by the Government Accountability Office, and by the Interior Department Inspector General's Office have all concluded that we are not selling the Nation's helium at market prices. Since Federal helium comprises such an enormous percentage of the global supply, with the price set and controlled by the Interior Department as required under the guidelines established some years back, the global price of helium is artificially low.

The current system isn't just a bad deal for taxpayers; it has also distorted the global helium market. If we continue to avoid a solution, as some have advocated, we could find ourselves facing even more severe helium shortages and price spikes when the Federal Reserve is largely exhausted a few years from now and when there may be insufficient alternative supplies to turn to.

That's why we must reform our Nation's helium policy, put the market-based signals in place that will help provide an incentive to bring new supplies on line. The failure to enact reforms of the helium program, such as those contained in this legislation, could mean an increased reliance on insecure and irregular helium supplies from Russia, Algeria, Qatar, and other foreign sources. It could mean higher prices for American industry and for researchers.

There have already been interruptions in supply. National labs have testified before our committee that helium deliveries necessary for their research have already been subject to interruptions.

□ 1420

The bipartisan legislation before us today would address both of these impending crises. H.R. 527 would extend the life of the Federal Helium Reserve past the end of this year and ensure a fair return to taxpayers on this federally-owned resource. It would generate more than $300 million for American taxpayers as estimated by the Congressional Budget Office. The bill will increase competition, transparency, and participation in helium markets, which will help shift commercial helium reliance from the Reserve to private sources.

The principles of this bill are consistent with the recommendations made by the National Academy of Sciences in 2010 to improve the helium program by expanding participation and openness in helium markets.

It will protect Federal users, such as NASA and the National Labs, as well as the scientific community by ensuring that they have priority access to this federally-owned resource in the short term and exclusive access in the longer term.

This bill was created with input from the Department of the Interior, the White House Office of Science and Technology Policy, and many scientific researchers. It has the support of the American Physical Society and many other groups and many helium users, such as corporations like General Electric, Siemens, Philips, Intel, Applied Materials, Dow Chemical, IBM, Texas Instruments, and many others. It's a product of close work between the majority and the minority members of the committee.

Again, I thank the majority for providing that collaboration with us. It's a good bill. It provides a workable solution to a real problem. I urge its adoption.

I wish we could deal with this bill promptly and all the amendments promptly. We could be done in less than an hour, and then we could turn our attention to other concerns that Americans have, such as jobs and education, training for workers, a conference committee to reconcile the differences between the House and the Senate budget resolutions, removing the thoughtless sequester that the majority imposed on the country affecting air traffic control and food inspections and Head Start slots and medical research and many other things. But instead, we will postpone the consideration of the amendments until tomorrow, I'm sorry to say, and eat up valuable time that we could spend dealing with America's pressing problems. Nevertheless, I look forward to the passage of this bill, and I urge my colleagues to support it.

With that, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I'm very pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. WITTMAN), a valuable member of the Natural Resources Committee.

Mr. WITTMAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 527, the Responsible Helium Administration and Stewardship Act.

H.R. 527 is important legislation for our Nation's high-tech, defense, medical, and scientific industries. It will ensure the continued operation of and sales of helium from the Federal Helium Reserve, providing a stable and secure supply of a critical material for the next several years.

This legislation represents a significant step forward in addressing the concerns associated with the helium supply from the Federal Helium Reserve. This also creates a situation where we have a reliable source of helium that's critical to the strategic interests of this Nation.

This bill also provides for the continued operation of the Reserve and the sale of helium to private entities, thereby helping to ensure a stable and secure supply of helium in the near term.

It provides price transparency through clear reporting requirements

for both the Bureau of Land Management and for those who purchase helium. And for many industries throughout the United States, this reliability and transparency is absolutely critical.

H.R. 527 is important and is urgently needed to address this Nation's helium supply in making sure, too, that we keep in mind the implications it has for both our national and our homeland security.

I'd like to applaud Chairman HASTINGS and Ranking Member MARKEY for their work on this bill, and I urge my colleagues to support it.

Mr. HOLT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. JOHNSON).

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Chairman, like a kid at a carnival, I rise in full support of H.R. 527, the Responsible Helium Administration and Stewardship Act of 2013.

Mr. Chairman, I'm relieved, and I'm sure that the American people are relieved as well, that Congress is finally going to do something about one of the most pressing issues of the day, that is, we've got to ensure access to helium for all.

Surely, those harmed by sequestration and those harmed by the Republican failure to appoint budget conferees appreciate the House spending 2 full legislative days on this most critical issue. The American people certainly understand the fact that 48 hours of this House's precious time was necessary to pass such a noncontroversial bill.

I'm pleased to support this bill, which shows that this Tea Party Congress will make the tough choice to keep children's birthday parties on schedule and give industries that rely on helium the lift that they deserve. Imagine, Mr. Chairman, a world without balloons. How can we make sure that there is not the injustice of there being no helium for comedians to get that high-pitched voice that we all hold near and dear to our hearts? Imagine a world without balloons. To date, the House has chosen to just simply float above it all.

Finally, we are going to do something for the American people, and we should all pat ourselves on the back for that. Too often lately, this body has sat deflated, not for a lack of hot air, mind you, but seriously, ladies and gentlemen, unlike a noble element, this House has failed to act on Americans' real concerns.

There are serious reasons to support this bill, and I do look forward to supporting it. The substance of this bill is not the focus of my sarcasm today, Mr. Chairman. My point is that America would be much better off if this Tea Party Republican Congress brought to the floor issues that mean the most to Americans, like appointing a conference committee to work out a budget with the Senate.

The CHAIR. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. HOLT. If the gentleman needs more time, I gladly yield an additional 30 seconds.

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Sadly, Republicans are just blowing in the wind and can't seem to tether themselves down to take on such an important task. They float off in different directions unable to appoint conferees to negotiate with the Senate.

Yesterday, despite the gravity of the matter, the Tea Party Republicans couldn't even agree on their own health care bill, which was named the Helping Sick Americans Now Act. With a title like that, I'm helium flabbergasted that they could not pass that bill.

□ 1430

Yesterday we spent all day debating that bill, and today after their failure to pass it, they've pretty much decided that sick Americans can wait. We need laughing gas because of the inability of the Republican House to deal with the difficult issues. It's real sad; we need some laughing gas. The sequestration is delaying flights and harming our economy.

The CHAIR. The time of the gentleman has again expired.

Mr. HOLT. I yield an additional 15 seconds to the gentleman.

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. With sequestration delaying flights and harming our economy, our Nation needs a little gas. Say what you will, but this is just the best thing that we can do here. So I'd like to float a simple idea: stop wasting our time. Let's get to the business that is meaningful for Americans. I support this bill.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I want to ask my friend from New Jersey, I have at this point no further requests for time. One additional speaker may be coming, but I'm prepared to close.

Mr. HOLT. We have at least one more speaker, and my closing.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HOLT. I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. TONKO) who counts among his constituents many who work in technical industries and laboratories who depend on helium and understand that although there are a lot of easy jokes about helium, this is a serious matter. It is a serious matter that we should move along with promptly.

Mr. TONKO. Mr. Chairman, I thank Representative HOLT. I want to thank Chairman HASTINGS and Representative MARKEY and Representative HOLT and other members of the Natural Resources Committee for working steadfastly together to bring this important bill to the floor.

The Federal Helium Reserve was created in 1925, long before today's many uses of helium were envisioned. Now this element has become an essential ingredient to our Nation's research, medical, technology, manufacturing, space, and defense activities. Helium is used in welding and in the manufacturing of fiber optic cable and semiconductors. Medical imaging has become a vital tool in the health care system, and every MRI requires helium. The list of applications for this element is long and touches many important industries.

When the current law passed in 1996, the situation with respect to helium's value and usage was quite different, and there was an expectation that additional private sources of helium would be developed and then of course enter the market. For a variety of reasons, that has not yet happened on a sufficient enough scale to ensure a stable supply of helium to meet our national demand for this basic element.

The Federal Government, through the Bureau of Land Management, needs to remain engaged in this market for an additional period of time. The United States reserve is about 40 percent of the worldwide supply of helium. The many industries and research institutions that rely on helium cannot afford a disruption in its supply.

The national storage facility is unique, and there are many characteristics of the helium market that are distinctly different from the markets of most commodities. These factors are likely the reasons a more robust private supply of helium has not yet emerged to replace our Federal Government's role. H.R. 527 provides additional time to phase down the Federal Government's role in the helium market and to allow a private market to develop.

There is no substitute for helium in many of its crucial applications. Passage of this legislation is critical to maintaining high-wage, high-skilled jobs in my district, the 20th Congressional District of New York, throughout New York State for that matter, and in many other States across our great country. It is essential that we work with the Senate to get a law signed this year to provide certainty to helium suppliers and users.

I recognize there are some who are uncomfortable with certain aspects of this legislation. It is not a perfect bill, and if the expected development of private supplies of helium does not occur, we need to revisit this issue in the future.

For the present, though, this bill offers a reasonable compromise that keeps helium flowing onto the market, and that is what we need now. I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 527 and maintain a reliable supply of this vital ingredient for the sake of research and industry.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I'm pleased to yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. LAMBORN), the chairman of the subcommittee dealing with this issue.

Mr. LAMBORN. I thank the chairman of the full committee for allowing me to speak. I rise in strong support of H.R. 527, the Responsible Helium Administration and Stewardship Act.

Our House Natural Resources Committee passed this bipartisan legislation by voice vote, and I encourage my colleagues in the full House to do the same. The Responsible Helium Administration and Stewardship Act adds free market reforms to the current system. The current system allows a small number of companies to have access to and benefit from the taxpayer resource, which is helium, but it's a good thing to broaden the base of those who are most benefiting from this resource.

There is currently some instability in the marketplace for American companies that are the end users of helium. These companies employ thousands of Americans, and they rely upon a dependable supply of helium for their business every day. This includes defense companies, medical companies, manufacturing companies, and a variety of users.

Numerous government reports—from the Department of Interior Inspector General to the Government Accountability Office to the National Academy of Sciences—have all come to the same conclusion: we need to reform the current system.

The current system allows a select group of companies to buy a critical Federal resource at significantly below market value to the exclusion of other companies. There are historical reasons how this situation developed, but we have to look to the future and what's best for the economy moving forward.

As a result, the American people are potentially being denied tens or even hundreds of millions of dollars of additional revenue because this Federal taxpayer resource is sometimes being sold at under-market values.

It should be noted that over 20 organizations and end-user companies representing high-tech manufacturers of semiconductors, aerospace technologies, life-saving medical devices, chemicals, fiber optic, and scientific researchers who require helium as an essential part of their daily business support this bill. H.R. 527 will ensure that these industries employing thousands of Americans and vital to the United States can obtain a reliable and secure source of helium while ensuring American taxpayers that they receive the best possible market value for this taxpayer resource.

H.R. 527 will end the current allotment system and add free market components to the BLM helium program. This will increase transparency between companies and the BLM and ensure that purchasers of helium will have timely access to the pipeline to ensure delivery of the helium that they have purchased.

This bill is supported by the ITI, and I urge your support of this legislation.

INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY INDUSTRY COUNCIL,
Washington, DC, April 25, 2013.

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

Hon. NANCY PELOSI,
Democratic Leader, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR SPEAKER BOEHNER AND LEADER PELOSI: On behalf of the Information Technology Industry Council (ITI), I write to express the importance of H.R. 527, the Responsible Helium Administration and Stewardship Act to the high-tech industry. ITI supports the passage of H.R. 527 and we will consider scoring votes in support of final passage of the bill in our 113th Congressional Voting Guide.

Helium is critical to a variety of advanced, high-tech manufacturing processes, as well as cutting-edge scientific research. It is irreplaceable in many of these processes, as there is no known substitute. The Federal Government controls 40% of the world's helium supply, and without Congress enacting legislation by the end of this fiscal year, the Federal Government's authority to sell helium to the private sector will expire. Such a supply disruption would be catastrophic to the private sector entities that require helium for their manufacturing processes. H.R. 527 would prevent such a problematic situation by ensuring the Federal Government has authority to continue selling helium to the private sector through an auction process.

The United States' information technology industry is the strongest in the world, driving economic growth, creating new businesses, and generating jobs. On behalf of ITI's member companies, I thank you for bringing this legislation to the floor to prevent any possible helium supply disruptions, and urge you and your colleagues to pass H.R. 527, the Responsible Helium Administration and Stewardship Act.

Sincerely,

DEAN C. GARFIELD,
President and CEO.

Mr. HOLT. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the comments of the gentleman from Colorado, the chair of the Energy and Mineral Subcommittee. He reiterates the important uses of helium, and I would add that any American patient or doctor who uses MRIs, which depend on helium, or any American who uses modern electronics whose manufacture depends on helium, or anyone who depends on so many other things for which helium is essential, should be grateful that decades ago farsighted legislators created the stockpile to preserve helium.

We now have before us the need to make sure that helium isn't sold at fire-sale prices. We need to make sure that we have a reliable supply for these important uses. We need to make sure that the Interior Department is not forced out of the business prematurely. The Interior Department has expressed support for the approach taken by this legislation.

Again, I commend and thank the chairman for his bipartisan leadership to bring this sensible legislation to the floor. I hope that the other body will act quickly and follow our lead and pass this legislation so we do not experience supply disruptions and price spikes later this year. I urge passage of this bill.

I yield back the balance of my time.

□ 1440

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, as has been pointed out on both sides, this is a very important piece of legislation. Our free economy is made up of a lot of different parts, and it's hard—as a matter of fact, it's impossible—to regulate all of those parts. The market does it a whole lot better.

But in this situation, because of past actions of Congress, there was a stockpile of Federal helium, and it became more and more valuable; but market prices weren't being got for that available commodity. This issue addresses that until the markets can catch up in several years in order to make sure there is a supply of helium.

And I'm glad to have worked in a bipartisan way with my colleagues on the Natural Resources Committee. We'll deal with the amendment process tomorrow. That's why we have a rule. There are several Members who wanted to improve, from their point of view, this piece of legislation, and you can't do that, obviously, on a suspension calendar, as has been suggested. You have to go through the rule process, and we will do that tomorrow.

So, in the meantime, Mr. Chairman, I urge adoption of this legislation, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Chair, I rise in support of the Responsible Helium Administration and Stewardship Act, a bipartisan bill that will prevent a global helium shortage that could limit high-tech manufacturing and critical scientific research.

Recognizing the value of our helium resources, the government established a Federal Helium Reserve in the 1960s. In 1996, Congress enacted legislation to privatize the Reserve and sell off its supply. Unfortunately, that sale has been conducted at below-market rates even as demand for helium, which is critical for hospitals, manufacturing, and research, has increased. Moreover, under that 1996 law, the Reserve will have to stop operations this October, cutting our domestic supply by nearly half and causing a worldwide shortage.

Today's legislation creates a new, auction-based program for selling helium from the Reserve, preventing the shortage and ensuring that taxpayers get fair value for this resource. It's a common sense solution to a serious problem and I urge my colleagues to support it.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Chair, I rise today in support of H.R. 527, the "Responsible Helium Administration and Stewardship Act," which will renew the Department of the Interior's (DOI) authority to continue operating the Federal Helium Reserve beyond this fiscal year.

I want to thank Chairman HASTINGS and Ranking Member MARKEY for their hard work in shepherding this legislation, which enjoys strong bipartisan support, to the floor.

Mr. Chair, I support H.R. 527 because it is an important first step in updating our nation's helium policy by increasing transparency and

fostering competitive helium markets, while providing a better return for American taxpayers.

Currently, the United States is the largest helium producer in the world. The most recent data from the United States Geological Survey indicates that at over 20 billion cubic meters, the total helium reserves and resources of the United States represents roughly 40 percent of the world's helium supply.

Helium is primarily used in magnetic resonance imaging (MRI) devices in hospitals, but is also used as a coolant for superconductors, as well as in cryogenics, welding, chromatography, and various other uses.

The Federal Helium Reserve is a strategic reserve located at the Cliffside Storage Facility in Potter County, Texas, near the city of Amarillo. Created in 1925, its original function was to ensure supplies of helium to the federal government for defense, research, and medical purposes.

Through the Helium Privatization Act of 1996, the Federal Helium Reserve evolved to serve four purposes: (1) operating and maintaining a helium storage reservoir and pipeline system view map; (2) providing crude helium gas by contract with private companies; (3) evaluating the Nation's helium-bearing gas fields; and (4) providing responsible access to federal land for managed recovery and disposal of helium.

While the Interior Department currently has the authority to continue funding and operating the Federal Helium Reserve, this authority is set to expire at the end of this fiscal year. Upon expiration, and absent Congressional action, our national supply of helium faces severe turmoil in the form of substantial price increases and market disruptions for American consumers and businesses.

Moreover, the Federal Helium Reserve, which constitutes a large portion of the global supply, is instrumental in controlling price. The large quantity of helium in the reserves means that the Interior Department effectively determines prices paid for helium around the world.

Numerous reports indicate that the Interior Department may be selling helium at below market value, which may have the effect of stifling private investment in new helium supplies. As a result, we risk facing a shortage in coming years as helium supplies diminish.

H.R. 527 addresses this problem by transitioning helium sales to a competitive auction system, thus ensuring a steady supply of helium and allowing users to bid on crude helium from the reserve. Consequently, the law of supply and demand would dictate price rather than having the price controlled by a central authority.

Ideally, I would have liked to see more discretion afforded to the Secretary of the Interior in this bill, particularly with respect to the minimum price charged for crude helium.

The bill requires the Secretary to make a determination as to the minimum sale price at auctions in accordance with various factors, including a confidential survey of domestic helium transactions with the reserve, as well as recent market prices as reflected by auction sales.

Currently under the bill, the Secretary would have the discretion to adjust the minimum price by up to 10 percent if the survey is not reflective of the current market value of helium or if a higher minimum price may result in greater conservation of helium.

However, market fluctuations in recent years have often been in excess of 10 percent. Providing the Secretary with greater discretion to adjust the minimum price in accordance recent trends is desirable to ensure that prices track market value as closely as possible.

In my view, the bill would be improved if the Secretary's discretion were enlarged to authorize adjustments to the minimum price by an amount not to exceed 20 percent.

But taken as a whole, H.R. 527 is a positive step in the right direction. And I want to express my appreciation again to Chairman HASTINGS and Ranking Member MARKEY for their good work.

Mr. Chair, I urge my colleagues in joining me in voting for H.R. 527, ''Responsible Helium Administration and Stewardship Act.''

Mr. PAULSEN. Mr. Chair, I rise in support of this important legislation which will ensure U.S. manufacturers of medical devices, computer chips, and balloons continue to have reliable access to helium. Helium is a critical element to the manufacturing and operation of these innovative and competitive industries and their products.

The Federal Helium Reserve is scheduled to close this year. If that should happen, a global helium shortage would disrupt business in these industries and could cause the loss of thousands of American jobs.

In my home state of Minnesota, a large balloon company continues to manufacture their products here in the United States. They depend on reliable access to helium not only to stay in business, but also to continue research and development, innovative engineering, manufacturing, and quality control for their balloon products.

But a helium shortage would negatively impact more than just balloon manufacturing. It would also harm the high tech and medical device communities as well. Approximately 250,000 Americans are employed in the manufacturing of computer chips using helium. These chips are used in GPS, smart phones, and MRI machines. Helium is also used to cool the magnets in MRI machines.

We must pass this legislation to prevent major shocks to these important industries. I urge my colleagues in the Senate to act soon to ensure critical access to helium for the medical device, IT, and balloon industries and to protect these American jobs.

The CHAIR. All time for general debate has expired.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. BRIDENSTINE) having assumed the chair, Mr. YODER, Chair of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 527) to amend the Helium Act to complete the privatization of the Federal helium reserve in a competitive market fashion that ensures stability in the helium markets while protecting the interests of American taxpayers, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

THE GOSNELL TRIAL

(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, Kermit Gosnell is a real-life Hannibal Lecter. Gosnell operated an abortion clinic that severed the necks of hundreds of babies and stuffed their bodies into freezers, plastic bags, and cat-food tins. Soon, a jury in Pennsylvania will decide his fate.

Mr. Speaker, the Gosnell case must give us a moment of reflection. Have 40 years of abortion on demand seared our national conscience and given us a false refuge behind euphemisms like ''choice''?

More than 3,000 unborn children die in abortion clinics every day in this country. While none of these deaths attract the headlines of the Gosnell case, each loss is a tragedy. Each of these defenseless babies is just as innocent as Gosnell's victims, just as human as you and I, and just as precious as our own children.

There is no moral distinction between killing a baby 5 minutes after birth or ending her life 5 minutes or even 5 days before delivery.

In the coming weeks, more questions will be asked: Who referred patients to Gosnell's house of horrors, and what can be learned from these atrocities?

Today, we all ought to re-examine our national conscience.

THE GOSNELL TRIAL

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

Mr. ROSS. Mr. Speaker, every day, over 3,200 children are aborted in this great country, the same country that is called the land of the free and the home of the brave. This isn't just unacceptable; it's a horrific tragedy.

And my heart goes out to all women who feel that abortion is the only option. God made them special and made their children special too. These children aren't free and will never have the option to be brave.

Currently, in Philadelphia, Kermit Gosnell, an abortion doctor, is on trial for multiple counts of murder. One count is for a woman who died during an abortion at his clinic.

The horrific findings in Mr. Gosnell's clinic serve as just one more devastating wake-up call. As a country, we should work to protect everyone, including women and children.

When will we be bold enough to enact serious changes?

These children are precious and are truly gifts. We should not use any taxpayer dollars to fund abortion. And I also believe that we should prohibit abortions for unborn babies who are more than 20 weeks old in-utero, which is why I recently cosponsored the District of Columbia Pain-Capable Unborn Child Protection Act.

THE GOSNELL TRIAL

(Mr. SMITH of New Jersey asked and was given permission to address the

House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, the Jeffrey Dahmer-like murder trial of an abortionist named Kermit Gosnell is replete with shocking testimony of beheadings, unfathomable abuse, spinal cord snippings, death, and body parts in jars.

But how different, really, is Gosnell's ''house of horrors'' from the abortions that occur in clinics around the country every single day? Not much. Not much at all.

Mr. Speaker, will Americans ever be told the horrifying details as to how and how often abortionists dismember, decapitate, and chemically poison innocent babies?

Last week, reporter Timothy Carney asked participants in a call hosted by the pro-abortion group RH Reality Check:

> What is the distinction between what Gosnell did and what a late-term abortionist like Leroy Carhart does?

Professor Tracy Weitz responded:

> When a procedure that usually involves collapsing the skull is done, it is usually done when the fetus is still in the uterus, not when the fetus has been delivered.

That's it? It's just a matter of where, in the womb or not, that this violence against children is construed to be okay?

Where is the outrage over 55 million children victims who have been killed by abortion, and where is the appalling lack of compassion?

Why the empathy deficit for the victims, women and children, especially by our President, President Barack Obama?

Women and children deserve better.

THE GOSNELL TRIAL

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

Mr. HUELSKAMP. Mr. Speaker, there's been a lot of talk in recent months about a ''war on women,'' but those using the term to attack pro-life supporters should look a little closer to home for the real war on women.

Abortion proponents would like us to believe that the atrocities being discussed at the murder trial of Philadelphia abortion provider Gosnell are neither standard nor acceptable practice in the abortion industry. But evidence indicates otherwise.

The so-called Aid For Women abortion clinic in Kansas City has also been the subject of several investigations into the care provided to women and the cleanliness of the facility with reports very similar to those coming out of the Gosnell trial.

And with abortion providers all up and down the east coast referring patients to Gosnell's clinic, I find it hard to believe that no one knew of the conditions, the wretched conditions at this clinic. That is where the real war on women and war on children is occurring.

THE GOSNELL TRIAL

(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, sometimes it's just so bad that we don't even want to look at it. Sometimes it's just so awful we want to turn our face away. But we can't.

Shayquana Abrams was a 17-year-old when she went to see a doctor named Gosnell. He performed an abortion on her. Afterwards, she was diagnosed with a grapefruit-sized abscess and a clot near her heart. It took her 2 years to recover. She was just a child, Mr. Speaker.

This Dr. Gosnell waged his own private war on women. And for what? For profit.

Now, thankfully, he's on trial; and, thankfully, more and more people are learning about this.

Maybe, Mr. Speaker, we just don't want to look because it is so awful. Maybe it's challenging our very premises, our very understanding of what this choice for abortion really leads to. But we have to look, and we have to recognize how deeply we are inflicting wounds upon our very selves.

Mr. Speaker, women deserve better. Our Nation can do better. Why not help young women like Shayquana and let the healing begin?

□ 1450

THE GOSNELL TRIAL

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

Mr. ROTHFUS. Mr. Speaker, I join my colleagues to continue to shine the light on the human rights abuses that are the subject of the Kermit Gosnell trial in Philadelphia.

Dr. Gosnell's practice included a procedure he called ''snipping.'' This appalling procedure ended the lives of some of the youngest members of the human family.

A culture of life needs to reject the philosophy that gives rise to such horror, and no organization that would support the ending of such young lives should receive one dime of Federal funding.

THE GOSNELL TRIAL

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

Mr. ROKITA. Mr. Speaker, I rise to highlight the deeply disturbing case of Dr. Kermit Gosnell, who is currently charged with four counts of first-degree murder and one count of third-degree murder related to the botched abortions at a Pennsylvania clinic. Former employees have testified that he delivered babies and then killed them by snipping their spinal cords with scissors. One staffer described this procedure as ''literally a beheading.''

Mr. Speaker, life is precious; therefore, every abortion is a tragedy. But this case exposes the full horror of abortion carried to its logical end. As columnist Kirsten Powers recently wrote, the difference between late-term abortion in the womb and the murder of a newborn infant is simply ''merely a matter of geography.''

In response to a nearly total lack of coverage by mainstream media, myself and many Members who stand today here, including MARSHA BLACKBURN, STEVE SCALISE, and a whole cadre of folks that are speaking today, wrote to the heads of the major TV networks demanding that they cover this and other high-profile abortion controversies.

Thankfully, this case has begun to receive the attention it deserves, and Americans are discovering that this is not about pro-choice versus pro-life, but about basic human rights.

WORKFORCE DEVELOPMENT INVESTMENT ACT

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

Ms. KUSTER. This week, I am introducing commonsense legislation to encourage public and private partnerships to help meet the needs of New Hampshire students and businesses. The Workforce Development Investment Act would give tax incentives to firms that partner with educators to improve workforce development and job training for students.

Training a highly skilled, 21st century workforce is critical for growing our economy, creating jobs, and strengthening the middle class. When we invest in our workforce, more employers will invest in the United States; and in the Granite State, our students will be more competitive in the job market, and our businesses will be more successful in the global economy.

Right now, there are companies like WH Bagshaw in Nashua, New Hampshire, that are looking to hire but struggling to find workers with the right skills for the job. My bill would help close this skills gap by providing incentives for businesses to team up with educators to teach our students the skills they need to compete and succeed.

This is a commonsense proposal, and I urge your support.

THE GOSNELL TRIAL

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

Mrs. BACHMANN. Mr. Speaker, it's difficult for me to even speak about

this subject today. I'm a woman who's been privileged to give birth to 5 children, and I've also taken 23 children into my home as foster children. It's very hard for me to imagine, Mr. Speaker, that a doctor in this country, a doctor who took an oath to do no harm, would, in fact, kill a woman at his abortion clinic and he would sever the heads of four babies that were born alive—and potentially others—and commit one gruesome act after another.

Shamelessly, the mainstream media has all but gone silent and failed to cover this horrific violence against women.

No one, Democrat or Republican, believes in violence against women. We abhor it. But there's nothing that even comes close to what's happened in this abortion clinic in Pennsylvania. The officials in Pennsylvania and the State Department of Health, unfortunately—it appears, willfully—ignored this heinous crime. It also appears that this has been ignored now across our Nation.

Well, we won't ignore it. And I thank God for the men who stood up here today to stand for women and against violence against women. I lend my voice and my support to that effort as well.

VA CLAIMS, OPERATIONS, AND RECORDS EFFICIENCY ACT

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

Mrs. KIRKPATRICK. Mr. Speaker, today, I introduced a bipartisan piece of legislation to help tackle the substantial backlog of veterans' claims. My bill is called the VA Claims, Operations, and Records Efficiency Act, or CORE. It directs the Department of Defense to enact an efficient electronic transfer of veterans' records instead of the outdated paperwork process that is currently being used.

The average veteran waits more than 250 days for a decision on a claim. About 175 days of that time is the VA waiting for the DOD to send the complete records. In Arizona's District One, one of my veterans' caseworkers is helping several vets who waited more than 2 years. This wait time is simply unacceptable. Federal agencies must leave paperwork in the past and adopt an efficient electronic approach.

I thank my colleague, Chairman COFFMAN, for cosponsoring this bill. Helping our veterans isn't a partisan issue; it's a national responsibility. Let's end the backlog so we can keep the promises we've made to our veterans.

THE GOSNELL TRIAL

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

Mr. BENTIVOLIO. I am glad our country is having a conversation about gun violence. It's about the children, we say. I am glad our country is discussing immigration reform. It's about the children, we say. I am glad we are finally having a conversation about our trillion-dollar deficit. It's about the children, we say. Every day, this Chamber debates and votes on legislation, all in the name of the children, we say.

Well, Baby A was a child. He had 10 fingers and 10 toes and he moved. He moved before those scissors were jabbed in the back of his head and he moved in reaction to the pain he felt.

Baby B had 10 fingers and 10 toes. He kicked in his mother's womb. His mother was a child herself—scared, frightened, looking for an adult to help her.

Dr. Gosnell, his staff, the health department, and even national pro-choice organizations were in no way concerned with these women, their health or well-being. Instead, these entities either turned a blind eye or they were more devoted to a political ideology rather than the sounds of babies drowning in toilets.

THE GOSNELL TRIAL

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

Mr. LANKFORD. In Philadelphia, an abortion clinic murder trial is about to go to the jury next week for the death of four children and one adult. The one adult was killed by an overdose of drugs that she was given during the abortion procedure. The four children represent many children that were delivered completely, and then their spinal cord was cut while they were outside the womb.

The defense has said those children would have died anyway. They were small. The drugs they had been given would have killed them already in the surgical destruction that happened during the actual abortion procedure. So those children don't matter. They shouldn't count as a murder. They wouldn't have lived anyway.

I'm going to ask two questions. One is: What is the difference of 3 feet between delivering a child and snapping their spinal cord or killing them in the womb? And the second is: Why would we do this to children in the first place?

I'd love for you to meet Olivia. She goes to high school with my daughter. She was born in 1996 at 1 pound, 2 ounces, just over 20 weeks at delivery, the very same as these children that were killed that day and many days in that Philadelphia abortion clinic.

We have got to stand for life. We cannot be a Nation that does this to our children.

□ 1500

THE GOSNELL TRIAL

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

Mr. SCALISE. Mr. Speaker, I rise to raise awareness about the trial that's going on in Philadelphia.

Dr. Kermit Gosnell is on trial right now for the murder of at least four babies who were born alive as a result of a botched abortion, as well as a mother who was murdered during the process of an abortion at the hands of Dr. Gosnell.

Now, just a few days ago, more than 70 Members of Congress sent a letter to the heads of the three major networks asking why they're not giving fair coverage to this trial. I think we all recognize if Dr. Gosnell used an AK–47 instead of a scalpel, the media coverage would rival a natural disaster. Yet barely a peep comes from the mainstream media because it happened to be an abortion doctor who was actually performing abortions.

This is one of those untold stories in our country that we all need to stand up for, Mr. Speaker. That's why we're here today. We're going to continue to stand up for the lives of the unborn and for their rights.

THE GOSNELL TRIAL

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

Mr. GOSAR. Mr. Speaker, today, I join my colleagues to express my disgust and anger at the barbaric actions of Dr. Kermit Gosnell.

The facts of this case are gut-wrenching. As a father, a Catholic, and a health care provider, I believe in protecting the unborn.

This case isn't only about upholding the sanctity of life, but it is also about patient care and safety. Further, it shows many in the mainstream media will turn a blind eye to the murder of infants if it suits their political agenda.

Regardless of one's abortion position, no one can defend Gosnell's practices, yet his criminal case proceeds without the national outcry for justice that we have heard on other murder cases. Do we value the lives of infants or the health care of mothers who endured such horrific medical care?

The lack of oversight allowing Dr. Gosnell to operate under horrific conditions, perform late-term abortions and murder babies should be scrutinized in the same manner as other serial killers. My hope is our actions today shed light on this case and start a conversation to be sure that this never happens again.

THE GOSNELL TRIAL

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

Mr. WALBERG. Mr. Speaker, I rise with my colleagues today to ask why the media has not reported on this atrocity that's been going on related to Dr. Gosnell. I rise as a Member of Congress, but also a minister.

I read an article just recently on this very issue that really brought to my attention what the problem is, why the media won't report. The article, talking about Dr. Gosnell, said:

> He regularly and illegally delivered live, viable babies in the third trimester of pregnancy—and then murdered these newborns by severing their spinal cords with scissors. He overdosed his patients with dangerous drugs, spread venereal disease among them with infected instruments, perforated their wombs and bowels—and, on at least two occasions, caused their deaths.

Over the years, many people came to know that something was going on here. But then, Mr. Speaker, it ends by saying, ''But no one put a stop to it.''

Until we stand as citizens of the United States, until ministers in the pulpit stand and speak for life itself, God-given, until we return to our foundational principles, the media, our Presidents, no one else will listen to the cries of these innocents. Mr. Speaker, it is time for America to stand in their defense.

THE GOSNELL TRIAL

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

Mr. ROE of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I stand today to express my horror at the accusations made in the trial of Kermit Gosnell, an abortionist in Pennsylvania. If these charges are true, they're horrific.

Let me speak from my heart. I am an OB/GYN physician who has delivered almost 5,000 babies. In my heart of hearts, I cannot imagine what must have gone on in the guise of health care in that abortionist clinic. It is physically nauseating for me to think about what this doctor did.

Life is a precious miracle, and the children who lost their lives in Philadelphia were blessed with this miracle only to have it so cruelly ripped away from them. Regardless of whether one is pro-life or pro-abortion, we should all agree that these children deserved a chance at life.

This country carries a responsibility and duty to protect those who do not have a voice, including the unborn children of America that represent our greatest silent minority. They're the most innocent among us and deserve the protections we afford to all other people in this great country.

One of government's most important duties is to protect the most vulnerable among us. I pledge to continue to remember and to strive toward this.

If found guilty, I expect the full weight of the law to be used to punish the accused.

I simply will finish by saying, as a reminder to all of us, what a precious gift of life our children are.

THE GOSNELL TRIAL

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

Mr. PERRY. Mr. Speaker, I stand here again today to speak for the underprivileged women and children who suffered under the horrible acts of Dr. Gosnell. And again, as a father of two little girls, just like President Obama, I challenge President Obama to lead in this unspeakable case. It's time for the President to finally acknowledge these acts.

Mr. President, your silence on this issue is deafening. It's deafening, isn't it? When will you stand up and say that we must protect these women and children and ensure their safety? These acts are reprehensible and require your leadership without delay.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Members are reminded to address their remarks to the Chair.

FAA FLIGHT DELAYS

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

Mr. RICE of South Carolina. I rise to speak about an entirely different topic today. And my topic pales in comparison to the death of children at the hands of this awful clinic, so please excuse me for the diversion.

What I rise to speak about today is the sequester and the effects on the Federal Aviation Administration. You see, in my State of South Carolina, our budget is actually less than it was 5 years ago. Whereas, in the last 5 years, the Federal budget has risen by 29 percent. In a time when hardworking Americans are tightening their belts, when State and local governments are tightening their belts, the Federal budget is up 29 percent. We run record deficit after record deficit. Yet with sequester, we're seeking a 2.4 percent cut—after a 29 percent rise in the last 5 years, 2.4 percent.

My State has cut its budget with minimal disruption because the Governor and the legislature have worked together to do exactly that, minimize disruption. This administration, on the other hand, is making every effort to make this 2.4 percent cut as painful as they possibly can.

FAA FLIGHT DELAYS

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

Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana. Having served in the city of Indianapolis city government, as well as working for the Federal Government as a United States Attorney and serving my citizens, that's what I thought Federal Government, city governments, and local governments were supposed to do—and State governments. And I've worked at a State higher ed institution. That's what public institutions are supposed to do. They are supposed to serve, and they are supposed to serve citizens.

Many of us travel by air frequently, and we're grateful with the relative ease which air travel allows us to visit, whether it's distant loved ones or travel to conduct business.

Government is vitally important in the service to citizens in air travel. But once again, the Federal Aviation Administration is finding it more important to play politics with air travel and air service than to serve the citizens, which is what government is supposed to do.

The FAA has decided to implement President Obama's sequester by furloughing employees, like their air traffic controllers—vitally important to the service and safety of our country—and causing delays in up to 40 percent of U.S. flights.

This isn't the only way the FAA could save money. There are many other ways the FAA could save money, and they were provided the flexibility to save that money. But instead, in 2010 alone, the FAA spent $8 million on employee conferences. There are many ways they are not serving us.

□ 1510

FAA FLIGHT DELAYS

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

Mr. MICA. Mr. Speaker, FAA furloughs of air traffic controllers and threats to delay flights represent an absolutely colossal failure of this administration. The FAA and the Obama administration knew about sequestration. In fact, the FAA knows, and this chart shows that, in fact, air traffic is down some 27 percent in the last decade.

FAA failed to make reductions where air traffic has actually been reduced. The FAA knows which airports they can reduce their workforce. We've got a report here that outlines in detail where we have more air traffic controllers than we need.

The Obama administration is poking Congress and the American people, the flying public, in the eye. There's no reason for this mess. I will tell you this: if Ronald Reagan were President, this whole fiasco would have been over Monday morning.

FAA FLIGHT DELAYS

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

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, these FAA flight delays have been in effect for less than a week and already the American people are suffering. FAA's financial mismanagement is now costing Americans time and money, and yet

the administration has done nothing to reverse it.

At a time when families are traveling to see their kids graduate from college, fly across the country to take care of their elderly parents, and make business trips to help support their families, these delays are inexcusable. That's why House Republicans voted twice to replace President Obama's sequester with reasonable and responsible spending cuts—because we wanted to prevent things like this from happening.

So I encourage all of you when you travel home this week to talk to people in your hometown airports, take pictures and engage the people you meet about what they're experiencing and then tweet those stories using the hashtag: #ObamaFlightDelays. And, above all, please join me in encouraging the administration to stop playing politics with the American people.

FAA FLIGHT DELAYS

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

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, this week, the Chicago Tribune published an editorial that stated what many of us have known for months: the administration is playing political games by attempting to make the sequestration as painful as possible on Americans, especially traveling Americans.

The FAA furloughs announced this week, they're not just wrong, they're irresponsible. The bottom line is the FAA has the flexibility to find money and minimize the impact to the traveling public. Even more concerning is that the FAA has chosen not to implement the furloughs in a way that could protect the most critical air traffic control operations and facilities. They are indiscriminately furloughing everyone in the FAA.

Air traffic controllers are being furloughed at the same rate as noncontrollers, and furloughs are being applied at the same rate regardless of the airport size. Waterloo in Iowa is not Chicago O'Hare. The FAA needs to manage better, and they need to do it now.

There is still time for the administration and the FAA to reverse course on these decisions and start making the right decision instead of trying to simply score political points by playing the political game of chicken.

FAA FLIGHT DELAYS

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

Mrs. WAGNER. Mr. Speaker, we have seen these political games played before with sequestration, and the American people have responded unfavorably every time. This decision to furlough air traffic controllers by the FAA is no different.

Staff shortages as a result of these furloughs led to more than 2,250 flight delays in the first 2 days alone, greatly—greatly—inconveniencing the schedules of many people trying to travel across our country. These delays are all unnecessary.

There are $2.7 billion in nonpersonnel operational costs that the House Transportation Committee has identified and which could be examined before furloughs that ultimately hurt the American people. The FAA and this administration have decided to inconvenience the American traveler instead of using its flexibility within the agency to enact these cuts in a responsible manner.

When air traffic controllers are being furloughed, yet workers helping implement ObamaCare have been unaffected, it becomes clear on where this administration's priorities are.

I am very concerned with Democrats using this latest example of a manufactured crisis to cut workers, not waste.

FAA FLIGHT DELAYS

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

Mr. LAMALFA Mr. Speaker, we live in a representative Republic, and so the people expect us at our different levels of government to go to Washington, go to your local State capitols and get the job done and do it right. We appoint people to get these jobs done for us that you expect, whether the President does the appointments or somehow the House and the Senate approve them. And yet Washington, D.C., has fallen down on the job; this administration has fallen down on the job on this issue of FAA and air traffic controllers and delays that can affect real American people.

It's really shameful that we are manipulated in such a way, because what we've seen in recent years, actually since 1996, the budget for FAA has increased 110 percent. And now in this fiscal crisis, this country has seen where everybody is having to cut back, whether personally in our own lives or in government, that we're finding ways to try and trim the cost of doing business of government a little bit.

A 4 percent cut in FAA resulting in 40 percent of our flights being delayed, that's an outrage. It should be an outrage to every individual that we're being manipulated this way at a time, with a $16-plus trillion deficit, we can't get this right.

So, missed connections, we're hurting the American public with these delays. We've got to do better. I ask the administration to do better.

CPC HOUR: IRAQ

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2013, the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LEE) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Ms. LEE of California. Mr. Speaker, first, let me just say I'm very pleased to anchor this Congressional Progressive Caucus Special Order on Iraq with my colleague from California, Congresswoman MAXINE WATERS.

Let me also take a moment to thank Congresswoman WATERS, who is the founder of the Out of Iraq Caucus. Congresswoman WATERS had the vision and the determination to pull together Members of the House who really needed some space, who needed to be able to provide legislative strategies and to beat the drum to end this war in Iraq. The country owes Congresswoman WATERS a debt of gratitude, and we thank you very much for that.

I also want to acknowledge Congresswoman Lynn Woolsey, who retired from Congress at the end of last year, but who loomed so large during this Special Order, given her incredible leadership in working to end the war in Iraq and to bring our troops home. She is and remains our sister in arms when it comes to working for global peace and security for our children, all of our collective work.

It was no wonder that many observers called Congresswomen WATERS, Woolsey, and myself ''The Triad,'' but it was actually Congresswoman Woolsey who coined this term in our formation.

□ 1520

We are here today to reflect back on the 10-year anniversary of the start of the unnecessary, immoral, and costly war and to remember and pay tribute to the sacrifices of our troops, those who lost their lives, the injured, their families, and their loved ones, many of whom are still grappling with the scars and the impact of the war. We are also here to reflect on the costs of this war in blood and treasure. On the costs of this war: $800 billion, 4,486 soldiers, an untold number of Iraqi civilians, countless refugees, and also on the lost opportunity costs of this war to our country.

Instead of spending $800 billion on Iraq, we could have created jobs, rebuilt our crumbling infrastructure or invested in our schools to provide every child with a 21st century education. Sadly, this list goes on and on. It is especially painful when we understand that this war never should have happened in the first place. It was a war of choice. It was unnecessary; it was immoral; and it was wrong.

Over 10 years now in the run-up to the war, there were those of us in Congress and millions of people in the antiwar movement who fought the launch of this war. We had questions about weapons of mass destruction claims. We pushed for hearings; we called for a full debate; and we called to halt the rush to war.

In October 2002, the Bush administration pushed for invading Iraq. During that time, I was on the Foreign Affairs Committee. I proposed an amendment, which the Rules Committee made in

order. We brought that amendment to the floor, which would have required the United Nations to continue with weapons inspections. At that time, I stated on this House floor that unilateralism is really not the answer. If Iraqi weapons of mass destruction are a problem to the world community, yes, we must confront it. We must do so through the United Nations, and we must determine whether or not there are weapons of mass destruction in Iraq. There were 72 of my colleagues who voted in favor of this amendment, which would have led us to the same conclusion that so many soldiers lost their lives and limbs to reach—that there were no weapons of mass destruction in Iraq. We all know the tragedy that followed.

The Bush administration launched its war of choice, claimed its ''mission accomplished,'' and chose to send pallets of shrink-wrapped cash and more of our brave young men and women to fight on and on—despite the fact that there was no real military solution to the quagmire that the Bush administration created.

It is important to remember that this war did not go unchallenged, that there was a tremendous groundswell of opposition and that that was critical in demanding its end and in helping to bring it to a close, finally, under President Obama. In Congress, this opposition was centered around the Out of Iraq Caucus, which Congresswoman WATERS, whom I mentioned earlier, founded, and Congresswoman Woolsey and I helped cofound. This was in 2005. Together, we held ad hoc hearings that the Republican congressional leadership refused to hold or participate in. We held press conferences, wrote op-eds, and took the floor to sound the alarm.

Here I need to acknowledge, as I know Congresswoman WATERS will—because I know this is a very important benchmark to acknowledge—that Congresswoman Woolsey on this point delivered 441 floor speeches over the last decade to call for the war's end.

We worked with our grassroots allies, like MoveOn, Win Without War, Progressive Democrats of America, the Friends Committee on National Legislation, United for Peace and Justice, Peace Action, and with great leaders like Tom Hayden and others, to help build a movement to bring our troops home.

I recall vividly when we marched here in Washington, D.C., past the White House, with hundreds of thousands of protesters in opposition to the war. These marches and rallies and actions happened all across this country. I have to say, in northern California and especially in the East Bay and in San Francisco—the entire Bay Area of California—they were really at the forefront of this effort. Of course we worked the legislative process as hard as we possibly could. There were many members of the Out of Iraq Caucus who led important legislative efforts to end the war:

I recall clearly the efforts of Congresswoman Woolsey, who offered the very first sense of Congress resolution calling for an end to the war and to bring our troops home. From what I remember, she received approximately 132, 133 votes for that resolution, but that was another defining moment;

There was a resolution that I offered very early on to repeal the doctrine of preemption—that's preemptive war. In other words, let's start a war to prevent a future war, which the President claimed in waging the war in Iraq;

There was the McGovern amendment, led by Congressman MCGOVERN, who led on the effort to bring a responsible end to the war by calling for a timetable;

Then, of course, my annual Lee amendment: to limit the funding for the safe, timely, and orderly withdrawal of our troops. What this Lee amendment was trying to accomplish was to stop the funding and to end combat operations but to protect our troops and contractors and bring them home.

One of my amendments, the Lee amendment, eventually was signed into law, which was to prohibit permanent bases in Iraq. Now that is and was and continues to be the law of the land. There were so many other efforts led by members of the Out of Iraq Caucus—from amendments, to resolutions, to letters, and to floor actions.

I want to yield now to my colleague from California and just, once again, thank her for her tremendous leadership in case she has to leave early before this hour ends.

Ms. WATERS. I would like to take a moment to express my sincere gratitude and appreciation for Congresswoman BARBARA LEE.

I want to thank her for having the vision to organize today's activities and to say to me and to our other friend Lynn Woolsey: let us not let this moment pass without reminding this country that it was 10 years ago that we were involved in the invasion of Iraq. Let us talk about the consequences of that, and let us do everything that we can to continue to be a voice for peace.

I want to thank you, BARBARA LEE, not only for today, but I am reminded of the courageous action that you took when you warned us, when there was legislation authorizing the use of military force, that we should have all been against it. However, you were the lone vote in the House of Representatives who voted against that authorization. So I thank you for your work, for your guidance, and for your leadership.

You are absolutely correct. In June of 2005, I became the chair and a founding member of the Out of Iraq Congressional Caucus, along with you, Representative BARBARA LEE, and, of course, our friend Representative Lynn Woolsey. As a matter of fact, we became known as ''The Triad.'' I want you to know that a combination of actions that we took helped to galvanize this Congress and to increase attention on this very issue. I will never forget the over 441 speeches that were made on the floor by our friend Congresswoman Woolsey. She is not here today because she has retired, but we will always remember the care and concern that she gave to this issue.

On March 19, 2003, the brave men and women of our Armed Forces were ordered into service in Iraq. In the following years, nearly 4,500 of those servicemembers did not return home to the United States, and tens of thousands would come back wounded, injured—their lives changed forever.

I voted against the war authorization in the first place, and in hindsight, I know there are many Members who also wish they had voted against it. It was in that spirit that the Out of Iraq Caucus was established: to bring to the House of Representatives an ongoing debate about the war in Iraq and to urge the return of U.S. servicemembers to their families as soon as possible. The Out of Iraq Caucus provided a real voice in Congress for the individuals and groups who supported these efforts.

We had a membership of nearly 80 Representatives from diverse constituencies. As a caucus, we kept in close communication with congressional leadership and with committee chairmen to drive Congress toward our objective of ending the war in Iraq. We also worked with other congressional caucuses and national organizations to hold hearings, press conferences, and town hall meetings to educate the American people and to pressure the Bush administration to conclude the war in Iraq.

□ 1530

At the time, our most important legislative goal was to end the Iraq war and bring our troops home to their families. Our work helped define the national debate on how this could be accomplished.

We again organized community rallies against a war, we marched in parades, we held press conferences, we worked with the mothers of many of our young men and women who were in the war, who were serving in the war, and we worked with many of the veterans organizations.

I, too, offered a series of legislation to buttress our opposition that our troops must be safely and speedily redeployed from Iraq and that we must work to restore peace in Iraq.

I introduced bills such as H.R. 3134, Responsible Security in Iraq Act; H.R. 5488, Iraqi Displacement Coordinator; H.R. 7215, Human Costs in Iraq Act; H. Res. 1326, Honor Iraq's Sovereignty; and, of course, H. Res. 1519, Press Freedom in Iraq.

On the 1-year anniversary of the founding of the Out of Iraq Caucus, I launched a campaign to inform the public about H.J. Res. 73. Ms. LEE, you will remember John Murtha, the former Member of this House who is now deceased who introduced H.J. Res.

73, now known as The Murtha Plan, which established a reasonable timetable for the redeployment of our troops from Iraq. We all worked with him on that legislation, and we honor him even today for his wisdom and his foresight.

I want to do just one thing before I have to leave, and that is read a letter to President Bush that we all sent funding only for redeployment of troops, if you recall. By the following year in 2007, we as a caucus delivered a letter to President Bush signed by 92 Members of Congress, which stated our intent to only support war funding for the safe and orderly redeployment of our U.S. troops from Iraq.

In the letter, we cited the tremendous human and financial costs of the President's failed Iraq policy. And because of you, BARBARA LEE, I'd like to share this letter because you were in the leadership of this. It said:

> Dear Mr. President: We are writing to inform you that we will only support appropriating additional funds for U.S. military operations in Iraq during fiscal year 2008 and beyond for the protection and safe redeployment of all our troops out of Iraq before you leave office.
>
> More than 3,600 of our brave soldiers have died in Iraq. More than 26,000 have been seriously wounded. Hundreds of thousands of Iraqis have been killed or injured in the hostilities and more than 4 million have been displaced from their homes. Furthermore, this conflict has degenerated into a sectarian civil war; and U.S. taxpayers have paid more than $500 billion, despite assurances that you, your key advisers gave our Nation at the time you ordered the invasion in March 2003 that this military intervention would cost far less and would be paid from Iraq oil revenues.

Remember that?

> We agree with a clear and growing majority of the American people who are opposed to continued, open-ended U.S. military operations in Iraq, and we believe it is unwise and unacceptable for you to continue to unilaterally impose the staggering costs and the soaring debt on Americans currently and for generations to come.
>
> Sincerely.

And it was signed by all 93 Members at that time.

Our efforts gained momentum; and by late 2008, President Bush signed the Status of Forces agreement, which mandated that the U.S. shall completely withdraw from Iraq no later than December 31, 2011, and all U.S. combat forces shall withdraw from Iraq cities before June 3, 2009.

As a caucus, we continue to hold hearings and briefings, as well as speaking on this very floor until President Obama, who initially opposed the war, approved an 18-month redeployment plan that would begin in September of 2009 and end in December of 2011.

Ms. LEE, I'm sorry that I'm going to have to leave the floor because I have a meeting scheduled with the members of our caucus of the Financial Services Committee. But I'd like to say before I leave, again, thank you for your leadership; thank you for your wisdom; thank you for having always been identified as a woman of peace, a woman who understood and believed and worked for peace and who has always believed that whatever our differences are in the world, that we must find ways to have the kind of diplomacy that can resolve these differences.

Some people think that this is not possible, but I know that those of us who believe this will continue to fight and to work for peace on Earth and goodwill toward all men and women.

Ms. LEE of California. Congresswoman WATERS, thank you so much for that very eloquent and profound statement and for your kind remarks. Let me just say to you also that you have been a woman who has always believed that peace is possible and peace is patriotic. So I just want to thank you for your leadership, for being here with us, and just say how proud we are that you are our Financial Services ranking member also. Thank you.

Let me take a moment now to yield to the gentleman from California, Congressman MARK TAKANO, who has been way out there in terms of opposing this war from day one.

Thank you again for being here.

IMMIGRATION REFORM

Mr. TAKANO. I want to thank the gentlelady from California for yielding me some time.

I'm going to switch subjects a little as I want to rise today to express my support for the immigration proposal released last week by the bipartisan group of Senators called the Gang of Eight.

While this bill is not perfect and I have serious doubts about several provisions in it, it shows that both sides of the aisle can work together on issues facing our Nation, that Democrats and Republicans can work together.

I am pleased that the proposal provides a pathway to citizenship, a fast track for DREAMers, an increase in the number of high-skilled worker visas and an opportunity for immigrants, who have been deported on noncriminal grounds, to apply for readmittance if they have a spouse or children in the United States.

I do, however, have some concerns regarding the legislation, including the fact that it fails to address binational eligible LGBT families.

More than a dozen countries allow same-sex partner-sponsoring, including Australia, Brazil, Canada, Denmark, Finland, France, Israel, New Zealand, Norway, South Africa, Sweden, the United Kingdom, and many more.

The United States should be no different.

Keeping these loving families apart is wrong, and it's bad for the economy.

Take the story of southern California residents Brian and Michael. They met in 2005, became engaged next year in Paris and were married during the brief window during which same-sex marriage was legal in California.

Brian, who's been an educator for over 20 years, teaches humanity courses at a magnet school during the day and at Los Angeles Community College at night.

His husband, Michael, came to the United States from Malaysia on a student visa in 2005, and since then has been the perfect example of the kind of immigrant we want to keep here. He has earned a master's degree in nursing and is currently working on a doctorate in the same field.

Michael and Brian have shared their lives for almost 10 years and cannot even travel internationally to see Michael's family because of the visa restrictions placed on them.

What's going to happen to Michael when he completes his education? Are we really going to break up this family? Are we really going to send a well-trained medical professional back?

The debate on reforming our immigration system is not over. I plan on working with Members of Congress from both sides of the aisle, from both Houses, to ensure that binational LGBT families are given the same opportunities as everyone else.

□ 1540

Ms. LEE of California. Let me go back now to the 10th anniversary of this unfortunate war, Mr. Speaker.

I'm going to introduce now into the RECORD tonight a timeline of some of what we have talked about tonight because they should be remembered and because these efforts and the efforts of the movement that ended this war finally did make a difference, although obviously not as quickly as we wanted; but we did make a difference together.

After years of speaking out and as the toll of the Iraq war stretched the patience of the American people, public opinion started turning. People began asking what were we doing in Iraq. Iraq had no weapons of mass destruction, as the Bush administration told us. Iraq had not been involved in the 9/11 attacks, as suggested by the Bush administration.

Then-Secretary of State Colin Powell made a presentation at the United Nations that was greatly misleading, stating that Iraq possessed extremely dangerous weapons of mass destruction. Some of you may remember the smoking cloud that he talked about. It was just really very, very tragic. He described biological weapons factories on wheels, and estimated that Iraq had between 100 and 150 tons—no, I believe it may have been 500 tons—of chemical weapons stockpiled. All of those claims about weapons of mass destruction turned out to be false.

Secretary of State Powell's own chief of staff, Colonel Lawrence Wilkerson, later said about his own participation in the deception at the United Nations, he said:

> I participated in a hoax on the American people, the international community, and the United Nations Security Council.

Iraq did not present a clear and present danger to the United States. Secretary Powell and his staff, they

knew this. President Bush, he knew this. Vice President Cheney, he knew this. But they wanted their war and they deceived the United Nations and scared the American public to justify their war of choice.

I distinctly remember the day in May 2003, 10 years ago next week, when President Bush stood on the deck of the USS Abraham Lincoln and proclaimed ''Mission Accomplished.'' Of course, the mission was far from accomplished. The war was to drag on for another 8 years.

President Obama committed to ending the war during his campaign; and he, of course, did as President. While the war in Iraq is over, its legacy continues and the lessons still have yet to be learned. We need to look closely at the decisions made, understand the mistakes and misjudgments, and ensure that we never again repeat such a tragedy.

In Ghana, in the Akan language of Ghana, there is a mythical bird that's a symbol. It's called Sankofa. It's a bird flying forward looking back, and the message is that in order to not make the same mistakes as we move forward, we have to look back and we have to know our history. We have to know where we have come from, what we have done in order to move forward, and we should learn from those mistakes. Sankofa.

The Special Inspector General for Iraq Reconstruction issued its final report to Congress just last month, detailing billions and billions of dollars lost to waste, fraud, and abuse. The occupation of Iraq was characterized by poor planning by the Bush administration, who ignored State Department and USAID analysis envisioning protracted U.S. involvement in Iraq requiring substantial spending for many years.

The Pentagon was left in charge of managing postwar Iraq, and Defense Secretary Donald Rumsfeld famously underestimated the resources needed to stabilize the country. When Lieutenant General Jay Gardner told Secretary Rumsfeld that the United States might need to spend billions of dollars to rebuild Iraq, Rumsfeld responded:

> If you think we're going to spend a billion dollars of our money over there, you are sadly mistaken.

Well, of course, it was Mr. Rumsfeld who was sadly mistaken, and the American public who was sadly misled, and the Iraqi people who sadly suffered from the chaos and destruction unleashed by ideologues who used Iraq as a laboratory for a light-footprint war.

Mr. Speaker, unfortunately, those lost opportunities and tragic mistakes are not behind us.

I would like to take a moment now and yield to my friend and colleague, a woman who has consistently been against the war and has stood for peace all of her life, Congresswoman SHEILA JACKSON LEE.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. I thank the gentlelady from California, and I particularly thank you for your astuteness on bringing us together. If I might reflect on memory lane that was very painful, we traveled a lot together, and I think of the moments in history on the Iraq war. The rising up of the American people was powerful, from San Francisco to places in between, to the quarter of a million people that walked down 53rd and 57th Street in New York on a cold morning in January.

People all over America recognized that it was not these brave men and women that you see here. And I brought pictures of wonderful families and men and women who were called to serve who we continue to honor and appreciate. I thought it was important to acknowledge that our soldiers have families. We see it all the time. My district is near Ellington Field, and it is increasingly becoming a base utilizing the talents of young Americans who are willing to volunteer. So I take this 10th anniversary, as well, to pay tribute to them and those who still serve in foreign fields around the world. We know that they still serve in Iraq and Afghanistan.

So we come here today on the 10th anniversary simply to ask the question: Why? And when we ask the question why, it is not a selfish question on behalf of Members of Congress. It is a question on behalf of those brave men and women who, no matter who calls them as Commander in Chief and for what cause, they accept the cause. For that reason, it is imperative that we understand the battle into which we send them.

In the Iraq war, it was alleged there were weapons of mass destruction. We have come to a fairly complete conclusion that there were no such weapons. We all knew Saddam Hussein, and none of us adhered to his despotic and horrible governance. But I will tell you, my colleagues thought the same thing, that our approach should have been different. The bloodshed not only of the young men and women that you see here, some of their comrades were lost, but the millions, the numbers of Iraqi people who themselves, their lives were lost and of course still continue to be in danger.

The Iraq war saw more than 4,400 brave men and women who wore the United States uniform make the ultimate sacrifice, and tens upon tens of thousands who in actuality were wounded. Over 32,000 of the men and women who came home suffered wounds. But as we know, those numbers have risen. Some 3,000 of the wounded call Texas their home, 500 lost their lives. We know the scars that were left on families—mother, fathers, children, and wives. We realized that we needed to make a better judgment.

As the tragedy unfolded in Boston, one of the emergency physicians, one of the medical professionals, said they knew exactly what it was because they had been to Iraq, and they understood the sound of the IEDs. How many of our brave men and women encountered these makeshift IEDs that tore through their body and either killed them or completely amputated or caused the amputation of their arms or legs and the disfigurement of their face. We see them now. We call them wounded warriors. We call them heroes, and certainly those who followed in Afghanistan.

But this 10th year reminds us to ask: Have we made the progress that we should have? The gentlelady spoke of the moneys, $800 billion that has directly contributed to the Nation's deficit, and the amount of money that was supposed to be used for restoration; and because there was no infrastructure in Iraq, we made our Army personnel be the little government.

□ 1550

We made soldiers be the ones that had to interact with the village leaders and the chiefs, and carry monies to them. No, nothing accounted for; just good intentions, following orders. But we cannot account for those dollars. We don't know if they made a difference. We don't know if they helped bring Iraqis home. We don't know if they helped build schools or hospitals.

So I think it is important to note that when we make decisions regarding war, we need to think about soldiers holding their families and loving their families. We need to think about the better way to go, and we need to ask those whose war we fight—Saddam Hussein is gone—the people whose war we fight, the conflict between the Shiites and Sunnis.

We need to understand our history as to whether or not a war that would see the loss of all these brilliant young people, divide families, whether or not we can bring some measure of peace, some comfort, some stability.

And I'd venture to say today that we have not. And I say this to the head of Iraq, the leader, Mr. Maliki, for his participation in the ongoing conflict in Iraq, because that is the case.

There is no coming together of the Shiites and Sunnis. There is a cluster of a government that hides in the walls, that does not go out and try to bring peace to the people. And I give you one example, Mr. Speaker, that troubles me over and over again—it is the Iranians who left Iran.

We know the conflicted issues and alliances were all, if you will, misunderstood; old alliances, friends and enemies. We understand that. But this is supposed to be a peaceful nation now, and there are Iranians who fled the despotic Iran, and have become, in essence, enemies of Iran.

They started out in Camp Ashraf. They were called rebels and terrorists. They have now been vindicated, and they're not called that anymore.

But let me tell you what the present government of Iraq allows. They allow, in the camp that was Camp Ashraf that is now Camp Liberty, bombs to go in from the Iraqi soldiers. They allow no medical care to come into that particular camp.

Just yesterday, the Friends of Iran, American Iranians were here, and they had 10 people or more, their faces, who had died in that camp because the government of Iraq, the government that we shed blood for, that we asked to be a peaceful nation, is, in essence, attacking people on their soil who are unarmed, who are not interested in war, who fled because they'd been persecuted.

And they don't allow them to get access to cars, access to hospitals, and so people die from sicknesses because they could not get care.

When we go into battle and send our troops into battle, shouldn't we ask the question of what is the ultimate result?

We understand that democracy in its structure that is here in the United States cannot only be the structure that fits every community, every nation, every faith. But what I would say to you is that we bring one of those C–130s, big C–130s that many of us have rode on to go into Iraq. And I spent many hours there, nothing in comparison, of course, to those who served, but I'm grateful I had the opportunity to go and serve and see those individuals who served, and to sit down with those from Texas and to break bread with them.

When we land one of those C–130s, why don't we know, and shouldn't we know our purpose, our goal, what is our ultimate direction that we would like to see?

Not the dominance of the United States over this nation that we help but to be able to know that they, too, stand for democracy and peace.

I want to thank the gentlelady from California for allowing me to share this time with her, and to say, it's important to remind us of the 10th anniversary, one, to say thank you, for when we land these C–130s and these men and women come out ready for battle, they are wearing our uniform and our flag but, at the same time, we must ask the question, for what? For what results? For what long-range results? For what peace? For we owe that to them.

I ask that we consider those in Camp Liberty and we find relief for them. I thank the gentlelady very much.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in solidarity with my fellow members of the Congressional Progressive Caucus to speak in recognition of the 10th Anniversary of the Iraq war. I want to thank my colleagues, Representatives LEE and WATERS for anchoring this Special Order.

On March 19, 2003 President Bush launched invasion of Iraq ten years ago under a cloud of questions about the motivations for the invasion. Today we see the toll of this war on our young military men and women, their families and communities across our nation.

First and foremost, I would like to thank our troops who served in the Iraq war, but more broadly I would like to thank all members of the armed forces for their courage and heroism under circumstances that few of us could imagine. As members of Congress we have, regardless of our view of the wisdom of entering into armed conflict with Iraq, have always stood in strong and unwavering solidarity with our troops.

Part of our role as representatives in Congress is to give voice to the plight of our constituents that include men and women in the armed forces—many of them served tour after tour after tour without break; and in the beginning of the war had insufficient equipment to protect them from IEDs which cost the nation countless lives and left many with traumatic life changing injuries.

We cannot forget their sacrifice and heroism in the face of what was asked of them. In April of last year the great city of Houston, which I am proud to represent, hosted a Bayou City-style parade honoring the homecoming of the American troops. This gesture of thanks defines the support that Houston has for our troops in any situation.

During the course of the Iraq War more than 4,400 brave men and women in uniform made the ultimate sacrifice and over 32,000 were wounded. Of these brave men and women more than 500 of the fallen and 3,000 of the wounded call Texas their home.

In 2003 I fought with many of my colleagues in the Congressional Progressive Caucus to ensure that the order to proceed with the Iraq War did not pass the House, but our efforts were not successful.

Although we have withdrawn from Iraq it is imperative to understand that the withdrawal is not synonymous with the end of the war on terror. It has been my stance since the beginning of the war that there are different steps that must be taken to combat terror—which include diplomatic and humanitarian efforts.

The war also had an economic cost to our nation, which we are still paying and will continue to pay until our colleagues on the other side of the isle resolve to battle the economic threat at home with the vigor of the fight against a less than creditable threat many thought they saw in Iraq 10 years ago.

The monetary cost of the war exceeded $800 billion, which directly contributed to the nation's deficit that is now trying to be mended by the Sequester. More worrisome, the long terms costs from the results of the war are expected to exceed $3 trillion.

Since our withdrawal, insurgencies have erupted across the country of Iraq. Iraq has been seen to gravitate towards Iran, a nation that has openly been hostile towards U.S. mission, and one that has proven to be a source of destabilization in the area.

The remedies to these issues once again come from intelligence and diplomatic channels that do not include invasions like the one the United States so hastily entered into with Iraq.

The tactical withdrawal from Iraq can be seen with some high regard as a template for how to end the war in Afghanistan, and exit the region safely and decisively. As a nation we must turn away from this past decade of occupying countries in the name of fighting terror. These endless occupations delay the creation of opportunity within our own nation, which must be one of the priorities as we attempt to overcome the economic hardships facing the nation.

In closing, I would once again like to extend my deepest gratitude to our troops fighting across the nation on the 10th Anniversary of the Iraq War, and would like to thank my Congressional Progressive Caucus colleagues again for hosting this event.

In this post-Iraq time we must turn our attention to helping' our men and women who have fought bravely overseas to ensure our freedom and the promotion of democracy.

Earlier this week a new Veterans Affairs outpatient clinic was opened in the Houston area, which will shorten the distance between Houston veterans and the care they need. The nearly 30,000 square foot establishment provides primary health care, mental healthcare, women's specialty care, x-rays, optometry, physical therapy, occupational therapy, ENT (ear, nose and throat) and audiology. The new center will have a fully operational laboratory by July, as well as a visiting cardiologist and surgical physician's assistant for minor procedures.

The new clinic is expected to service 7,000 to 8,000 veterans within its first year of operation and create more than 50 paying jobs.

The Houston area clinic is one of many Community-Based clinics that have been established in response to the growing number of Iraq and Afghanistan veterans returning from war. It is vital that we keep these veterans, and current soldiers, in mind as we develop policies to ensure their care and wellbeing.

Ms. LEE of California. Let me thank the gentlelady from Texas for that very profound statement and presentation. And just let me say to you that, as the daughter of a 25-year veteran of the Armed Forces, I am deeply thankful for your bringing forth the faces of our Armed Forces.

And also, talking about the obstacles now that they're facing upon their return, I'm especially concerned with the widespread and often undiagnosed incidents of PTSD and the alarming suicide rates among our soldiers.

The back claims, the Veterans Affairs losing records, denying claims that are clearly service-related. I want to acknowledge Congresswoman JACKIE SPEIER and her work in our area and throughout the country to try to address the backlog of claims of our veterans who don't deserve to be treated this way.

Since the invasion of Iraq 10 years ago, over 2,000 current and former servicemembers have committed suicide. The lessons from this tragedy cannot be any clearer. It's a lot easier to get into war than to get out of one.

It's my hope, Mr. Speaker, that this reckless and shortsighted decision will mark a turning point in American history, and that we will be more careful about war and use all of the tools of American power, as Congresswoman Woolsey so eloquently talked to us about and introduced over and over again, SMART security that should be used in resolving disputes, including diplomacy.

Let me ask you, Mr. Speaker, how much time do I have remaining?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman has 21 minutes remaining.

Ms. LEE of California. I would like to know if the gentlelady from Texas has anything else to say. Otherwise, we will close.

Let me just use a bit more time and say that there's no military solution in

Afghanistan either, so we must absorb that fact and learn, again, what we learned in Iraq. And we need to bring the war in Afghanistan to an accelerated end.

We need to stop throwing good money after bad, poorly conceived and poorly managed reconstruction efforts, and bring our troops home now.

And we need to repeal the 2001 Authorization For the Use of Military Force, which Congresswoman WATERS mentioned, which I voted against right after the horrific events of 9/11. This overly broad blank check has underwritten the past decade of perpetual war.

I have a resolution, H.R. 198, it's the Repeal of the Authorization For the Use of Military Force. This will remove one of the underlying legal justifications for targeted drone killings that has been invoked over and over again, this time, targeted killings, to justify a wide range of activities, including warrantless surveillance and wiretapping activities, and, yes, a blank check for war anywhere, any time, for any length of time.

I hope those who are listening and who care about this, go back and read that resolution of 9/14. What it said was the President, and I'm paraphrasing now, but it was the President is authorized to use force against any nation, organization, individual, deemed connected to terrorism and the 9/11 attacks.

Now, this was in 2001. 2001. No end game, no timetable, a blank check, perpetual war until this is repealed. So Congress really needs to reassert its constitutional authority in the matters of war. Our Founding Fathers were very deliberate in placing war-making powers in this body. In a democracy, such as ours, we have this system of checks and balances.

On 9/14, we did not have a full debate. From what I remember, it may have been an hour, it may have been 2 hours. But we did not fully debate that blank check and what that meant by authorizing then-President Bush, now President Obama and any future President, to use force in perpetuity.

□ 1600

We can no longer abdicate our constitutional duties allowing any President to engage in hostilities without debate, without oversight, and without accountability.

And I want to commend Senator DURBIN for conducting hearings this week looking at the constitutionality and the rationale for targeted killings using drones. This was a very important hearing. I was able to sit through some of that hearing, and it was very revealing. Actually, there was a young man from Yemen who received a State Department scholarship. He went to school here, had gone back to Yemen, and his village was devastated by drones.

So you can see what's happening now. There are more and more hostilities, unfortunately, toward the United States, unless we get this policy straight about the lethal use of drones and have congressional oversight and debate and really exercise our constitutional responsibility to really declare war, if that's what we're going to do.

And so as we embark into this new age of modern warfare, we do need rules. We need oversight; we need accountability; and we need to develop an international legal framework on drones.

And we understand asymmetrical warfare and the new world in which we live. None of us have our head in the sand about that. We just need to make sure that Congress has a role in debating exactly how we're going to, if we're going to, and when the appropriate use of force is necessary.

For me, personally, I believe in SMART Security; and I know that that will lead to a world that our children deserve and is worthy of our children's future.

So let's put this decade of perpetual warfare behind us. We should bring our troops home. We should invest in our veterans and our children, create jobs here at home and really begin to invest in our future for the sake of our children and our grandchildren.

I have this chart here to show you just in terms of the fiscal implications of what these policies have brought. When you look at the deficit, with the war and the economic policies of the Bush era, the tax cuts, we're looking at this line right here. Had these unfortunate policies not occurred, our deficit would be down here. This is very clear. This was put forth by the Congressional Budget Office in February. These are their estimates.

It's very clear, I hope, to everyone that the failed economic policies of the Bush administration and the wars in Iraq are the major contributing factors to the economic crisis that we find ourselves in. And so, aside from the human toll that this 10-year war and the war in Afghanistan has taken, we have a real crisis now, an economic crisis in this country that we need to come to grips with. Our senior citizens did not cause this crisis. Our children did not cause this crisis. The poor, our middle class individuals, and families did not cause this crisis. And we cannot forget what has taken place over the last 10 years of this unbelievably terribly sad time in our history, where we lost so many lives and we lost so much time in terms of rebuilding our country for the future of our children.

I yield back the balance of my time.

KEY IRAQ VOTES FROM THE 109TH CONGRESS

H. CON. RES. 35 [109th]

Latest Title: Expressing the sense of Congress that the President should develop and implement a plan to begin the immediate withdrawal of United States Armed Forces from Iraq.

Sponsor: Rep Woolsey, Lynn C. [D–CA–6] (introduced 1/26/2005) Cosponsors: 34

Committees: House International Relations

Latest Major Action: 1/26/2005 Referred to House committee. Status: Referred to the House Committee on International Relations.

H. RES. 82 [109th]

Latest Title: Disavowing the doctrine of preemption.

Sponsor: Rep Lee, Barbara [D–CA–9] (introduced 2/9/2005) Cosponsors: 15

Committees: House International Relations

Latest Major Action: 2/9/2005 Referred to House committee. Status: Referred to the House Committee on International Relations.

H. AMDT. 214 [109th]

(A009)

Amends: H.R.1815

Sponsor: Rep Woolsey, Lynn C. [D–CA–6] (offered 5/25/2005)

AMENDMENT PURPOSE:

An amendment numbered 26 printed in House Report 109–96 to express the sense of Congress that the President should develop a plan for the withdrawal of U.S. military forces from Iraq, and submit this plan to the congressional defense committees.

STATUS:

5/25/2005 6:20 pm: Amendment (A009) offered by Ms. Woolsey. (consideration: CR H4035–4040, H4043; text: CR H4035)

5/25/2005 7:53 pm: On agreeing to the Woolsey amendment (A009) Failed by recorded vote: 128–300 (Roll no. 220).

H. CON. RES. 197 [109th]

Latest Title: Declaring that it is the policy of the United States not to enter into any base agreement with the Government of Iraq that would lead to a permanent United States military presence in Iraq.

Sponsor: Rep Lee, Barbara [D–CA–9] (introduced 6/30/2005) Cosponsors: 86 Committees: House International Relations

Latest Major Action: 6/30/2005 Referred to House committee. Status: Referred to the House Committee on International Relations.

H. AMDT. 750 [109th]

(A050)

Amends: H.R. 4939

Sponsor: Rep Lee, Barbara [D–CA–9] (offered 3/16/2006)

AMENDMENT PURPOSE:

An amendment to prohibit the use of funds from being available to enter into a basing rights agreement between the United States and Iraq.

STATUS:

3/16/2006 4:39 pm: Amendment (A050) offered by Ms. Lee. (consideration: CR H1107–1110; text: CR H1107)

3/16/2006 5:04 pm: On agreeing to the Lee amendment (A050) Agreed to by voice vote.

H.R. 5875 [109th]

Latest Title: Iraq War Powers Repeal Act of 2006

Sponsor: Rep Woolsey, Lynn C. [D–CA–6] (introduced 7/25/2006) Cosponsors: 26 Committees: House International Relations

Latest Major Action: 7/25/2006 Referred to House committee. Status: Referred to the House Committee on International Relations.

SECOND AMENDMENT RIGHTS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2013, the gentlewoman from Missouri (Mrs. HARTZLER) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mrs. HARTZLER. When I was 10 years old, I got my first job. It would require skill and perseverance and patience, and it would have a real potential economic impact on our family hog farm. My dad hired me. He paid me 15 cents a unit.

What was my job? It was shooting sparrows around our farm. At that time, there was a disease going around rural America, and sparrows were taking it from farm to farm. So it had a real practical purpose.

But, as I'm a parent now, I look back on it. I used to tag around with my dad all the time, and I wonder maybe if he just kind of wanted to give me something to do, in addition to a job.

But I had a lot of fun that summer going around the grain bins and the sheds on our farm and our buildings and trying to catch that bird unawares. And I think over the entire summer, I may have earned around 45 cents. So it wasn't a big moneymaker, but I sure had a lot of fun.

And I learned some important things. I learned that using firearms can be a fun hobby and hunting can be fun; also, that using firearms can have a real practical purpose. And over the years, I've shot a lot of different kind of firearms now and different sizes, but I really appreciate what our Founding Fathers did when they established our Second Amendment and gave us that as our basic right.

This afternoon, my colleagues and I want to highlight not only why the Second Amendment is important to us and to the people in our districts, but how it is also important to this country. We want to dispel the myths that decisions about how to address violence are based on facts and not emotions.

As a lifelong gun owner as well as a former public schoolteacher, I appreciate the thoughtful discussion that our country has been having after the tragic school shooting in Newtown, Connecticut. My heart has gone out to those families, as I know everyone in America's heart has, and our prayers as well. We want to understand the desire to stop the violence. I share that goal but believe that many of the proposals being put forth miss the mark. So let's look at some of the proposals and compare them to the facts.

One proposal that is being talked about and has been talked about is to ban what's called assault rifles. Well, the fact is that lawbreakers ignore the laws. Banning firearms would only take guns away from our law-abiding citizens and ensure that lawbreakers have guns.

I was watching TV a couple of weeks ago, and I saw the sponsor of the Senate bill to ban these assault rifles and she was giving a rationale why she thought it was important. She was saying, Well, gangs in California have assault rifles, and we've got to get these off the streets and out of the hands of our gang members, so we need to pass this bill. And I just kind of scratched my head and thought, Do you really believe that gang members are going to listen and pay attention to a law that Washington, D.C., passes? They break laws every day. I really can't see them getting together and having an organizational meeting and saying, Well, let's have the legislative report and have the gentleman, the gang member, say, Well, they passed a new law in D.C., so I guess we can't use assault rifles anymore.

We've got to look at the facts about whether passing this law would really address violence. In this case, it certainly wouldn't.

As far as that legislation, also the word ''assault'' is an adjective. It is not a gun. What gun control advocates call an assault rifle is actually a regular rifle with only a few cosmetic differences on the outside, such as a pistol grip, a hand guard, and a removable magazine. It is misleading to label firearms with negative words in order to advance a gun control agenda.

The fact is that more deaths have been inflicted using fists and knives and baseball bats than with a gun. In fact, one-and-a-half times as many homicides are committed with blunt objects such as a baseball bat, over two times as many homicides with fists, and five times as many with knives.

So why aren't proponents of bans on firearms calling baseball bats assault baseball bats or assault knives? Well, the reason is because the American people know that objects are only tools of people who wish to do others harm. They are not the cause. Now, it's a slogan, it's a bumper sticker, but it is true: guns don't kill people; people do.

So that's one proposal that I think misses the mark.

Another proposal is to create universal background checks. Well, the fact is that the vast majority of gun sales already have background checks with the sale, because all firearm sales through dealers must complete the instant background check. The only transactions that do not require the background checks are sales between individual gun owners; and they are not the problem. Requiring law-abiding citizens to have to go to a dealer and get a background check on their neighbor in order to sell him a gun would do little to stop mass killings.

Imposing the new law would not have stopped the Sandy Hook killer. He stole the guns he used to carry out his evil scheme. The same with the Aurora, Colorado, shooter in the movie theater. He actually had passed a background check. So passing a new law like this does not really address the issue.

□ 1610

It's time for all of us to address the real issue of how to protect our children and schools rather than to use a tragedy to impose more government control on law-abiding citizens or infringe on our Second Amendment rights.

Several of my colleagues are going to join me today to share their insights into why the Second Amendment matters to them and their constituents, and to discuss how to address the real issues of violence in our country.

I would like to start off with my fellow colleague from the great State of Missouri (Mr. LUETKEMEYER). So gentleman, what would you like to share about our Second Amendment rights?

Mr. LUETKEMEYER. Thank you, Congresswoman HARTZLER. It's always good to work with another fellow Member from Missouri, the Show Me State, where we can give some folks a little insight as to what's going on.

Mr. Speaker, when I was growing up in rural Missouri, firearms were a regular part of my life. Beyond learning how to safely handle firearms while hunting and shooting, I learned also to respect them. Like so many parents, I made sure those same lessons were instilled in my own children.

It is because of the efforts of parents or adults who can have a positive influence on a child that the culture of safety and respect toward firearms have been so well maintained in rural America. Our communities and families work very hard to ensure this heritage, and it is very upsetting when lawmakers—many of whom know nothing about firearms—attempt to place limitations on our Second Amendment right to keep and bear arms.

The Second Amendment is, in fact, a primary constitutional right that sets America far apart from nations around the world. Our Founders got this right. They knew ensuring the right of a citizen to keep and bear arms would always be vital to ensuring personal freedoms.

I have spent my time as an elected official—first in the Missouri State House of Representatives, and now in Congress—working to protect the Second Amendment. However, not only is it important to protect the right to own the gun; it is also important to protect the privacy of the information about the ownership of the gun and the conceal-carry permits and things like that.

I will give you an example. In my State just recently—in fact, we're barely finished working on this—it has come to our attention that the Department of Revenue and Highway Patrol, in working in conjunction with the Social Security Administration's Inspector General, was looking into getting control of the conceal-carry permit list of all the folks in the State of Missouri to compare it for mental health disability fraud in our State. While we were satisfied in going through all the different informational checks and crosschecks with regard to the Federal side of this—that they did everything legally they were supposed to do as well as the information was protected and not compromised—it still pointed out some of the looseness and sloppiness that went on with regards to the way that the State folks handled our information. To me, that is something that we have to be constantly watchful for.

Someone once said the price of freedom is eternal vigilance. I think with regard to Second Amendment rights, it certainly is something that is very true.

Mrs. HARTZLER. I thank you, gentleman. I think well said there. Our rural heritage is based on our Second Amendment rights, and well said.

Certainly, being from Missouri, I appreciate your work—and we've worked together on this. This is a very real concern. I call it the Department of Revenue debacle.

I certainly appreciate State Senator Kurt Schaefer and others there in Missouri who have been on the forefront of getting to the bottom of this and how our conceal-carry list was released to Federal authorities without all of the permissions and all of the safety guards in place. That is very, very disturbing. So thank you for your work on that and for your comments.

I would now like to yield to a new Member here, who has just hit the ground running and who brings so much to our whole delegation with his service. I appreciate the gentleman from New York (Mr. COLLINS), and I would be happy to yield time to you, gentleman.

Mr. COLLINS of New York. I want to thank both the gentlewoman and gentleman from Missouri for their comments.

Mr. Speaker, I come to the House floor this afternoon to stand in support of the Second Amendment. I also proudly stand here in support of all the law-abiding gun owners in New York's 27th Congressional District and all across our country.

As a father and a grandfather, the recent violent tragedies in our country have left my heart heavy. But as a gun owner with a carry permit, I proudly carry my dad's Ithaca .45 from World War II. As a Member of Congress representing thousands of law-abiding gun owners, I join my colleagues and say we refuse to allow these tragedies to be used for political gain.

These recent crimes should not be used as a pretense to weaken our constitutional rights. And law-abiding citizens should not fall victim to additional laws and regulations which have no impact on reducing crime.

Let us not kid ourselves. What was recently proposed in the Senate and what has recently become law in my home State of New York would have done nothing to prevent the Newtown or Christmastime shootings of firefighters in Webster, a community just outside my district.

I strongly support the Second Amendment and the right of an individual to protect themselves and their family. The actions of depraved killers should not punish law-abiding gun owners. And the actions of this Congress should not pick away at the rights guaranteed by our Constitution.

Mrs. HARTZLER. Thank you, gentleman. That is well said. Tragedies should not be used for political gain. That is so true. We want to get at the heart of what causes violence and how to protect children, and not just pass laws that wouldn't even address the problem.

I'm glad to see my colleague from South Dakota here. She is quite a champion of gun rights. We're looking forward to hearing your comments, lady, about the Second Amendment.

Mrs. NOEM. Well, thank you. I appreciate that, and I thank the gentlelady from Missouri for her leadership on this issue.

You know, people sacrificed for the rights that we have. The Constitution is so important to me. It's important to the people of South Dakota and to my family, and the Second Amendment is very dear to our heritage.

That's why I wanted to come to the floor today, because I wanted to talk about how the Constitution guarantees us the individual's right to keep and bear arms. That's why I strongly support the Second Amendment.

This right isn't abstract to me. It's part of my family's heritage, and it's my State's culture. I am a gun owner and a member of the Congressional Sportsmen's Caucus. I'll continue to fight and defend this right for the people of South Dakota and for our way of life.

You know, the Second Amendment has been described in many different ways over the years, such as it is there to support our natural rights of self-defense. It is there for resistance of oppression. It even was described as a civic duty to act in concert in the defense of the State. These are all reasons that we need to make sure that we are continuously talking about the benefits of this right, what it means to mothers and fathers who are protecting their families, and what it means to us growing up in a country where people sacrificed, bled and died to protect the rights that we had.

You know, growing up in South Dakota, I've always had an enormous amount of respect and appreciation for the outdoors and for hunting. If you aren't familiar with South Dakota, I'll tell you that hunting is a very important part of it. It's one of our greatest traditions and ways of life across the State.

I grew up hunting and taking hunting trips—sometimes for weeks on end, one- or two-week trips to the mountains to hunt with my dad and my brothers. It was good family quality time. We had a lot of conversations while we were enjoying the outdoors.

The first person that taught me how to hunt and to carry a gun correctly was my grandmother. She and I and her black lab BJ would go out and spend hours together. It was during those times that she not only taught me the proper way to handle a firearm and to enjoy the wildlife, but also life lessons that I don't think I would have gotten if I hadn't spent that much time with her in the outdoors enjoying that heritage.

This belief in the Second Amendment is critically important to South Dakotans, and I certainly appreciate the fact that I had the opportunity to enjoy it. Now I have the chance with my own kids and with my husband, Brian.

Opening day of pheasant season is always big in South Dakota. It's a family reunion, but obviously there are many, many friends that show up for that as well. It starts with a big breakfast. We all gather together for good entertainment and conversation until it's time to go out and start enjoying the day together. It's a tradition that we don't want to lose. Every year, sportsmen and -women flock to South Dakota to enjoy this tradition and take advantage of our State's abundance of hunting and wildlife.

I want to give you a few facts about South Dakota. With over 700,000 acres of public hunting land, South Dakota is home to the Nation's best pheasant hunting, and it's the pheasant hunting capital of the world. In fact, last year, pheasant hunters were able to put 1.55 million roasters in their game bags.

In 2011 alone, the pheasant hunting season had an economic impact of over $225 million to our State. It's our number two industry as tourism, and a big part of that happens during the hunting season. A majority of the money spent from that $225 million comes in from out-of-state visitors.

Hunting and maintaining a healthy habitat for wildlife is one of the great things that I appreciate about South Dakota, and it's why I'm so proud to call it home.

During the debates that have occurred here in Washington, D.C., recently, I received many, many—thousands, actually—letters from South Dakotans. I just want to read a couple of excerpts from a couple of those if I have the chance.

The first one was from Kevin in Aberdeen. He said:

> I urge you to oppose any and all antigun legislation that will simply penalize law-abiding gun owners. Instead, focus on improvements to our Nation's mental health system and enhancing school security, while respecting our Second Amendment rights.

Mike, who is also from Aberdeen, in talking about a bill that had been proposed said:

> This is clearly the wrong answer for a real issue. Taking away a right that has been proven to save lives time and again is the wrong reason against obvious mental issues and security lapses.

□ 1620

The last one I want to touch on is from Greg. He says:

> I agree that work needs to be done to keep weapons out of the hands of mentally ill individuals, but this isn't the answer. I regularly use a rifle that would be banned under some proposed legislation when controlling coyotes and the rabbit populations on my farm. I've also used the rifle for controlling prairie dog populations on other landowner property, in addition to hunting on public lands.

That's one of the things you don't talk about a lot. For many people in the middle of the country out in western South Dakota, they simply wouldn't be able to be in business anymore if they didn't have the opportunity to control predators that could

wipe out their entire livestock herd. The Second Amendment guarantees them the right to have the ability to do that.

This is just a small glimpse into the traditions that we have in South Dakota and the heritage that gun ownership offers all of us.

I want to thank the gentlelady for giving me the opportunity to talk about that. The Second Amendment is critically important. It needs to be defended, and I was very proud to stand here and do that with you today.

Mrs. HARTZLER. Thank you, lady. It was sure important, I think, that those voices from South Dakota would be heard and how it is a part of a heritage of so many people in this country and how it has very practical and real benefits to the citizens. We need to focus on solutions that are based on facts and not emotions.

One thing that the lady talked about is that it is a constitutional right. And I wanted to just reiterate that the U.S. Supreme Court has affirmed that gun ownership is an individual right. In District of Columbia v. Heller, the U.S. Supreme Court held that D.C.'s complete gun ban infringes on the Second Amendment rights of the D.C. citizens, and it clarified that the Second Amendment guarantees a fundamental individual right to have a firearm in the home.

So this isn't something just that was talked about and established years ago when our country was founded; it has been upheld recently. We are very thankful for that and want to continue to protect that right.

We have a gentleman here from Texas, who I'm sure knows all about rights and wants to share a little bit about Texas views on why it's important to have our Second Amendment rights. This is BLAKE FARENTHOLD, and I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. FARENTHOLD. Thank you very much.

As I was listening to the gentlelady from South Dakota (Mrs. NOEM), her stories about growing up around firearms and the quality time that she spent with her grandmother learning marksmanship and learning gun safety and learning about life in the outdoors really struck home with me.

I remember growing up with my grandfather, driving around the ranch learning to shoot a .22, moving up and learning how to shoot a shotgun and learning how to do so safely. In Texas, gun control is hitting what you aim at, and that's part of growing up, with an understanding of firearm safety and marksmanship. It's part of many American's lives, just like it was a part of my life.

I got a lot of letters as the debate about gun control was going through the Senate, as well, urging me to continue to stand up for the Second Amendment rights that our Founding Fathers realized was so important—the right to bear arms; the right that those in the Revolutionary War fought for.

One of the letters came just this week from a student and a Boy Scout named Caleb. He said:

> Dear Representative Farenthold:
>
> I wanted to thank you for your beliefs on gun control in our State. I believe that we all have a right to bear arms and protect ourselves if we are in harm.

And that really kind of sums up the feeling of a lot of folks in Texas and a lot of the farmers and ranchers that I represent.

As Representative NOEM was talking about, spending time shooting with her children, one of the things that I look back on in raising my daughters—they are now in college—and you look back and think, well, what should I have done? I should have spent more time outside with them. I should have spent more time passing on some of the things that I've learned. But there's still an opportunity.

Morgan, my 24-year-old daughter, came to me just a couple of weekends ago when I was back home in Corpus Christi and said, ''Dad, can we take a concealed-carry class together this summer?'' So that's on the agenda for when I'm back in Texas is passing on the tradition of the safe and responsible use of firearms in my family.

I'm looking forward to spending time with her in that concealed-carry class, and I hope it instills in her the same passion that I have for the sport of shooting. If this plays out well, we're going to spend time on the skeet range; we're going to spend some time out hunting. It's something that I'm really looking forward to. It's an important part of America. It's an important part of folks' family lives.

The Second Amendment has got to be protected, and the traditions of safe firearms use in this country needs to continue for a myriad of reasons—just more reasons than I can list.

I see you've got quite a few other people here who want to talk about their experiences with the Second Amendment and their beliefs, so I'm not going to eat up all the time. Thank you.

Mrs. HARTZLER. Thank you very much, BLAKE. I'll look forward to hearing how it goes in August with your daughter there.

I think you made a really great point about the important role of protection and how firearms provide a very practical and very, very vital role in self-protection. Estimates range anywhere from 83,000 times a year up to perhaps 1 million times a year citizens of this country use firearms in order to protect themselves. In Missouri, let me share with you just a couple of examples.

In 2008, there was a woman in Cape Girardeau who endured a horrific crime. Someone broke into her apartment through a window and she was raped. Two days later she came home and that person was there again. She had the window repaired, but they were there. This time, though, she was prepared. She had borrowed a friend's shotgun, and she protected herself this time with the shotgun and the outcome was totally different and the person is in jail now.

There's another example in Kansas City. There was a man who had a restraining order against someone who was trying to do him harm. He entered his home and, once again, he was attacked by this person with a knife. But, thanks to having a gun in the home, he was able to stop him, and that person is behind bars as well.

We could go on with many, many examples, but Americans every day use their Second Amendment rights to protect and defend their families and themselves. It is so important that we keep that ability to do that. That's why our Founding Fathers established this right.

Now I would like to turn to my friend from Michigan, TIM WALBERG, to share your thoughts on the Second Amendment. Gentleman, thank you for being here.

Mr. WALBERG. I thank the gentlelady, my friend from Missouri, for holding this opportunity for us to speak on the Second Amendment.

I've often said at town hall meetings that we're talking about the Second Amendment to the U.S. Constitution, the Second Amendment in the Bill of Rights, that namely speaks to the issue that was declared so strongly in the Declaration of Independence, that document, one of two documents that could be considered the greatest man-made documents ever penned, the Declaration of Independence and then the Constitution.

The Bill of Rights understood what the Declaration said, that all men are created equal and endowed with certain unalienable rights, namely, the right to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness.

I think the Framers and Founders understood with the First Amendment, the right to free speech and the freedom of religion, but also that understanding that the right to life involved making sure that I could defend myself, protect myself, care for myself, feed myself with the use of a weapon in the field in hunting, but not simply that. Mr. Speaker, I will say, it was there to make sure that a citizen, a free citizen of the United States, was able to care for himself or herself, his family or her family, in any shape or form.

And so I see the First Amendment as important, but I see equally important the Second Amendment, the right to keep and bear arms. And as my friend Ted Nugent says: ''Keep'' is defined as ''It's mine. It's not yours. You're not going to take it from me.''

Very simple. Very simple.

I think we need to understand as there are laws that are being thought of, well-intentioned even, and yet laws that really aren't based in reality of what takes place around civilization, when it understands that we need to make sure that we don't step on other

people's rights and their freedoms and their opportunities, yet there is a place when we must be prepared to defend ourselves so that those rights can be carried on, not only for ourselves, but for those that count on us to care.

□ 1630

In a famous quote, Benjamin Franklin said it this way:

> They that can give up essential liberty to obtain a little temporary safety deserve neither safety nor liberty.

Well said.

I think there are people with well-meaning intentions right now that aren't thinking of the fact that liberty comes with a cost, that it comes with the responsibility and an accountability to continue on to make sure that liberty continues, not only for me, but for you and everyone else, and that liberty is protected from those who would take away our freedoms, our rights, even our lives.

I like to hunt, and I love to trapshoot, and I love to shoot skeets, and I love to shoot sporting clay, and I love to target practice. On my farm, we have a target range, and my wife uses it as well. In fact, she uses it better than I do with a pistol. Yet with the fun and enjoyment that can come from being trained, we also understand the concerns that are there as with any tool, as my dad taught me. He taught me not only how to shoot a gun and about the inherent dangers that were there that also demanded my responsibility and accountability, but he also taught me how to use a radial saw. He said it would work very well in doing the things it was meant for, but you have to be careful with it.

So, yes, we who believe in the Second Amendment believe that there ought to be training and that people ought to care for how they use their weapons, but we believe they ought to be allowed for us to freely use as they were intended for all good purposes. I grew up on the south side of Chicago. Leroy Brown and Junkyard Dog were my neighbors. I love that area of Calumet City where I grew up, but I also know that there are dangers. I also know that protection is required and that the protection to fit the need and the concern is what must be there.

So I would say to my friend and colleague, as well as to the Speaker and to those who might listen to these words, that the Second Amendment is not the problem; and the law-abiding citizen who carries out the responsibilities of the Second Amendment is not the problem. Most of us fit in that category. Nothing in the bill that was put forth in the Senate, or any other thoughts, would take care of those criminals. It would not have changed the Boston bombers in their ability to get and to use for criminal, terrorist purposes any change or impingement on the Second Amendment. They would have still committed their atrocities, and they would have still gotten their weapons. The only negative impact would have been on law-abiding citizens, the ability to keep and to bear arms, to protect themselves—to carry out the constitutional right.

So I thank the gentlelady from Missouri for allowing us to speak on this issue.

Hopefully, some would hear the common sense of it all and not just hear what some would say: that if we appreciate weapons, we are warmongers or that we are living in danger and producing danger in other people's lives. The fact is just the opposite: we are there to ensure safety, ensure liberty and to make sure that people are protected against criminals who would abuse us regardless of what the law or the Constitution says.

I will defend that, and I thank my colleagues for standing for this reality and truth for the Second Amendment.

Mrs. HARTZLER. Thank you, Mr. WALBERG. Well said.

I like how you point out that the right to life is tied to the Second Amendment—to be able to defend ourselves and protect that life. That is so true. Also, it's not a safety issue. In fact, violent crime has dropped by 72 percent since 1993 in this country; and, actually, there has been a 47 percent increase in U.S. households that have guns. We now have 47 percent of us who own a gun, and crime has gone down. So an excellent point there.

I would like to yield to my friend from Louisiana, Representative STEVE SCALISE. He is a champion of our Second Amendment.

Thank you for coming.

Mr. SCALISE. I want to thank my colleague, Mrs. HARTZLER from Missouri, for hosting this leadership hour to talk about our Second Amendment rights and for yielding time as well.

I am very proud to rise in strong support of our Second Amendment rights and also in opposition to many of these bills that have been floating around Congress that would take away those rights that are so precious to all Americans. Those rights were so important that the Second Amendment to the Constitution—part of our Bill of Rights, the first set of amendments to our Constitution—enshrined this right to the American people to bear arms. This wasn't a right that they just gave to the militia, to the military, to our local law enforcement. This was a right that was granted to all Americans because it was so precious and important.

We were all shocked and saddened by the murders at Sandy Hook; but I think what is also disappointing is, when you have these tragedies, unfortunately, there are people—Washington politicians—who try to take advantage of those tragedies, who then come behind and try to impose their own agendas in the name of somebody else. When you look at a lot of these bills that have been filed, they have absolutely nothing to do with those murders or with any of these other tragedies that we've seen.

You look at Sandy Hook. He stole the gun. The gun was from his mother. He murdered his own mother. I think they counted over 40 different laws that were broken by the Sandy Hook murderer. Then somebody is going to tell you that one more law, which makes it harder for law-abiding citizens to get a gun, would have stopped him from doing that when, in fact, he didn't even break the laws that they're proposing.

So I think people see through that. People realize that these bills are, unfortunately, the same bad ideas that have been floating around for decades by people who just want to take away our Second Amendment rights. They just don't share those same beliefs that our Founding Fathers had when they felt that it was so important that all American citizens have these protections.

I am proud to come from Louisiana. We call ourselves a Sportsman's Paradise. There, when you talk about the Second Amendment, we're not just talking about hunting. Some people want to say that the Second Amendment is really just about hunting. It's not about hunting. It's about a lot more than hunting. It's about the ability for people to protect themselves.

I was in New Orleans after Hurricane Katrina. During those days, there were some very dark days. We had a few weeks, not just hours or days, where you couldn't pick up the phone and call 911. There was no 911 system. In many cases, there was no power for weeks. You couldn't get law enforcement to come if there were somebody trying to come and loot your house or worse, so the citizens at home in their houses with their guns was the only protection that people had for not just days, but for weeks after Hurricane Katrina.

One of the more frightening things that happened after Hurricane Katrina—there were many frightening things that happened during Katrina—but after Katrina, local law enforcement gave an order to have the police actually go door to door in the city of New Orleans and confiscate guns from law-abiding citizens. It actually happened. It has been well documented to the point where I was in the State legislature at the time, and I filed legislation to prevent that from ever being able to happen again. In fact, the NRA, which is so decried by all of these gun control advocates, actually stood up and said that it's wrong for government to go door-to-door and take your guns from you.

People said, Oh, that can never happen in America.

Yet, it happened. It happened in an American city—in New Orleans.

After Katrina, there is actual video footage of a woman, Ms. Connie. She was in her house in uptown New Orleans, and the police actually came to her house to take her gun. She didn't want to give up her gun, and they tackled her. They broke her collarbone. I actually brought her to testify for my bill. I am proud to say my bill passed back then and that no longer can anybody in Louisiana take away your guns

even during a natural disaster. Fortunately, because of the NRA's leadership, they made this a national law. It's now a national law. But that actually happened.

So this Second Amendment right is incredibly sacred, and it's unfortunate that some try to take advantage of disasters to go and try to chip those rights away. That's why we're here today, and that's why I'm proud of my colleague from Missouri and of so many others who are here to stand up for that right that we all hold dear.

Mrs. HARTZLER. Thank you very much, STEVE.

It's very helpful, I think, to be reminded of the firsthand account of what can happen and what did happen in Louisiana when the government came to take the guns away from the citizens there. We don't ever want to see that happen again because, like you said, it's imperative for personal protection besides its being a personal right. So thank you for sharing that. I appreciate it.

□ 1640

Mrs. HARTZLER. Well, we have my friend and colleague from Indiana, who's come to join us here, MARLIN STUTZMAN.

You brought a couple of guests here with you today to be a part of our Special Order?

Mr. STUTZMAN. I did.

Mrs. HARTZLER. Very good. Well, I yield to you. I want to hear what you have to share.

Mr. STUTZMAN. I thank the lady from Missouri for yielding. I brought my two sons, Payton and Preston, along today. So it's a father and son outing here. Payton asked if he could come along to hear us talk about the Second Amendment.

We, of course, we're farmers back in Indiana, and I grew up with BB guns. And Payton now has his little BB gun and a 410/22, and Preston has a little BB gun. So we enjoy the sport out on the farm.

I want to just thank you for bringing this issue to the floor today because it's such an important issue for our country, and obviously a lot of things have happened over the past several years that brings this issue to us appropriately. I believe that we do need to have a discussion not only about our Second Amendment rights, but about gun safety and how each of us as Americans who owns a gun is responsible.

Of course, my wife, Christy, and I are grieving, along with our family which is grieving for those who lost loved ones in Newtown and, of course, in Arizona, Colorado, Virginia and so many other places. We've had some cases in Fort Wayne of just irresponsibility, but also intended murder. But, of course, as we saw what happened in Boston, bad people can take any device and hurt people with those devices, and it is always sad to see.

But one of the things that I know from constituents back home is that they don't expect knee-jerk reactions from Washington when it comes to legislation. And now I would like to just quote a couple of quotes from our Founding Fathers that I think are so important and quotes about our Second Amendment rights.

George Washington said, ''A free people ought to be armed.''

Thomas Jefferson says that, ''The strongest reason for the people to retain the right to keep and bear arms is, as a last resort, to protect themselves against tyranny in government.''

He also says, ''The beauty of the Second Amendment is that it will not be needed until they try to take it.''

I think that is why this motivates people to contact their Members of Congress, to let them know how they feel.

Madam Speaker, we are a democracy that is represented by people we send to Washington. As we saw the votes unfold in the Senate, I think that each one of those Members in the Senate was representing the people that they were elected by. Of course, the President was very critical of the Senate after they were not able to pass a bill that he had wanted. But when he is criticizing them, he is criticizing each one of those particular Members and also the people that sent them to the United States Senate. To watch each different vote take place, I think it tells us that Americans across the country are not about just knee-jerk reactions but about responsibility when it comes to gun ownership, and it also shows their passion about protecting the Second Amendment. Many of these Members in the Senate did not want to vote for tighter gun control laws because they were representing the people from their particular States.

So I believe that last week the American people spoke. It wasn't just the Senate. The American people, through their representatives, said that they don't want stricter gun legislation. We've already tried Senator FEINSTEIN's so-called ''assault weapons'' ban in the nineties and it failed to reduce murder rates then, and it would, I believe, fail to reduce murder rates now. The American people understand that, and I believe that the United States Senate understands that, as well. They've seen this before.

So while we watched the Senate work through the gun legislation, there was one particular amendment that I thought was very intriguing, and that was the amendment that Senator CORNYN from Texas offered. That was an amendment that—I have a bill filed here in the House, H.R. 578. It's called the Respecting States' Rights and Concealed Carry Reciprocity Act of 2013, which basically allows law abiding citizens that have a concealed weapon permit to carry across State lines to those States that do have concealed carry permits.

Senator CORNYN offered a very similar amendment to the underlying bill in the Senate. It almost passed. It was within three votes of passing, which I thought was very interesting that while the President was trying to enact stricter gun legislation, a bill that would actually let us as Americans travel across the country almost passed in the Senate. I think that sends a strong message to all of us as Americans that the Senate does understand and respect the importance of the Second Amendment but also is interested in letting those folks who are abiding by the law to also carry throughout the country.

The bill that I've authored understands that instead of pursuing ineffective gun controls, we really do need to strengthen the protections for law abiding citizens who exercise their right to self-defense every day.

One other comment is that my bill would simply make sure that law abiding gun owners who legally carry a concealed weapon in their home State may do so in other States. Illinois does not have a permit, so they would not be allowed to carry there, but just about every other State does.

I think Americans have seen over the past couple of weeks that both sides of the aisle see that sweeping gun control legislation is misguided and it is an attack on law-abiding gun owners, and it is designed to advance another agenda instead of really saving lives.

I believe what we really should be focused on is the people behind the weapon, the people that plant the bomb, the people that are taking these particular tools and hurting other people, whether it's with a ball bat or a crowbar or any other sort of device that people could pick up with their hands and hurt others. We really need to focus on the mental challenges that these people have. There has to be. There is information that we know about these particular people, and I believe that's who we need to focus on.

We as Americans need to make sure that we teach our children safety. If someone has decided to purchase a gun, they have a responsibility to understand how that particular weapon operates and the safety measures that go along with it, just like I learned in my hunter safety course when I was 12 years old, and also by my father, who threatened me many times if any more windows were shot out that I was going to be paying for them.

There are so many different exciting and joyful opportunities that families can do together as a family with firearms, but also there is a great responsibility that comes along with that.

Also, as the quotes that I read before from our Founding Fathers show, there is an even greater right behind that, a principle behind that, that we do have a responsibility not only to protect ourselves but to protect other citizens that we live with.

So thank you for bringing this issue to the floor, and thank you to all of those who have spoken, as well. I believe that as we continue these discussions that it should be thoughtful, that

it be careful, and we in Congress have a responsibility to let people know that we do understand that this issue is an important matter. But as we've seen in the votes from the Senate, people want to know gun safety is the most important issue that we're dealing with.

□ 1650

Mrs. HARTZLER. Absolutely. Very well said. I appreciate your comments, and I'm so glad you brought Payton and Preston along. I was sharing earlier that I got my start on the farm with my BB gun as well. I'm glad to hear you're well on your way to having a lot of years of fun hunting and doing it safely with your father teaching you.

My friend from Indiana brought up so many great points. The quotes from the Founding Fathers really bring home what this is all about and why it is so important that we as a country retain the right as citizens to be able to protect ourselves, not just from individuals, but from the government even. Well said there.

As far as the Senate vote, I think you brought up an excellent point as well, that the American people really did speak. I think overwhelmingly the American people understand that taking away guns or putting new restrictions on law-abiding citizens is not going to address the problems of violence in our society, and it would not have prevented the tragedy that occurred in Connecticut or any of the other shootings that we have experienced. So we need to, as I said earlier, focus on the facts and not on emotions.

I wanted to share with you some of the comments from people in my district. I think lots of times people in the country have the pulse of what is common sense and what is wise policy for our country, more so than in the heat of the moment sometimes with some things that have gone on here at the Capitol.

This is an example from Samantha of what happened recently in our district in Randolph County, and I think she has a very interesting perspective on this. She said:

> I am a citizen of Randolph County, and on Easter Sunday, two men went on a crime spree in our area and shot two very close friends of mine, pistol whipped an elderly lady, and killed a woman from Moberly. These suspects were on the run from police for over 12 hours, including overnight. The residents of this area didn't sleep well not knowing what was going on. Houses were on lockdown. It was a horrible feeling knowing the armed men were able to get away from police officers for several hours and not knowing where they would go next.
>
> As a mother, I was terrified for my family. Knowing that we were protected in case these perpetrators came in our neighborhood was the only thing that made that night even bearable. Please vote to keep our Second Amendment rights. It is our right to protect ourselves from these criminals who will always be able to get guns no matter what they do, such as drugs, because drugs are illegal as well. If they want them, they will get them. Let normal, law-abiding citizens keep their guns to protect themselves. We should not have them taken away because there are people who are irresponsible for them. Those people will get guns no matter what, but law-abiding citizens need to be able to protect our families. It is our right, just as freedom of speech is, and should not be taken away.

Well said, Samantha. I think that is a perfect example of what happens potentially when a crime is occurring, and how important it is for families to be able to defend themselves in that event.

Here's a comment from Carol from Lowry City. She said in an email to me:

> By definition, criminals do not care about laws. They will acquire guns and whatever weapon they want to use for their nefarious activity regardless of what the law is. The only thing that this unconstitutional gun grab will do is put innocent, law-abiding citizens in harm's way by preventing them from protecting themselves, their property and their family. If stringent gun control which stripped Second Amendment rights from the people were the answer to alleviating violence, then the city of Chicago would be a model of safety. Instead, Chicago, which has some of the most strict gun control laws in the Nation, led the country in number of deaths related to firearms at 532. The people could not protect themselves against the criminal activity around them, and many paid for it with their lives.

I wanted to share some statistics from the World Health Organization. It lists, and you probably can't see it, but two pages' worth of countries here that have a higher percentage of murders per 100,000 citizens than we do. You have countries everywhere from the Bahamas, Puerto Rico, Jamaica, Panama, Brazil, Greenland, Costa Rica, Russia, British Virgin Islands, Philippines, Uruguay, Thailand, and on and on. Two pages of countries that have very high murder rates, and yet here is the United States below all of them. And you know what all of these other countries have in common? All of these countries have banned guns 100 percent from their citizens.

So this validates what Carol from Lowry City said to me in her email, that when you take guns away from individuals, crime rates actually go up because criminals will have the guns and the law-abiding citizens won't be able to protect themselves. I thought that was a really good point that she makes.

Here's a comment in an email from Vicki Jo from Clinton, Missouri. She said:

> I would like you to know that I do not support more regulations on any guns, accessories, or ammunition. These items are only tools some people choose to use as weapons against others. I feel the Second Amendment gives me the freedom to own and operate any firearm that I choose. I'm a hunter and, if needed, would use my firearms for protection from harm. I feel that more attention needs to be spent on those dealing with mental illness and pose a threat to others' welfare. We law-abiding citizens don't need more laws to take more freedoms away from us. Please pursue the violators of these crimes and not their ill-chosen tools.

Well said.

Larry from Mexico, Missouri, said:

> Guns can do no harm by themselves. They are no more harmful than any large vehicle like a truck or bus that has mass or weight as a part of their structure.

It's interesting that Larry would say that because yesterday I saw a clip on the news of someone who actually went after someone else in a car. The other person was on a bicycle, and they tried to kill them. They were able to save the person. Thankfully, he wasn't hurt, but they are still looking for the person in the car. So are we going to ban cars because they can be used to kill people? Of course not, because what we need to do is find the person who was trying to commit the crime.

Continuing on, Larry says:

> Sick individuals can take any truck and drive it into a school or mall, killing our loved ones just as a gun can. I don't want anyone to be hurt or die, but feel that this path of legislation is wrong. As others have suggested, we need to focus on people. People are the motor driving the gun, truck, bus or any other object. The focus has to become helping the mentally ill.

And we have Jessica from Warrensburg. She said:

> If a fraction of the time, energy, money and passion that went into debating gun control went toward establishing a more efficient national or State mental health outreach campaign, perhaps we would have less heartbreaking tragedies involving individuals who felt unheard, isolated, and alienated. A commonly heard phrase is guns don't kill people, people kill people. If that is true, What are we doing to help people?

I think that brings up the point of mental health issues in our country and how we should be focusing more on these killers and what caused them or led them to do it. What about violent video games? If you look at the Newtown, Connecticut, shooter as well as the Aurora, Colorado, shooter, Madam Speaker, you'll find that both of them spent an inordinate amount of time playing violent video games where they actually were carrying out scenarios of shooting people. How come we aren't hearing proposals talking about that from gun control advocates or from those who say that they want to do this to help children. Let's get to the heart of the issue here.

We have Kelly from Sedalia who adds:

> The one thing all of these misguided proposals have in common is that they won't reduce crime. Criminals by definition are law breakers. They are not deterred by laws against murder, rape, armed robbery, et cetera; and they won't be affected by additional gun control laws on top of the tens of thousands of existing laws we have on the books at every governmental level. Again, I urge you to oppose any and all anti-gun legislation that will simply penalize law-abiding gun owners and instead focus on improvements to our Nation's mental health system and enhancing school security while respecting our Second Amendment rights.

The gentleman from Indiana brought up some really good points awhile ago, and we share a lot in common. We both come from a farm background, and we both still have a farm today. We both have children still in school, and we enjoy sharing our heritage. I say to the

gentleman, my daughter, we've had a lot of fun with her, teaching her how to shoot a gun and going out also in our pasture. We have an area that we've blocked off, and we target shot, and it's a lot of fun and she enjoys it. But just as importantly as it being enjoyable, I think just being familiar with guns and for the potential of having self-protection is so important, as well. And I know you would agree.

□ 1700

Mr. STUTZMAN. Absolutely. I think that as Payton, our oldest, we've given him a bow and arrow, and he has his straw bales out in the back of the barn. And I think that any time he goes out, we always talk to him about look what's beyond your target and make sure that you're not shooting in a direction towards a house or towards any other one that's behind there.

And it really does come down to awareness and responsibility and making sure that any time you're shooting, whether it's a bow and arrow, or whether it's a baseball, for that matter, throwing a baseball or shooting a firearm, that there is an awareness always around you.

I know we see a lot of the tragedies that happen in cities, whether it could be from a stray bullet, and that's where we need to continue to focus on those people, whether it's through our churches, whether it's through charitable organizations, through schools, education, and helping people understand the great responsibility that comes with firearms.

I feel fortunate to be raised on a farm where I could start at a very young age and was taught the lessons of responsibility with gun ownership. And then we're teaching the same with Payton and Preston.

There is that point of fun and the enjoyment of having firearms as you're out in the woods or wherever you're at. But it also goes deeper than that. And I think that's why the Second Amendment goes to the very heart of Americans and how we were founded. Obviously, the men who fought in the Revolutionary War needed to have the access to a gun to defend themselves against the Redcoats at the time, and so they obviously had to learn the same thing.

And it wasn't just to defend themselves from another army. It was also a tool used to provide food for themselves.

We're very fortunate in so many ways that we don't have the responsibility of using a gun on a daily basis like people used to. With that, people don't use a firearm as often, and they do have a responsibility to make sure that they're trained when they do purchase one, and recognizing those that are around them when they're using them.

But again, it goes to the heart of us as Americans and defending our freedom. And if it has to absolutely come to that, to defeat tyranny. That is what Thomas Jefferson mentioned about the Second Amendment.

Mrs. HARTZLER. It's certainly a deterrent, I think, from any government who would want to take on their citizens. And you look at this list that I was sharing, two pages of people and countries who have very high murder rates. I feel for the people of those countries.

I can't imagine what that would be like to live in a country where you're basically helpless. You and your family are helpless. You are totally open to and vulnerable to anyone, whether it's somebody in government, a rogue government, or a criminal who wants to do yourself or your family harm, and you don't have that ability to protect yourself.

Madam Speaker, how much time do I have remaining?

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana). The time of the gentlewoman has expired.

IMMIGRATION REFORM

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

Mr. VARGAS. Madam Speaker, I rise today to speak on our Nation's need for comprehensive immigration reform. I did want to, however, congratulate my friend, MARLIN STUTZMAN, and his family. What a beautiful family. And it was a delight looking over and seeing both boys. What a terrific family.

I come today, though, to thank, really, the faith community in this country that has come together around comprehensive immigration reform. It's been interesting to see how, literally, every denomination, every faith group, has come together and said that we must have comprehensive immigration reform because of the values that they have, as religious people and religious groups, but also, more importantly, the religious values that we share as Americans.

So I want to thank all of the groups that have been praying for us, that have come to the Capitol to speak to us, to say, open up your hearts, open up your minds and take a look at the stranger among you.

I would like to read a letter that I received yesterday that, I think, puts it into context, certainly in the Judeo-Christian context, and that was a letter that I received from Rabbi Ron Stern from the Stephen S. Wise Temple in Los Angeles, California.

He wrote this:

Among the fundamental stories of the Jewish people is the classic telling of the experience of slavery in Egypt.

The story is not only told each year during the Passover Seder held by Jews around the world but it is also referenced repeatedly as the rationale for many Jewish ethical principles.

The tradition teaches us that we must always remember that we were strangers in a strange land, that we were powerless immigrants with no choice but to rely upon the grace and mercy of others who not only had power over our subsistence, but sometimes over our lives.

The truth of the Exodus story for the Jewish people is eternal because we have often been wanderers in lands that were not our own.

Subsequent to the Exodus story, the first encounter with the landless powerlessness occurred nearly 2,500 years ago in the land of Babylonia.

It was there that we also learned the strength that comes when a people exits the shadows and is able to take its place in the light of the Nation's destiny. A vibrant Jewish community thrived there for thousands of years as citizens of a Persian nation.

Elsewhere in the world over the centuries Jews encountered wandering, rootlessness and powerlessness in Europe, Russia and Northern Africa. With each move, we endured the insecurity of foreigners never fully welcomed in a land that benefited from our labor and our skills.

The all too infrequent eras of stability, security and peace were welcomed isles of harmony that allowed our people to prosper.

Because of our history, because of our collective memory of wandering and existing as immigrants in lands that were not our own from birth, because we were wanderers who traveled to nations looking for better fortunes and left nations where fortune and safety eluded, the Jewish people have a mission to extend compassion and embrace to others who seek the very security that we often sought for ourselves.

Now that we have found peace, comfort, stability and strength in this great country, we demand nothing less than that for others who seek these essential components of life for themselves and for their families.

Eleven million immigrants have cared for our children, attended our schools, worked in our factories, fought our wars, frequented our businesses, and made our way of life possible.

The time is now for those who have become a part of our American fabric through the sweat of their hands to be given the place in our society that we cherish for ourselves as well: citizens of the United States of America.

Sincerely, Rabbi Ron Stern.

I want to thank Rabbi Stern. I think that he, along with so many others, have really set the stage for something that I think is not only overdue but that we're going to do, and that is, we're going to look into our hearts, and we're going to see that the stranger among us is not so strange.

It was interesting that the rabbi mentioned fought our wars. For those of us that have been working with immigrants, I think probably the saddest things, the saddest occurrences that we've encountered are these, when military men and women have spouses who are undocumented.

□ 1710

A good example is a story I gave before, and I'll give it again, it was so compelling.

Here in the Capitol, on the Senate side, we heard testimony from an Army soldier who had, unfortunately, been injured. He came home and his wife is taking care of him and his young family. And what he's had to do is line the car windows and all over the car with stickers that say, ''Injured Soldier,''

''Go Army,'' and all sorts of other stickers that show that he is someone that went and fought for us overseas. And the reason he does this, he says, is because he doesn't want to get pulled over for some small traffic violation because his wife is the only one that's able to drive, and she could be deported because she's undocumented.

And probably even more compelling, we had, afterwards, a member of the Marines come forward and say, tragically, that he is fearful when he is sent overseas, but not of dying, interestingly. He said that he served two tours of duty in Iraq. He said that he was scared the whole time he was there, but not of what I thought. He said, You wouldn't guess. He said, I'm going back now to Afghanistan, and I have the same fear. And you know what his fear is? His fear is not of dying. Interestingly and starkly, he said, That's what Marines do. We fight and we die. I'm not afraid of that. I'm afraid that my wife will get deported because she's undocumented. I'm afraid that my wife will get deported. That's what his fear is, that his wife may be deported.

He says, What then will happen to not only my wife but my children? I'm off in Afghanistan doing what I think is right, defending our country, defending our liberty, and at the same time my wife could get deported to a nation she doesn't really even know anymore. She came as a child. She came from Mexico. How is that fair?

And I can tell him, Of course, that's not fair. But I think that more and more of us are hearing these stories. And I thank him for his bravery to come forward because it does, in fact, put his family in peril because she could get deported. But I thank him and I thank the other brave members of the military that have come forward and given us their stories. I've heard from many now.

Now I would like to take a moment to share with you a letter written by the Evangelical Immigration Table to us here in the United States Congress.

They wrote:

Dear Speaker Boehner and Leader Pelosi,

Congratulations to you and your campaign teams on your election victories.

Our Nation faces many great challenges and opportunities. We pray that God will lead and guide your steps and provide you with the wisdom during the years ahead. As evangelical leaders, we live every day with the reality that our immigration system doesn't reflect our commitment to the values of human dignity, family unity, and respect for the rule of law that define us as Americans.

Initiatives by both parties to advance commonsense fixes to our immigration policies have stalled in the years past. With your leadership, this can change. In the next Congress, Republicans and Democrats need to come together to pass and implement a national immigration strategy that addresses our Nation's broken immigration system. We commit to supporting you. We are already working across the country to educate and mobilize our fellow evangelical Christians to support just immigration laws. Support for reform is growing in our churches, denominations, campuses, and communities.

As an aside, it is. And we see it here at the Capitol. We see more and more church groups and pastors coming and speaking to us, and speaking to us in a very united way and a very compassionate way and a very values-filled way, saying that we have to do something. And I thank them again for that.

They go on:

We stand ready to support legislation that reflects our Christian values and builds the common good. We are driven by moral obligation rooted deeply in our faith to address the needs of immigrants in our country. Compassionate and just treatment of immigrants is a frequent topic in the Scripture. The Hebrew word for immigrant, ''ger'', occurs 92 times throughout the Bible.

We respectfully request that you meet personally with leadership from the Evangelical Immigration Table in the first 92 days of the next Congress to discuss bipartisan immigration reform legislation that:

One, guarantees secure national borders;

Two, respects the God-given dignity of every person;

Three, ensures fairness to taxpayers;

Four, protects the unity of the immediate family;

Five, establishes a path toward legal status and/or citizenship for those who qualify and those who wish to become permanent residents;

Six, respects the rule of law.

These principles are endorsed by the signers of this letter and by more than 150 other prominent evangelical leaders from around the Nation. The principles reflect a growing convergence with the position of other religious, civic, business, labor, and law enforcement leaders.

We urge you to reach across the aisle and to work to create a bipartisan solution that reflects our values, creates just and humane immigration laws, and moves us forward together.

The letter was signed by Leith Anderson, President, National Association of Evangelicals; Stephan Bauman President and CEO, World Relief; David Beckmann, President, Bread for the World; Noel Castellanos, CEO, Christian Development Community Association; Robert Gittelson, President, Conservatives for Comprehensive Immigration Reform; Richard Land, President, Ethics and Religious Liberty Commission of the Southern Baptist Convention; Samuel Rodriguez, President, National Hispanic Christian Leadership Conference; Gabriel Salguero, President, National Latino Evangelical Coalition; Richard Stearns, President, World Vision United States; and Jim Wallis, President and CEO of Sojourners.

So why have all of these evangelical leaders and why have so many other faith groups come together and said with a unified voice that we have to have comprehensive immigration reform? Well, as they say, the reason is because of their values. Because they believe in the Bible and they believe that the stranger among us must be treated as ourselves. In fact, interestingly, some of them quote Leviticus.

In Leviticus, of course, it says that you shall love the alien, the stranger, as you love yourselves, because you have to remember that you once were strangers, too, in the land of Egypt.

And so I thank all of these religious leaders, all of these faith communities that have come together. Interestingly, I can't recall another time when you've had so many different religious faith groups, pastors, reverends, and rabbis come together with one voice and say, This is the path forward; we all agree. But we have it here.

The nice thing about it is that I think we are getting to a point where we are going to agree that we have to have a comprehensive immigration package that reflects the values that they have spoken to, the values that we hold dear as Americans, and I think that we are going to get there. And I thank each and every one of them that prays for us because I am a person of faith. I do believe that prayers work. I can feel their fervent prayers here. We can all hear them here. It's a wonderful thing.

I do want to read a few more letters and a few more quotes from these same evangelical leaders because I think it's important to get a feel for how unanimous they are that we have to have comprehensive immigration reform that really reflects our best values, our better angels. So here's a press release from the evangelical leaders to amplify the call for bipartisan immigration reform with radio ads in key States.

□ 1720

Dr. Richard Land, president, Ethics and Religious Liberty Commission of the Southern Baptist Convention:

Evangelical Christians who listen to Christian radio tend to be well educated in the Scriptures and politically engaged. Reaching them with this message about God's heart for immigrants and the importance of immigration solutions rooted in Biblical values will be absolutely critical for building the political will we need to pass meaningful reforms in 2013.

Our political leaders need to hear from our constituents and from their constituents and know that evangelical Christians are strongly behind them if they have the moral courage to act on the values we see in Matthew 25 and other places in the Scripture concerning welcoming the stranger.

I thank Dr. Richard Land. When he says that he hopes that we hear from our constituents, we are hearing from them. In fact, we're also hearing from Dr. Richard Land and other leaders in the evangelical churches that have come here to say, if you have any distrust in your heart for the immigrant, the stranger, or even hate, put it aside. Instead, follow your heart and understand that the immigrant, the stranger among you, deserves your love, your attention, your values.

I think it's happening here. Again, I don't think it's by accident, I think it's by their prayers. I think it's by them coming together with a united voice and saying we have to do what is right. And I thank them.

I'd like to read now from Reverend Dr. Uth, senior pastor of the First Baptist Church of Orlando. The reason I want to read the pastor's notes is because the pastor not only talks about

reform, he comes from a particular area, Orlando. This is his quote:

There's a consistent message throughout Scripture, and it's a command to welcome and to treat fairly all people, but especially the stranger and the foreigner in your land. When we fail to welcome the stranger, in essence we fail to welcome Christ.

And so Christians in our church, when they learn about God's heart for the immigrant and what the Bible has to say, their hearts are open because we are a people of faith, and it is our desire to live out that faith in our world.

Coupled with that, when they meet these immigrants, when they have personal encounters, all of a sudden this issue has a face, it has a story. And it's in that meeting that transformation happens and has happened here for us. We know that the time is now for this discussion.

I thank the pastor. I thank him because he's right. But I also thank him because I think his prayers, his supplications are being answered. I think the prayers of his congregation are being answered. We are coming together, and we are coming together in a bipartisan way.

There are many other things that we disagree on. I've been here not very long, but I can already tell you there are a lot of things that we disagree on. But more and more, we're coming together around the issue of comprehensive immigration reform, and we're coming together because it's the right thing to do.

In fact, the voices now—and they're few and they're shrill—seem to be a real outlier now. They seem to be far out, nowhere in the mainstream. Instead, we're down to the nitty-gritty and we're trying to figure out the small things. I think that that's very good; I think that that's healthy.

I appreciate, again, the candor that we've had on this discussion. It is a pleasure to have the discussion on immigration be so humane and values-based. But also, some of the interests around the country are coming together too.

I sit on the Agriculture Committee, and we were having a committee hearing on horticulture and specialty crops. Almost immediately, the discussion went to comprehensive immigration reform because it's one of the most important things for the agricultural community. Interestingly, they said that the bill in the Senate is not perfect, the bill that we're going to produce here is not perfect, but it's getting close. They're saying that there's a lot of agreement between those that work in the field and represent them and those that are the farmers. When do you see that? It seldom happens. Again, I think it's happening because of the prayers of the pastors.

I do want to read a few more of them because they've sent so many of them now to my office, and also because I appreciate what they're doing. They're making a difference here. I also want to show that it's not only in Orlando, in one part of the country; it's all over the country that pastors and religious groups are coming together to pray for us, to encourage us to move forward on comprehensive immigration reform. So I would like to read from Reverend Dr. Fleming, senior pastor, Champion Forest Baptist Church in Houston, Texas:

We're beginning now to see immigrants as us. We live together, we work together, we serve together, we're all in this together, and the notion of welcoming the outsider and the stranger and inviting them in has been key to that. We see the immigrant as a person created in the image of God. They're husbands and wives, they're parents, they're children.

Oftentimes our broken immigration system causes great suffering in the homes and in the families and in the people's lives.

I believe, and my experience has been here in Texas that conservative Christians and evangelicals are rising to support a Biblical approach to this very complex issue.

I thank him. I thank Dr. Reverend David Fleming, senior pastor, Champion Forest Baptist Church of Houston, for his courage, for his prayers, for his encouragement, for his heart, and for his insight. I think it's very insightful. I want to quote him:

We're beginning now to see immigrants as us. We live together, we work together, we serve together, we're all in this together, and the notion of welcoming the outsider and the stranger and inviting them in has been key to that.

In fact, they have been invited in. I've had the great honor now to speak to many pastors, and evangelization has happened with many of the undocumented people that have come to our Nation.

Now, in fact, as the marine that I spoke of earlier, as well as the soldier, oftentimes they meet their spouses in church and they get married. Then we put them in a situation that if they legally want to live together their spouse has to leave the country for 10 years. Can you imagine that? The marine, who is again going to be deployed overseas, for his wife to be here legally she would have to leave the country for 10 years, what would she do with the children? Does she take them with her? They're American citizens. Does she go to this country that she really doesn't know anymore? How can that be right? How can that be fair? How can that be just? How can that be Christian? How can those be our values? They're not our values. That's why I thank Pastor Dr. David Fleming for stepping forward and saying it's time that we change.

Now, I happen to be a Catholic, so I'd like to quote now Archbishop Jose Gomez, the archbishop of Los Angeles and chairman of the USCCB Committee on Migration. He says this:

Our collective faith groups are prepared to support just and humane reform of a broken immigration system. With the President's leadership and cooperation between both parties in Congress, we can achieve this goal within the year.

We agree with the President and the bipartisan Senate leaders who are stressing the importance of a path to citizenship for the undocumented. We should not sanction a permanent underclass in our society.

Never to correct an archbishop; however, I would add that also the good work that's being done bipartisanly here, too, in this House, in the Congress, and you will soon see a bill.

I thank and I pray every day for the members of that group that are working hard—often under great stress—to come forward with a bill, a change in the law, that represents our better angels. It represents our values as Americans, as Christians, as Jews, as people of faith. So I thank them.

I'd also like to quote Reverend Samuel Rodriguez, president of the National Hispanic Christian Leadership Conference:

Today's meeting invigorated me with hope and optimism. The President's resolve in conjunction with evangelical support facilitate the prescription for a comprehensive resolution addressing America's immigration crisis. I am convinced that with prayer and prophetic activism, we will live out Matthew 25 and welcome the stranger in the name of Jesus.

□ 1730

Of course he quotes famously Matthew 25. Matthew 25, of course, is the judgment where Jesus himself says how we will be judged as a nation. I hope you go back and read that part of Scripture.

Jesus says:

''When I was hungry, you gave me to eat. When I was thirsty, you gave me to drink. When I was naked, you clothed me. When I was ill, you cured me. When I was a stranger, you welcomed me. When I was a prisoner, you visited me.''

Then of course the sheep will ask:

''When do we do that, Jesus?''

''When you did it to the least of my brothers.''

That's what Reverend Samuel Rodriguez was quoting and most Christian groups quote. It's so profoundly who we are: the welcoming of the stranger, Christ among us.

Madam Speaker, I know I don't have much time left. I appreciate deeply the time that I was given today to speak to my colleagues and to speak to hopefully a larger crowd that I have great faith, I have great faith that we are coming together and we're coming together in a way that we will produce a bill that we can all be proud of and hopefully that we will all support but that will have bipartisan support. And it won't be an accident. It will be because of the prayers of these pastors. It will be because of the courage of Rabbi Stern. It will be because of all the encouragement that we've received from the faith communities outside of this House. It is because of their fervent love and support for the immigrant, the stranger, that we will have a just law, and I thank them.

Madam Speaker, thank you for the opportunity today. I yield back the balance of my time.

ATROCITIES OF ABORTION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2013, the Chair recognizes the

gentleman from Arizona (Mr. FRANKS) for 30 minutes.

Mr. FRANKS. Thank you, Madam Speaker.

Madam Speaker, there was a time when the rules of Congress forbid anyone to petition this Congress against slavery. For some inexplicable reason, once in a while, it seems mankind becomes completely blind to a monstrosity. History is replete with such examples. It seems we are never quite so eloquent as we are when we decry the crimes of the past generation, and yet we seem as staggeringly blind as some of our most sightless predecessors when it comes to facing and rejecting atrocities in our own time.

Whether it was slavery, the Nazi Holocaust, or the many human genocides across history, the patterns were the same. Innocent human beings, children of God all, were systematically dehumanized and then subjected to the most horrifying inhumanity. All the while, human society as a whole hardened their hearts and turned away.

But, Madam Speaker, truth and time travel on the same road. And although it was often agonizingly slow, the truth of these tragic inhumanities in our past began to dawn on people of reason and good will. Their hearts first and then their minds began to change.

I've often asked myself: What was it that changed their minds? What changed the minds of those who had previously embraced an invincible ignorance to hide from themselves the horror of what was happening to their innocent fellow human beings?

Madam Speaker, if I only really knew or if I knew how to express it because, you see, today such a conundrum looms before humanity once again, those most glaring examples of which are things like the trial in Philadelphia of Dr. Kermit Gosnell. 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, Madam Speaker. He called it ''ensuring fetal demise.'' 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 it ''snipping.'' Over the years there were hundreds of ''snippings.''

When authorities entered the clinic of Dr. Gosnell, they found a torture chamber for little babies that I do not have the words or the stomach to adequately describe. Suffice it to say that Dr. Gosnell ran a systematic practice in his late-term abortion clinic to cut the spines of those babies who had survived his attempt to abort them.

Every American with the slightest shred of compassion for the innocent should learn the truth of this case for themselves, Madam Speaker, because perhaps the greatest tragedy of all surrounding this case is that it is not as rare as those in the media would try to convince us.

Six months after the Supreme Court legalized abortion on demand in the United States, Dr. Peter A.J. Adam, an associate professor of pediatrics at Case Western University, reported to the American Pediatric Research Society concerning research he and associates had conducted on 12 babies up to 20 weeks old who had been born alive from hysterotomy abortion. These men decapitated these little babies and cannulated the internal carotid arteries. They then kept these little heads alive with heart-lung machines in order to study them. Like the victims of Dr. Gosnell, their spines had been completely sliced through and the painful agony that they were feeling is beyond our imagination, Madam Speaker.

Americans were outraged when they learned that the Russians had kept the heads of dogs alive in the 1950s. Yet, when asked, Peter Adams responded to the criticism of keeping these little human heads alive. He responded by saying:

> Our society has declared the fetus dead and abrogated its rights. I don't see any ethical problem. Whose rights are we going to protect once we've decided the fetus won't live?

In another case, Madam Speaker, Dr. Abu Hayat, the Manhattan abortionist who severed the arm of a baby girl later born alive, is reportedly the first physician in the United States to be jailed for an illegal third-trimester abortion since the infamous 1973 *Roe* v. *Wade* decision.

Sixty-three-year-old Abu Hayat was convicted of having knowingly performed an abortion on Rosa Rodriguez in October of 1991. The 7- to 8-month-old baby girl she carried, baby Ana Rosa Rodriguez, was born the next day, but one of her arms was missing at the shoulder because of Dr. Hayat's botched abortion. Hayat was also convicted of assault on the woman because, in the middle of the abortion, he stopped to demand an additional $500. When the woman's husband couldn't come up with the additional money, she was sent home semiconscious and still bleeding.

Madam Speaker, my heart goes out to those like Rosa Rodriguez, and especially to her, who sooner or later had to face the question from her baby daughter, Mommy, where is my arm? Oh, Madam Speaker, it beggars human imagination to try to take in the crushing emotional burden that the abortion industry in this country has heaped upon so many American mothers.

Madam Speaker, I will not expound upon the cases of abortionist Dr. Scott Ricke or abortionist Gordon Goei or Malvin Roy Weisberg in the infamous Weisberg incident in Woodland Hills, California. However, I will tell you, Madam Speaker, that they involved thousands of unborn children, many of them in their third trimester, in what can be described as a torturous and mass desecration of innocent unborn babies.

Would it be too much to hope for, Madam Speaker, that Members of this body and Americans in general might research these tragedies for themselves, given the cataclysmic implications for any society who turns a blind eye to such atrocities against the most innocent and helpless of its members?

□ 1740

If our society is to survive with our humanity intact, our moral impulse toward our fellow human beings must first survive. Madam Speaker, that is why it is so important for people to see for themselves the inhumanity of what is being done to these little victims. Maybe it would not change everyone's mind, but it has changed many minds. One such example gained a lot of media coverage.

Abby Johnson spent 9 years working at a Texas Planned Parenthood clinic—first as a volunteer and then as clinic director. At one point, she was asked to assist during a routine abortion procedure. Amazingly, this was the first time in those 9 years that Abby had actually watched on an ultrasound an abortion being performed. She recounts holding the transducer over the mother's midsection and observing the display of the baby's movements on the screen. She then watched as the abortion proceeded and as the unborn baby attempted unsuccessfully to escape the probe.

She said:

> I could see the whole profile of the baby. I could see the probe. I could see the baby try to move away from the probe, and I just thought: What am I doing? Then I thought: never again.

Two weeks later, looking out the clinic window and seeing two members of Coalition for Life standing outside, praying, Johnson walked out of the clinic and joined them, and she has never looked back.

Then there was the case of Brenda Shafer, a nurse who was so radically pro-abortion that she told her teenage daughters that they would be forced to have an abortion if they ever got pregnant; but only 3 days of working in an abortion clinic was more than she could handle.

She speaks of going in on her third and final day and watching as the doctor performed three partial-birth abortions, including one procedure on a 6-month-old baby boy with Down syndrome. She watched as the little boy's arms and legs were delivered, his little fingers clasping and unclasping, his feet kicking before the vacuum tube was inserted into the baby's head. He went completely limp—only to be discarded as if he were nothing more than a rag.

Brenda said:

> I have been a nurse for a long time, and I have seen a lot of death—people maimed in auto accidents, gunshot wounds, you name it—and I have seen surgical procedures of every sort; but in all of my professional years, I had never witnessed anything like this. For a long time, sometimes still, I had nightmares about what I saw in the clinic that day.

Former abortion provider Nita Whitten tells a similarly gut-wrenching

story of a young teenage girl who was pressured by her mother to have an abortion. The doctors had inserted what is called a ''laminaria'' to allow the abortion to be performed. Nita describes the young girl going into the bathroom and screaming at the top of her lungs for her mother, screaming over and over ''It's a baby. It's a baby'' after she saw the baby that was aborted in the toilet.

For this little girl, who will forever be scarred by what she saw, there was no debate about whether her baby was just a blob of tissue. Unlike the ostensibly educated abortionists, this girl realized intuitively what science has long argued: conception creates a genetically unique human life—a baby.

All of these people shared a common thread when they were confronted with the brutality and the reality of abortion. They could no longer deny the truth that abortion is the murder of a defenseless child. It's easy for those of us who are far removed from the actual abortion clinics—those who do not have to confront the unspeakable pain caused within the doors of those clinics every day—to idealize and justify abortion on demand.

They tell themselves that they are really fighting for women. They convince themselves that that little flicker they see on the ultrasound screen, as the baby is savagely torn apart in his own mother's womb, is not the tiny beating heart of another living being. They lie to themselves year after year, ignoring the truth that every 5-year-old child knows instinctively. They desensitize themselves to the horrors and the reality until the violent destruction of a defenseless baby is viewed as if it were nothing more than having one's tonsils removed.

Indeed, this is the hope and the goal of monsters like Kermit Gosnell or Abu Hayat or Scott Ricke or Gordon Goei or Malvin Weisberg, just to name a few.

When Abby Johnson, Brenda Shafer, Nita Whitten, and so many others like them saw what abortion really was, they changed their minds. I would never suggest that I clearly know what sparked the change in their hearts, but I am convinced that it is the same spark in the human soul that has turned the tide of blood and tragedy and hatred and inhumanity throughout history. And, Madam Speaker, I am also convinced that it is mankind's only hope.

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

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. BURGESS (at the request of Mr. CANTOR) for today and the balance of the week on account of attending the opening of the George W. Bush Presidential Library in Dallas, Texas.

Mr. SESSIONS (at the request of Mr. CANTOR) for today and the balance of the week on account of attending the opening of the George W. Bush Presidential Library in Dallas, Texas.

Mr. MARCHANT (at the request of Mr. CANTOR) for today and the balance of the week on account of attending the opening of the George W. Bush Presidential Library in Dallas, Texas.

BILL PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Karen L. Haas, Clerk of the House, reported that on April 25, 2013, she presented to the President of the United States, for his approval, the following bill.

H.R. 1246. To amend the District of Columbia Home Rule Act to provide that the District of Columbia Treasurer or one of the Deputy Chief Financial Officers of the Office of the Chief Financial Officer of the District of Columbia may perform the functions and duties of the Office in an acting capacity if there is a vacancy in the Office.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. FRANKS of Arizona. Madam Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 47 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Friday, April 26, 2013, at 10 a.m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

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

1262. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule — Project-Level Predecisional Administrative Review Process (RIN: 0596-AD07) received April 8, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

1263. A letter from the Director, Policy Issuances Division, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule — Food Ingredients and Sources of Radiation Listed and Approved for Use in the Production of Meat and Poultry Products [Docket No.: FSIS-2011-0018] (RIN: 0583-AD47) received April 8, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

1264. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Flumioxazin; Pesticide Tolerances [EPA-HQ-OPP-2012-0139; FRL-9381-7] received April 5, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

1265. A letter from the Under Secretary, Department of Defense, transmitting a biennial strategic plan for the Defense Advanced Research Projects Agency for 2012; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1266. A letter from the Under Secretary, Department of Defense, transmitting authorization of 11 officers to wear the authorized insignia of the grade of major general or brigadier general; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1267. A letter from the General Counsel, National Credit Union Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Chartering and Field of Membership Manual for Federal Credit Unions (RIN: 3133-AE02) received April 8, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Financial Services.

1268. A letter from the Secretary, Securities and Exchange Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule — Identity Theft Red Flags Rules (RIN: 3235-AL26) received April 11, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Financial Services.

1269. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the Department's ''Report to Congress on Dual Language Learners in Head Start and Early Head Start Programs''; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

1270. A letter from the Director, Regulations Policy and Management Staff, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the Department's final rule — Change of Address; Biologics License Applications; Techical Amendment [Docket No.: FDA-2013-N-0011] received April 8, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1271. A letter from the Director, Regulations Policy and Management Staff, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the Department's final rule — Listing of Color Additives Exempt From Certification; Reactive Blue 247 Copolymers [Docket Nos.: FDA-2011-C-0344 and FDA-2011-C-0463] received April 8, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1272. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans; Mississippi; 110(a)(2)(E)(ii) Infrastructure Requirement for the 1997 and 2006 Fine Particulate Matter National Ambient Air Quality Standards [EPA-R04-OAR-2012-0402; FRL-9798-6] received April 5, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1273. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Revisions to the California State Implementation Plan, Santa Barbara County Air Pollution Control District and South Coast Air Quality Management District [EPA-R09-OAR-2012-0828; FRL-9776-6] received April 5, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1274. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans; Georgia: New Source Review-Prevention of Significant Deterioration [EPA-R04-OAR-2012-0662; FRL-9798-5] received April 5, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1275. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans; Region 4 States; Prong 3 of Section 110(a)(2)(D)(i) Infrastructure Requirement for the 1997 2006 Fine Particulate Matter National Ambient Air Quality Standards [EPA-R04-OAR-2012-0814; FRL-9799-8] received April 5, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1276. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Revisions to the California State Implementation Plan, Antelope Valley

Air Quality Management District and Monterey Bay Unified and Santa Barbara County Air Pollution Control Districts [EPA-R09-OAR-2012-0886; FRL-9778-4] received April 5, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1277. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Revisions to the California State Implementation Plan, Santa Barbara and San Diego County Air Pollution Control Districts [EPA-R09-OAR-2013-0426; FRL-9794-4] received April 5, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1278. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Revisions to the California State Implementation Plan, Butte County Air Quality Management District and Sacramento Metropolitan Air Quality Management District [EPA-R09-OAR-2012-0914; FRL-9776-8] received April 5, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1279. A letter from the Acting General Counsel, Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule — Regional Reliability Standard PRC-006-NPCC-1 —— Automatic Underfrequency Load Shedding [Docket No.: RM12-12-000; Order No. 775] received April 5, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1280. A letter from the Chief of Staff, Media Bureau, Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule — Reallocation of Channel 2 from Jackson, Wyoming to Wilmington, Delaware, Amendment of Section 73.622(i), Post-Transition Table of DTV Allotments, Television Broadcast Stations [MD Docket No.: 13-73] (RM-11695) received April 15, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1281. A letter from the Acting General Counsel, Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule — Revisions to Reliability Standard for Transmission Vegetation Management [Docket No.: RM12-4-00; Order No. 777] received April 15, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1282. A letter from the Assistant Secretary For Export Administration, Department of Commerce, transmitting the Department's final rule — Amendments to Existing Validated End-User Authorizations: CSMC Technologies Corporation in the People's Republic of China (PRC) [Docket No.: 130322279-3279-01] (RIN: 0694-AF90) received April 18, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1283. A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting the Department's final rule — Implementation of the Defense Trade Cooperation Treaty Between the United States and Australia (RIN: 1400-AD38) received April 9, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1284. A letter from the Chief, Branch of FS, Department of the Interior, transmitting the Department's final rule — Endangered and Threatened Wildlife and Plants; Listing the Yellow-Billed Parrot With Special Rule, and Correcting the Salmon-Crested Cockatoo Special Rule [Docket No.: FWS-R9-ES-2011-0075]; [4500030115] (RIN: 1018-AY28) received April 11, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

1285. A letter from the Chief, Branch of Listing, Department of the Interior, transmitting the Department's final rule — Endangered and Threatened Wildlife and Plants; Designation of Critical Habitat for Southwestern Willow Flycatcher [Docket No.: FWS-R2-ES-2011-0053] (RIN: 1018-AX43) received April 11, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

1286. 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; Pacific Cod by Catcher Vessels Using Trawl Gear in the Western Regulatory Area of the Gulf of Alaska [Docket No.: 111207737-2141-02] (RIN: 0648-XC502] received April 10, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

1287. 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; Pacific Cod by Catcher Vessels Greater Than or Equal to 50 Feet (15.2 Meters) Length Overall using Hook-and-Line Gear in the Central Regulatory Area of the Gulf of Alaska [Docket No.: 120918468-3111-02] (RIN: 0648-XC585) received April 15, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

1288. A letter from the Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Pacific Halibut Fisheries; Catch Sharing Plan [Docket No.: 130123063-3207-02] (RIN: 0648-BC75) received April 15, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

1289. 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 Mackerel, Squid, and Butterfish Fisheries; Framework Adjustment 7 [Docket No.: 121128658-3161-02] (RIN: 0648-BC72) received April 15, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

1290. A letter from the Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Magnuson-Stevens Act Provisions; Fisheries of the Northeastern United States; Northeast Multispecies Fishery; Sector Exemptions; Final Rule Implementing a Targeted Acadian Redfish Fishery for Sector Vessels [Docket No.: 120813331-3122-02] (RIN: 0648-XC164) received April 15, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

1291. 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; Pacific Cod by Catcher Vessels Less Than 50 Feet (15.2 Meters) Length Overall Using Hook-and-Line Gear in the Central Regulatory Area of the Gulf of Alaska [Docket No.: 120918468-3111-02] (RIN: 0648-XC584) received April 15, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

1292. A letter from the Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Fisheries Off West Coast States; Pacific Coast Groundfish Fishery; Trawl Rationalization Program; Reconsideration of Allocation of Whiting [Docket No.: 120313185-3252-01] (RIN: 0648-BC01) received April 15, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

1293. 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; Pacific Cod by Catcher Vessels Using Trawl Gear in the Central Regulatory Area of the Gulf of Alaska [Docket No.: 111207737-2141-02] (RIN: 0648-XC590) received April 15, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

1294. 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; Pacific Cod by Catcher Vessels Less Than 60 feet (18.3 meters) Length Overall Using Jig of Hook-and-Line Gear in the Bogoslof Pacific Cod Exemption Area in the Bering Sea and Aleutian Islands Management Area [Docket No.: 111213751-2102-02] (RIN: 0648-XC596) received April 15, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

1295. A letter from the Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Fisheries Off West Coast States; Coastal Pelagic Species Fisheries; Annual Specifications [Docket No.: 120924487-3221-02] (RIN: 0648-XC263) received April 15, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

1296. 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; Sablefish Managed Under the Individual Fishing Quota Program [Docket No.: 111207737-2141-02 and 111211375-2102-02] (RIN: 0648-XC569) received April 15, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

1297. 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 Caribbean, Gulf of Mexico, and South Atlantic; 2013 Commercial Accountability Measure and Closure for Coastal Migratory Pelagic Resources of the Gulf of Mexico and South Atlantic [Docket No.: 001005281-0369-02] (RIN: 0648-XC570) received April 15, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

1298. A letter from the Acting Under Secretary and Acting Director, Department of Commerce, transmitting the Department's final rule — Setting and Adjusting Patent Fees; Correction [Docket No.: PTO-C-2013-0010] (RIN: 0651-AC86) received April 9, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1299. A letter from the Attorney-Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; Lubbers Cup Regatta; Spring Lake, MI [Docket No.: USCG-2013-0210] (RIN: 1624-AA00) received April 18, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1300. A letter from the Attorney-Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Drawbridge Operation Regulations; Pelican Island Causeway, Galveston, Channel, TX [Docket No.: USCG-2013-0063] (RIN: 1625-AA09) received April 18, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C.

801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1301. A letter from the Deputy Assistant Chief Counsel for Safety, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Vehicle/Track Interaction Safety Standards; High-Speed and High Cant Deficiency Operations [Docket No.: FRA-2009-0036, Notice No. 2] (RIN: 2130-AC09) received April 9, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1302. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; The Boeing Company Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2005-22523; Directorate Identifier 2005-NM-058-AD: Amendment 39-17379; AD 2013-0507] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received April 9, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1303. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; The Boeing Company Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2008-0847; Directorate Identifier 2008-NM-056-AD; Amendment 39-17375; AD 2013-05-03] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received April 9, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1304. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; The Boeing Company Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2012-0597; Directorate Identifier 2012-NM-054-AD; Amendment 39-17377; AD 2013-05-05] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received April 9, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1305. A letter from the FMCSA Regulatory Ombudsman, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Commercial Driver's License Testing and Commercial Learner's Permit Standards [Docket No.: FMCSA-2007-27659] (RIN: 2126-AB59) received April 9, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1306. A letter from the Trial Attorney, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Systems for Telephonic Notification of Unsafe Conditions at Highway-Rail and Pathway Grade Crossings (RIN: 2130-AC38) received April, 9, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1307. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; PILATUS AIRCRAFT LTD. Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2008-0070; Directorate Identifier 2007-CE-098-AD; Amendment 39-17398; AD 2008-07-11 R1] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received April 9, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1308. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Establishment of Class E Airspace; Round Mountain, TX [Docket No.: FAA-2012-0771; Airspace Docket No. 12-ASW-7] received April 9, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1309. A letter from the Director of Regulation Policy and Management, Office of the General Counsel, Department of Veterans Affairs, transmitting the Department's final rule — Grants to States for Construction or Acquisition of State Homes (RIN: 2900-AO60) received April 10, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions of the following titles were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mr. LOBIONDO (for himself, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, and Mr. JONES):

H.R. 1721. A bill to direct the Secretary of Defense to prohibit the performance of Department of Defense flight demonstration teams outside the United States; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. MCKINLEY (for himself, Mr. ENYART, Mr. GRIFFITH of Virginia, and Mr. ROE of Tennessee):

H.R. 1722. A bill to direct the Secretary of Labor to conduct a review of the forms related to obtaining workers' compensation benefits under the Federal Black Lung Benefits Program; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Ms. SCHAKOWSKY (for herself, Mr. CONYERS, Ms. EDWARDS, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. YARMUTH, Ms. LEE of California, and Mr. GUTIERREZ):

H.R. 1723. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to impose increased rates of tax with respect to taxpayers with more than $1,000,000 taxable income, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HARPER (for himself, Mr. COLE, Mr. BARLETTA, Mr. HULTGREN, Ms. JENKINS, Mr. MEEHAN, and Mrs. WALORSKI):

H.R. 1724. A bill to eliminate taxpayer financing of presidential campaigns and party conventions and reprogram savings to provide for a 10-year pediatric research initiative through the Common Fund administered by the National Institutes of Health, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committees on House Administration, and Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. CARTWRIGHT (for himself, Mrs. BEATTY, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Mrs. CAPPS, Mr. CÁRDENAS, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, Ms. CHU, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. DEFAZIO, Mr. DEUTCH, Mr. DOGGETT, Mr. ENYART, Ms. ESTY, Mr. FATTAH, Ms. FRANKEL of Florida, Ms. GABBARD, Mr. GRIJALVA, Ms. HAHN, Mr. HIGGINS, Mr. HINOJOSA, Mr. HOLT, Mr. HONDA, Mr. HORSFORD, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. JONES, Mr. KILDEE, Ms. KUSTER, Ms. LEE of California, Mrs. LOWEY, Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. NEAL, Mr. NOLAN, Ms. NORTON, Mr. PASCRELL, Mr. PASTOR of Arizona, Mr. PETERS of Michigan, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. RUSH, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Ms. SHEA-PORTER, Ms. SPEIER, Mr. TONKO, Ms. WATERS, Ms. DELAURO, Mr. LARSEN of Washington, Ms. KAPTUR, and Ms. SINEMA):

H.R. 1725. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to provide for unlimited eligibility for health care for mental illnesses for veterans of combat service during certain periods of hostilities and war; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. POSEY (for himself and Mr. PIERLUISI):

H.R. 1726. A bill to award a Congressional Gold Medal to the 65th Infantry Regiment, known as the Borinqueneers; to the Committee on Financial Services, and in addition to the Committee on House Administration, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. WALZ (for himself, Mr. FORTENBERRY, Mr. GIBSON, and Mr. PETERSON):

H.R. 1727. A bill to expand and improve opportunities for beginning farmers and ranchers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture, and in addition to the Committee on the Budget, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. RANGEL:

H.R. 1728. A bill to repeal certain appropriations riders that limit the ability of the Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco, Firearms, and Explosives to administer the Federal firearms laws; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. KIRKPATRICK (for herself and Mr. COFFMAN):

H.R. 1729. A bill to direct the Secretary of Defense to provide the service records of veterans to the Secretary of Veterans Affairs in an efficient, electronic format; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. ENGEL (for himself and Ms. NORTON):

H.R. 1730. A bill to amend the Communications Act of 1934 to prohibit mobile service providers from providing service on mobile devices that have been reported stolen, to require such providers to give consumers the ability to remotely delete data from mobile devices, to prohibit the alteration or removal of mobile device identification numbers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. SCHRADER (for himself, Mr. DENHAM, Mr. FARR, Mr. FITZPATRICK, Mr. CAMPBELL, and Mr. HUFFMAN):

H.R. 1731. A bill to provide for a uniform national standard for the housing and treatment of egg-laying hens, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Ms. BASS (for herself, Mr. MARINO, Mr. CHABOT, Mr. FARENTHOLD, Mr. GRIJALVA, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio, Ms. MOORE, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. POLIS, Mr. RANGEL, and Mr. VARGAS):

H.R. 1732. A bill to amend part E of title IV of the Social Security Act to better enable State child welfare agencies to prevent human trafficking of children and serve the needs of children who are victims of human trafficking, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committee on Education and the Workforce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mrs. BLACKBURN (for herself, Mr. MATHESON, Mr. GRIFFITH of Virginia, Mr. GRIMM, Mr. DESJARLAIS, Mrs. BLACK, and Mr. BILIRAKIS):

H.R. 1733. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to limit the liability of health care professionals who volunteer to provide health care services in response to a disaster; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on the Judiciary, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. CAPUANO (for himself, Mr. CICILLINE, Mr. CONNOLLY, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mrs. DAVIS of California, Mr. DEFAZIO, Ms.

DELAURO, Ms. EDWARDS, Mr. ELLISON, Ms. ESHOO, Mr. FARR, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Mr. LYNCH, Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. MICHAUD, Ms. MOORE, Mr. MORAN, Ms. NORTON, Ms. PINGREE of Maine, Ms. SHEA-PORTER, and Ms. SLAUGHTER):

H.R. 1734. A bill to amend the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 to require shareholder authorization before a public company may make certain political expenditures, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. CASSIDY:

H.R. 1735. A bill to amend the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act to provide for participation in the Exchange of the President, Vice President, and Executive cabinet officials in same manner as Members of Congress and Congressional staff; 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 Mrs. DAVIS of California (for herself, Mr. POLIS, Mr. BEN RAY LUJÁN of New Mexico, Ms. BORDALLO, and Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD):

H.R. 1736. A bill to amend the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 to recruit, prepare, and support principals through capacity-building measures that will improve student academic achievement in high-need schools; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Ms. DELAURO (for herself, Mr. KINZINGER of Illinois, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Mr. MICHAUD, Mr. CICILLINE, Mr. LOEBSACK, Ms. DUCKWORTH, Ms. LEE of California, and Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois):

H.R. 1737. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow manufacturing businesses to establish tax-free manufacturing reinvestment accounts to assist them in providing for new equipment and facilities and workforce training; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DOGGETT (for himself, Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. BECERRA, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. CROWLEY, Mr. KIND, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Mr. LEWIS, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mr. PASCRELL, Mr. RANGEL, Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California, Ms. SCHWARTZ, Mr. LEVIN, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. HINOJOSA, Mr. ANDREWS, Mrs. CAPPS, Mr. CÁRDENAS, Ms. CASTOR of Florida, Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, Mr. CICILLINE, Mr. COHEN, Mr. CUELLAR, Mr. CUMMINGS, Ms. FUDGE, Mr. GALLEGO, Mr. GARAMENDI, Mr. AL GREEN of Texas, Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Mr. HOLT, Mr. HONDA, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Ms. LEE of California, Mr. LOEBSACK, Ms. MATSUI, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Ms. MOORE, Mr. PASTOR of Arizona, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Ms. SHEA-PORTER, Mr. SHERMAN, Mr. SIRES, Ms. SPEIER, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Mr. VELA, Mr. WELCH, Mr. YARMUTH, Mr. POCAN, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Mrs. NEGRETE MCLEOD, Mr. VARGAS, Mr. TONKO, Mr. DEFAZIO, Mr. GRIJALVA, Ms. EDWARDS, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Ms. TITUS, Mrs. DAVIS of California, Mr. NADLER, Mr. RUSH, Ms. BASS, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Mr. CAPUANO, Mr. CLEAVER, Mr. DOYLE, Mr. FATTAH, Mr. DEUTCH, Mr. KILDEE, and Mr. PRICE of North Carolina):

H.R. 1738. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to extend and modify the American Opportunity Tax Credit, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ENYART (for himself and Mr. ISRAEL):

H.R. 1739. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to direct the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to pay provisional benefits for certain nonadjudicated claims, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. FORBES (for himself and Mr. LIPINSKI):

H.R. 1740. A bill to intensify stem cell research showing evidence of substantial clinical benefit to patients, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. GOODLATTE (for himself and Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia):

H.R. 1741. A bill to establish a dairy producer margin insurance program for the purpose of protecting dairy producer income by paying participating dairy producers margin insurance payments when actual dairy producer margins are less than a threshold level, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. HECK of Nevada (for himself, Mr. WEBSTER of Florida, Mr. GARDNER, Mr. RENACCI, Mr. KILMER, Mr. BUCSHON, and Mr. CARNEY):

H.R. 1742. A bill to exclude from consideration as income under the United States Housing Act of 1937 payments of pension made under section 1521 of title 38, United States Code, to veterans who are in need of regular aid and attendance, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. HOLT (for himself, Mr. GRIJALVA, Ms. CASTOR of Florida, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mrs. CAPPS, Mr. POLIS, and Mr. MARKEY):

H.R. 1743. A bill to amend the Oil Pollution Act of 1990 to require responsible parties to pay the full cost of offshore oil spills, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. HORSFORD:

H.R. 1744. A bill to provide for the implementation of the multispecies habitat conservation plan for the Virgin River, Nevada, and Lincoln County, Nevada, to extend the authority to purchase certain parcels of public land, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. ISRAEL (for himself and Mr. KING of New York):

H.R. 1745. A bill to direct the Administrator of the Federal Aviation Administration to issue regulations regarding secondary cockpit barriers; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. KING of Iowa:

H.R. 1746. A bill to amend the National Labor Relations Act to protect employer rights; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Ms. KUSTER:

H.R. 1747. A bill to allow employers a credit against income tax as an incentive to partner with community colleges or other educational institutions to improve workforce development and job training for students; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LARSEN of Washington (for himself, Ms. BROWN of Florida, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Ms. LEE of California, Ms. DEGETTE, Mr. ELLISON, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. HONDA, Mr. FARR, Ms. CHU, Mr. SMITH of Washington, Mr. BECERRA, Mr. COHEN, Ms. NORTON, Mr. LEWIS, Ms. BORDALLO, Ms. SCHWARTZ, Mr. RUSH, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mr. DEUTCH, Ms. MOORE, Ms. SPEIER, Mr. LYNCH, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. TONKO, Mr. CLAY, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Mr. CÁRDENAS, Mr. CUMMINGS, Ms. DELBENE, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Ms. WILSON of Florida, and Mr. SERRANO):

H.R. 1748. A bill to amend the Help America Vote Act of 2002 to permit an individual who is subject to a requirement to present identification as a condition of voting in an election for Federal office to meet such requirement by presenting a sworn written statement attesting to the individual's identification, and for other purposes; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Ms. LEE of California (for herself, Ms. BROWN of Florida, Mr. CAPUANO, Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, Ms. CLARKE, Mr. CLAY, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. AL GREEN of Texas, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. MEEKS, Ms. MOORE, Ms. NORTON, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. RUSH, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Ms. WATERS, Mrs. BEATTY, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, and Mr. RICHMOND):

H.R. 1749. A bill to measure the progress of recovery and development efforts in Haiti following the earthquake of January 12, 2010, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. LUETKEMEYER (for himself, Mr. WESTMORELAND, and Mr. GARY G. MILLER of California):

H.R. 1750. A bill to enhance the ability of community financial institutions to foster economic growth and serve their communities, boost small businesses, increase individual savings, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York (for herself, Mr. POLIS, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. GRIJALVA, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Mr. CICILLINE, Ms. LEE of California, Mr. POCAN, Mr. KEATING, Mrs. DAVIS of California, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Mr. NADLER, Ms. MOORE, Mr. ENGEL, Ms. NORTON, Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, Mr. ELLISON, and Ms. TITUS):

H.R. 1751. A bill to amend the Family and Medical Leave Act of 1993 and title 5, United States Code, to permit leave to care for a domestic partner, parent-in-law, adult child, sibling, grandchild, or grandparent who has a serious health condition, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce, and in addition to the Committees on House Administration, and Oversight and Government Reform, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. MARINO:

H.R. 1752. A bill to amend the Food and Nutrition Act of 2008 to require retail food stores to collect, and report to the Secretary of Agriculture, detailed information that identifies food items purchased with benefits provided under the supplemental nutrition assistance program; and to require the Secretary to compile and publish such information; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. PALLONE (for himself, Mr. BISHOP of New York, Mr. RUNYAN, Mr. GRIMM, and Mr. LOBIONDO):

H.R. 1753. A bill making supplemental appropriations for the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration for fisheries disasters, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Appropriations, and in addition to the Committee on the Budget, 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. PETERS of Michigan (for himself, Mr. ROSS, and Mr. ELLISON):

H.R. 1754. A bill to establish pilot programs to encourage the use of shared appreciation mortgage modifications, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. POLIS (for himself, Mr. ANDREWS, Mr. COHEN, Ms. BASS, Mr. CONNOLLY, Mrs. BEATTY, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. BECERRA, Mr. COOPER, Mr. BISHOP of New York, Mr. COURTNEY, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. CROWLEY, Ms. BONAMICI, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Mrs. DAVIS of California, Mr. BRALEY of Iowa, Mr. DEFAZIO, Mrs. CAPPS, Ms. DEGETTE, Mr. CÁRDENAS, Mr. DELANEY, Mr. CARNEY, Ms. DELAURO, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Ms. DELBENE, Mr. CARTWRIGHT, Mr. DEUTCH, Ms. CASTOR of Florida, Mr. DINGELL, Mr. CASTRO of Texas, Mr. DOGGETT, Ms. CHU, Mr. DOYLE, Mr. CICILLINE, Ms. DUCKWORTH, Ms. CLARKE, Ms. EDWARDS, Mr. CLAY, Mr. ELLISON, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. FARR, Mr. FATTAH, Ms. FRANKEL of Florida, Ms. FUDGE, Mr. GARCIA, Mr. AL GREEN of Texas, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. GUTIERREZ, Ms. HAHN, Ms. HANABUSA, Mr. HANNA, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Mr. HECK of Washington, Mr. HIGGINS, Mr. HIMES, Mr. HINOJOSA, Mr. HOLT, Mr. HONDA, Mr. HORSFORD, Mr. HUFFMAN, Mr. ISRAEL, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. KEATING, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. KILMER, Mr. KIND, Mrs. KIRKPATRICK, Ms. KUSTER, Mr. LANGEVIN, Mr. LARSEN of Washington, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Ms. LEE of California, Mr. LEVIN, Mr. LEWIS, Mr. LOEBSACK, Ms. LOFGREN, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Mrs. LOWEY, Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico, Mr. BEN RAY LUJÁN of New Mexico, Mr. LYNCH, Ms. MATSUI, Mr. MAFFEI, Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York, Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. MATHESON, Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mr. MCGOVERN, Ms. MENG, Mr. MICHAUD, Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, Ms. MOORE, Mr. MORAN, Mr. MURPHY of Florida, Mr. NADLER, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Ms. NORTON, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. PASCRELL, Mr. PAYNE, Ms. PELOSI, Mr. PETERS of Michigan, Mr. PETERS of California, Ms. PINGREE of Maine, Mr. POCAN, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Mr. QUIGLEY, Mr. RANGEL, Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mr. RUSH, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California, Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California, Mr. SARBANES, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. SCHNEIDER, Mr. SCHRADER, Ms. SCHWARTZ, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Mr. SERRANO, Ms. SHEA-PORTER, Mr. SHERMAN, Ms. SINEMA, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. SMITH of Washington, Ms. SPEIER, Mr. SWALWELL of California, Mr. TAKANO, Mr. TIERNEY, Ms. TITUS, Mr. TONKO, Ms. TSONGAS, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. VEASEY, Mr. WALZ, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Ms. WATERS, Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. WELCH, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Mr. YARMUTH, Mr. CAPUANO, Mr. DENT, Mr. GRAYSON, Mr. O'ROURKE, Mr. HOYER, Mr. MCNERNEY, Mr. SIRES, and Ms. BROWNLEY of California):

H.R. 1755. A bill to prohibit employment discrimination on the basis of sexual orientation or gender identity; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce, and in addition to the Committees on House Administration, Oversight and Government Reform, and the Judiciary, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. POSEY:

H.R. 1756. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Defense to transport to any country, without charge, supplies that have been furnished by a nonprofit organization and that are intended for distribution to members of the Armed Forces, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. POSEY (for himself and Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York):

H.R. 1757. A bill to direct the Secretary of Health and Human Services to conduct or support a comprehensive study comparing total health outcomes, including risk of autism, in vaccinated populations in the United States with such outcomes in unvaccinated populations in the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN (for herself, Mr. DIAZ-BALART, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Ms. WILSON of Florida, and Mr. GARCIA):

H.R. 1758. A bill to increase the portion of community development block grants that may be used to provide public services, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. RUIZ (for himself, Mr. CÁRDENAS, Mrs. KIRKPATRICK, Mr. BARBER, Mrs. NEGRETE MCLEOD, Mr. TAKANO, and Mr. COOK):

H.R. 1759. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to direct the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to submit to Congress quarterly reports on the timeliness in which the Department of Veterans Affairs receives certain information from other departments or agencies of the United States; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. SCHIFF:

H.R. 1760. A bill to establish an entrepreneur-based immigrant category for alien entrepreneurs who have completed or are in the process of completing a degree in Science, Engineering, Math or a technology-related field; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TERRY:

H.R. 1761. A bill to amend title XIX of the Social Security Act to cover physician services delivered by podiatric physicians to ensure access by Medicaid beneficiaries to appropriate quality foot and ankle care, to amend title XVIII of such Act to modify the requirements for diabetic shoes to be included under Medicare, and for other purposes; 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. THORNBERRY:

H.R. 1762. A bill to provide a biennial budget for the United States Government; to the Committee on the Budget, and in addition to the Committees on Rules, and Oversight and Government Reform, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Ms. TITUS (for herself, Mrs. DAVIS of California, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Mrs. CAPPS, Ms. WATERS, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Mr. HONDA, Mr. HECK of Washington, Ms. DELBENE, Mr. PETRI, and Mr. GARAMENDI):

H.R. 1763. A bill to direct the Secretary of Education to establish and administer an awards program recognizing excellence exhibited by public school system employees providing services to students in pre-kindergarten through higher education; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Ms. SLAUGHTER (for herself, Mr. BURGESS, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, and Ms. SPEIER):

H. Res. 180. A resolution recognizing the sequencing of the human genome as one of the most significant scientific accomplishments of the past 100 years and expressing support for the designation of April 25, 2013, as ''DNA Day''; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. BRALEY of Iowa (for himself and Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas):

H. Res. 181. A resolution supporting the goals and ideals of Workers' Memorial Day in order to honor and remember the workers who have been killed or injured in the workplace; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Ms. DELBENE (for herself, Mr. VARGAS, Mr. DEFAZIO, Mr. BENISHEK, Mr. HASTINGS of Washington, Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York, Ms. KUSTER, Mr. SCHRADER, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. GARAMENDI, and Mr. REICHERT):

H. Res. 182. A resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives that specialty crops are a vital part of agriculture in the United States, that the Committee on Agriculture should propose funding for programs that support specialty crops priorities, and that legislation should be passed that includes funding reflecting specialty crops as a growing and important part of United States agriculture; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. ROHRABACHER:

H. Res. 183. A resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives that the Broadcasting Board of Governors should broadcast and direct Azeri language content into the Islamic Republic of Iran and Baloch language content into the Islamic Republic of Iran and the Islamic Republic of Pakistan; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. ROHRABACHER:

H. Res. 184. A resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives that the United States should immediately remove all members of the United States Armed Forces from Afghanistan and pursue alternative strategies, which do not require large deployments of ground combat forces of the Armed Forces, in order to create a stable Afghanistan that is not a base for international terrorism; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of Rule XII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

6. The SPEAKER presented a memorial of the Senate of the State of Tennessee, relative to Senate Joint Resolution No. 38 urging the Congress to adopt a balanced federal budget; to the Committee on the Budget.

7. Also, a memorial of the House of Representatives of the Commonwealth of Kentucky, relative to House Concurrent Resolution No. 109 urging the Congress to persuade

the EPA to withdraw its proposed Greenhouse Gas New Source Performance Standard for Electric Generating Units; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

8. Also, a memorial of the Senate of the State of Kansas, relative to Senate Resolution No. 1737 recognizing the many contributions made by the citizens of the Republic of Azerbaijan; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

9. Also, a memorial of the Senate of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, relative to Senate Resolution reaffirming the friendship between the Commonwealth of Massachusetts and Taiwan; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

10. Also, a memorial of the House of Representatives of the State of Kansas, relative to House Resolution No. 6022 recognizing the many contributions made by the citizens of the Republic of Azerbaijan; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

11. Also, a memorial of the Senate of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, relative to Senate Resolution No. 53 supporting those peaceful political actions that will result in the final reunification of Ireland; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

12. Also, a memorial of the House of Representatives of the State of New Mexico, relative to House Joint Memorial No. 22 requesting the Congress to provide full funding to cover the costs associated with the benefits received by Indian tribes and the United States; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

13. Also, a memorial of the Senate of the State of Tennessee, relative to Senate Resolution No. 4 memorializing the Congress to amend the Constitution relative to authorizing states to rescind certain federal laws; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

14. Also, a memorial of the House of Representatives of the State of New Mexico, relative to House Memorial 7 calling for the New Mexico delegation to vote in favor of legislation that would remove the deadline for ratification of the equal rights amendment; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

15. Also, a memorial of the House of Representatives of the State of New Mexico, relative to House Joint Memorial No. 34 urging the New Mexico delegation to vote in favor of the reauthorization of the Violence Against Women Act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

16. Also, a memorial of the Senate of the State of Hawaii, relative to Senate Concurrent Resolution No. 32 requesting Congress to recognize the legacy of the Late Senator Daniel K. Inouye by designation of the Kilauea Point Lighthouse on the Island Kauai, Hawaii, as the Daniel K. Inouye Kilauea Point Lighthouse; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

17. Also, a memorial of the House of Representatives of the State of New Mexico, relative to House Joint Memorial 7 requesting that the Congress reauthorize Section 5056 of the Water Resource Development Act of 2007; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

18. Also, a memorial of the Senate of the State of Tennessee, relative to Senate Resolution No. 3 asking that the Department of Health and Human Services resolve the longstanding Medicare Liability owed to Tennessee related to Special Disability Workload cases; jointly to the Committees on Energy and Commerce and Ways and Means.

19. Also, a memorial of the Legislature of the Territory of Guam, relative to Resolution No. 10-32 requesting that the President send the World Health Organization Framework Convention on Tobacco Control to the Senate for ratification; jointly to the Committees on Foreign Affairs and Energy and Commerce.

CONSTITUTIONAL AUTHORITY STATEMENT

Pursuant to clause 7 of rule XII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the following statements are submitted regarding the specific powers granted to Congress in the Constitution to enact the accompanying bill or joint resolution.

By Mr. LoBIONDO:

H.R. 1721.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 18 of the Constitution of the United States of America

By Mr. McKINLEY:

H.R. 1722.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

According to Article I, Section 8, Clause 18 of the Constitution: The Congress shall have Power to make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.

By Ms. SCHAKOWSKY:

H.R. 1723.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section VIII.

By Mr. HARPER:

H.R. 1724.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

clause 3 of section 8 of article I of the Constitution.

By Mr. CARTWRIGHT:

H.R. 1725.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I; Section 8 of the Constitution states ''The Congress shallhave 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;''

The power to spend for the general welfare is one of the broadest grants of authority to Congress in the United States Constitution. The scope of the national spending power was brought before the United States Supreme Court in a landmark case in 1937 dealing with the newly enacted Social Security Act. In Steward Machine Co. v. Davis the Court sustained a tax imposed on employers to provide unemployment benefits to individual workers.

Subsequent Supreme Court decisions have not questioned Congress's policy decisions as to what kinds of spending programs are in pursuit of the ''general welfare,'' and so numerous programs have been funded in such diverse areas as education, housing, veterans' benefits, the environment, welfare, health care, scientific research, the arts, community development, and public financing of election campaigns.

By Mr. POSEY:

H.R. 1726.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 5 of the Constitution of the United States: To coin Money, regulate the Value thereof, and of foreign Coin, and fix the Standard of Weights and Measures;;

Article I, Section 8, Clause 12 of the Constitution of the United States: To raise and support Armies, but no Appropriation of Money to that Use shall be for a longer Term than two Years;

Article I, Section 8, Clause 16 of the Constitution of the United States: To provide for calling forth the Militia to execute the Laws of the Union, suppress Insurrections and repel Invasions;

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18 of the Constitution of the United States: The Congress shall have Power to make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the forgoing Powers, and all other vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United St Department or Officer thereof

By Mr. WALZ:

H.R. 1727.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. RANGEL:

H.R. 1728.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8

By Mrs. KIRKPATRICK:

H.R. 1729.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article I, Section 8, Clause 18 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. ENGEL:

H.R. 1730.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 1 of the Constitution. Congress has the power to enact this legislation, as well, under Article 1, Section 8, Clauses 1, 3 and 18.

By Mr. SCHRADER:

H.R. 1731.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Congress has the authority to act under Article I, §8, clause 3—the Commerce Clause.

By Ms. BASS:

H.R. 1732.

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 1, Section 1.

Article. I.

Section 1.

All legislative Powers herein granted shall be vested in a Congress of the United States, which shall consist of a Senate and House of Representatives.

By Mrs. BLACKBURN:

H.R. 1733.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1

By Mr. CAPUANO:

H.R. 1734.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I Sec. 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. CASSIDY:

H.R. 1735.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 1 of the United States Constitution

By Mrs. DAVIS of California:

H.R. 1736.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause I

By Ms. DeLAURO:

H.R. 1737.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8., Clause 1.

By Mr. DOGGETT:

H.R. 1738.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article One, Section 8 and the 16th Amendment of the Constitution.

By Mr. ENYART:

H.R. 1739.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. FORBES:

H.R. 1740.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clauses 1 and 18

By Mr. GOODLATTE:

H.R. 1741.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The ability to regulate interstate commerce pursuant to Article 1, Section 8, Clause 3.''

By Mr. HECK of Nevada:

H.R. 1742.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The power granted to Congress under Article I, Section 8, Clause 18 of the United States Constitution, to make all laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into execution the foregoing Powers, and all other powers vested by the Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or officer thereof.

By Mr. HOLT:

H.R. 1743.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I of the U.S. Constitution

By Mr. HORSFORD:

H.R. 1744.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article. I. Section. 8. Clause, 18. and

Article. IV. Section. 3. Clause. 2.

By Mr. ISRAEL:

H.R. 1745.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8.

By Mr. KING of Iowa:

H.R. 1746.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This legislation contains a clarification that is intended to limit the scope of an existing statute. As such, this bill makes specific changes to existing law in a manner that returns power to the States and to the People, in accordance with Amendment X of the United States Constitution.

By Ms. KUSTER:

H.R. 1747.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article, I, Section 8, Clause 1 (relating to the power to lay and collect taxes, duties, imposts and excises, to pay the debts and provide for the common defence and general welfare of the United States) of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. LARSEN of Washington:

H.R. 1748.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

As described in Article 1, Section 1 ''all legislative powers herein granted shall be vested in a Congress.''

By Ms. LEE of California:

H.R. 1749.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article I of the United States Constitution and its subsequent amendments, and further clarified and interpreted by the Supreme Court of the United States.

By Mr. LUETKEMEYER:

H.R. 1750.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The constitutional authority on which this bill rests is the explicit power of Congress to regulate commerce in and among the states, as enumerate in Article 1, Section 8, Clause 3, the Commerce Clause, of the United States Constitution.

Additionally, Article 1, Section 7, Clause 2 of the Constitution allows for every bill passed by the House of Representatives and the Senate and signed by the President to be codified into law; and therefore implicitly allows Congress to repeal any bill that has been passed by both chambers and signed into law by the President.

By Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York:

H.R. 1751.

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. MARINO:

H.R. 1752.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 9, Clause 7: ''No Money shall be drawn from the Treasury, but in Consequence of Appropriations made by Law; and a regular Statement and Account of the Receipts and Expenditures of all public Money shall be published from time to time.''

By Mr. PALLONE:

H.R. 1753.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, section 9, clause 7

Article I, section 8, clause 1

By Mr. PETERS of Michigan:

H.R. 1754.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3

By Mr. POLIS:

H.R. 1755.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clause 3 of section 8 of article I of the Constitution; clause 18 of section 8 of article I of the Constitution; section 5 of Amendment XIV to the Constitution.

By Mr. POSEY:

H.R. 1756.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 12 of the Constitution of the United States:

To raise and support Armies, but no Appropriation of Money to that Use shall be for a longer Term than two Years;

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18 of the Constitution of the United States

The Congress shall have Power to make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the forgoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States or in any Department or Officer thereof.

By Mr. POSEY:

H.R. 1757.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 of the Constitution of the United States:

The Congress shall have Power to regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes.

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18 of the Constitution of the United States

The Congress shall have Power to make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the forgoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States or in any Department or Officer thereof

By Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN:

H.R. 1758.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I—The Legislative Branch.

Section 1: The Legislature:

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.

Section 8:

Clause 1. The Congress shall have Power to lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts and Excises, to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defense and general Welfare of the United States; but all Duties, Imposts and Excises shall be uniform throughout the United States.

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 Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.

By Mr. RUIZ:

H.R. 1759.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

clause 18 of section 8 of article I of the Constitution

By Mr. SCHIFF:

H.R. 1760.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 4 of the Constitution. Article I, Section 8, Clause 4 of the Constitution.

By Mr. TERRY:

H.R. 1761.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Sec. 8, Cl. 1

By Mr. THORNBERRY:

H.R. 1762.

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, Imports and Excises, to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defence and general Welfare of the United States; but all Duties, Imposts and Excises shall be uniform throughout the United States;

Article I, Section 9, Clause 7: No Money shall be drawn from the Treasury, but in Consequence of Appropriations made by Law; and a regular Statement and Account of the Receipts and Expenditures of all public Money shall be published from time to time.

Article I, Section 5, Clause 2: Each House may determine the Rules of its Proceedings, punish its Members for disorderly Behavior, and, with the Concurrence of two thirds, expel a Member.

By Ms. TITUS:

H.R. 1763.

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 I, Section 8, Clause 3 of the United States Constitution.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 35: Mr. BRIDENSTINE.

H.R. 38: Mr. KIND.

H.R. 96: Mr. CICILLINE.

H.R. 164: Mr. ROONEY and Mr. LOBIONDO.

H.R. 176: Mr. BARR and Mr. SCALISE.
H.R. 180: Mr. MAFFEI and Mr. RANGEL.
H.R. 183: Mr. MAFFEI and Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California.
H.R. 184: Mr. POCAN and Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California.
H.R. 258: Mrs. WALORSKI.
H.R. 262: Mr. MAFFEI.
H.R. 301: Mr. GRIFFIN of Arkansas.
H.R. 303: Mr. PETERSON.
H.R. 320: Mrs. BEATTY and Mr. O'ROURKE.
H.R. 351: Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California and Mr. DESANTIS.
H.R. 358: Mr. BUCSHON.
H.R. 484: Mr. LATTA.
H.R. 485: Ms. ESHOO.
H.R. 494: Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mr. REED, and Mr. ISSA.
H.R. 508: Mr. PETERS of Michigan and Mr. LOEBSACK.
H.R. 515: Mr. CAPUANO.
H.R. 531: Ms. WILSON of Florida, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, and Mr. WELCH.
H.R. 535: Mr. CARNEY, Ms. TSONGAS, Ms. NORTON, Mr. CÁRDENAS, and Mr. TAKANO.
H.R. 543: Mr. BENTIVOLIO and Mr. DOGGETT.
H.R. 565: Mr. LOEBSACK and Mrs. DAVIS of California.
H.R. 577: Mr. BRIDENSTINE and Mr. BROUN of Georgia.
H.R. 627: Mr. ENGEL, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Ms. ZOE LOFGREN, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, and Mr. DIAZ-BALART.
H.R. 630: Ms. WATERS, Ms. FRANKEL of Florida, and Mr. GARAMENDI.
H.R. 647: Ms. ESTY, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, and Mr. LATTA.
H.R. 671: Mr. HUFFMAN.
H.R. 675: Mrs. KIRKPATRICK, Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico, and Ms. SLAUGHTER.
H.R. 679: Mr. KIND, Mr. O'ROURKE, Mr. CARNEY, Mr. DAINES, Mr. LATTA, and Mrs. BUSTOS.
H.R. 685: Mr. MILLER of Florida.
H.R. 693: Mr. BARR.
H.R. 698: Mr. CLAY, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. SCHIFF, and Mr. GRIFFIN of Arkansas.
H.R. 713: Mr. KIND, Mr. BRALEY of Iowa, Ms. BORDALLO, Mr. LIPINSKI, Ms. MOORE and Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York.
H.R. 724: Mr. BISHOP of Georgia.
H.R. 755: Mr. CÁRDENAS.
H.R. 763: Mr. LATHAM, Mr. HASTINGS of Washington, Mr. HECK of Nevada, Mr. WHITFIELD, and Mr. HUNTER.
H.R. 769: Mr. LOWENTHAL, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. RUPPERSBERGER, Ms. EDDIE Ms. BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Ms. JACKSON LEE and Mr. MAFFEI.
H.R. 794: Mr. GRAYSON.
H.R. 807: Mr. LATTA.
H.R. 811: Mr. COLE.
H.R. 831: Mr. SWALWELL of California, Mrs. BEATTY, Mr. PIERLUISI, and Mr. COBLE.
H.R. 847: Mr. CAPUANO.
H.R. 851: Mr. TAKANO and Ms. DELAURO.
H.R. 855: Mr. BISHOP of New York.
H.R. 864: Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Mr. COHEN, Mr. DEUTCH, Mr. GOODLATTE, and Mr. WILSON of South Carolina.
H.R. 811: Mr. HONDA.
H.R. 904: Mrs. CAPPS and Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York.
H.R. 920: Mr. BISHOP of New York.
H.R. 924: Mr. GRIJALVA.
H.R. 949: Ms. FUDGE.
H.R. 952: Mr. COLLINS of New York.
H.R. 958: Mr. HUFFMAN.
H.R. 960: Mr. CASSIDY.
H.R. 961: Mr. POCAN, Ms. MENG, Mr. TONKO, Mr. HONDA, Ms. CLARKE, and Mr. NOLAN.
H.R. 984: Mr. SHIMKUS, Mr. MCKINLEY, and Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania.
H.R. 990: Mr. BISHOP of Georgia.
H.R. 997: Mr. STOCKMAN.
H.R. 1020: Mr. WALBERG, Mrs. WALORSKI, Mr. BROUN of Georgia, Mr. HUFFMAN, Ms. SEWELL of Alabama, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. ROGERS of Michigan, Mr. MCCAUL, Mr. HUDSON, and Ms. BROWN of Florida.
H.R. 1027: Mr. DINGELL, Mr. LEVIN, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. CARTWRIGHT, and Mr. POCAN.
H.R. 1030: Mr. TAKANO.
H.R. 1038: Mrs. CAPPS.
H.R. 1041: Mr. RANGEL.
H.R. 1091: Mr. GOHMERT and Mr. LONG.
H.R. 1129: Mr. FARENTHOLD.
H.R. 1150: Mr. DEFAZIO.
H.R. 1154: Mr. DEFAZIO and Ms. ESHOO.
H.R. 1175: Mr. DEFAZIO.
H.R. 1182: Mr. LAMALFA.
H.R. 1199: Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. RUSH, Mr. SABLAN, and Mr. MARKEY.
H.R. 1209: Mr. CASTRO of Texas, Mr. ISSA, Mr. HECK of Washington, Mrs. HARTZLER, Mr. KING of Iowa, Mr. SCHOCK, and Mr. OWENS.
H.R. 1242: Mr. NUNNELEE.
H.R. 1249: Mr. BARTON, Mr. YOUNG of Indiana, Mr. BENISHEK, Mr. LATTA, and Mr. HUELSKAMP.
H.R. 1250: Mr. VALADAO.
H.R. 1276: Mr. SARBANES, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mrs. ROBY, Ms. NORTON, Ms. DELAURO, Mr. RIGELL, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. COLLINS of New York, Ms. FUDGE, Mr. GRIMM, Mr. CONNOLLY, Ms. EDWARDS, and Ms. TSONGAS.
H.R. 1282: Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York.
H.R. 1286: Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Mr. CLYBURN, Ms. BASS, and Mrs. LOWEY.
H.R. 1303: Mr. NUNNELEE, Mrs. KIRKPATRICK, Mr. PAULSEN, and Mr. POE of Texas.
H.R. 1313: Mr. JORDAN.
H.R. 1338: Mr. SARBANES.
H.R. 1339: Mr. KEATING.
H.R. 1341: Mr. GRAVES of Georgia.
H.R. 1344: Mr. POCAN and Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio.
H.R. 1354: Mr. MICHAUD, Mr. COLE, Mrs. KIRKPATRICK, Ms. DELBENE, Mr. ROSKAM, Mr. STIVERS, and Mr. NEAL.
H.R. 1355: Mr. POE of Texas and Mr. WESTMORELAND.
H.R. 1389: Ms. TITUS, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Mr. PETERS of Michigan, and Mr. WAXMAN.
H.R. 1406: Mr. ROTHFUS, Mr. LAMBORN, and Mr. WEBSTER of Florida.
H.R. 1413: Ms. SINEMA and Mr. MATHESON.
H.R. 1414: Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Ms. DELBENE, and Mrs. LOWEY.
H.R. 1416: Mr. BISHOP of New York, Mr. VEASEY, Mr. WITTMAN, and Mrs. NOEM.
H.R. 1427: Mr. CRENSHAW and Mr. CARSON of Indiana.
H.R. 1431: Mr. JOYCE, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, and Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico.
H.R. 1449: Mr. TURNER, Ms. NORTON, Mr. LATHAM, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Mr. WAXMAN, Ms. SEWELL of Alabama, Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Mr. CASSIDY, Mr. BROOKS of Alabama, Mr. YOHO, Mr. STIVERS, Mr. MEEHAN and Mrs. BEATTY.
H.R. 1466: Ms. SHEA-PORTER, Mr. LEWIS, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. CLAY, and Ms. CLARKE.
H.R. 1494: Mr. MILLER of Florida and Mr. YOUNG of Florida.
H.R. 1496 Mr. FRANKS of Arizona and Mr. FINCHER.
H.R. 1526: Mr. WALDEN.
H.R. 1528: Mr. CRAWFORD, Mr. SMITH of Nebraska, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Mr. HANNA, and Mr. VALADAO.
H.R. 1565: Mr. CICILLINE.
H.R. 1572: Mr. BARR and Mr. HUDSON.
H.R. 1586: Mr. LANKFORD.
H.R. 1595: Mr. MCNERNEY and Ms. WATERS.
H.R. 1605: Ms. ESTY.
H.R. 1613: Mr. POE of Texas and Mr. MCCAUL.
H.R. 1620: Mr. RUIZ.
H.R. 1622: Mr. ELLISON.
H.R. 1626: Mr. LONG.
H.R. 1630: Ms. DEGETTE, Mr. MCGOVERN, Ms. SPEIER, Mrs. KIRKPATRICK, Mr. LOEBSACK, Ms. ESHOO, and Mr. CICILLINE
H.R. 1634: Mr. YOUNG of Indiana, Mr. TIBERI, and Mr. ROSKAM.
H.R. 1638: Mr. STOCKMAN.
H.R. 1640: Mr. KEATING and Mr. RAHALL.
H.R. 1643: Mr. HECK of Washington.
H.R. 1652: Ms. BROWN of Florida, Mr. HONDA, Mr. MAFFEI, and Mr. VEASEY.
H.R. 1659: Ms. KUSTER.
H.R. 1661: Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Mr. MCINTYRE, Mr. ELLISON, Ms. NORTON, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. CONNOLLY, Mr. LOEBSACK, and Mr. RYAN of Ohio.
H.R. 1685: Mr. MCNERNEY and Mr. WELCH.
H.R. 1692: Ms. WATERS and Mr. BISHOP of Georgia.
H.R. 1693: Mr. THORNBERRY and Ms. SHEA-PORTER.
H.R. 1700: Mr. RANGEL.
H. J. Res. 36: Mr. MULVANEY and Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina.
H. J. Res. 41: Mr. GIBSON.
H. Res. 30: Mr. SHERMAN and Mr. ROYCE.
H. Res. 36: Mr. FORTENBERRY, Mr. STEWARD, Mr. CAMPBELL, and Mr. FLEISCHMANN.
H. Res. 72: Mr. MARCHANT.
H. Res. 86: Mr. GOODLATTE.
H. Res. 94: Ms. DEGETTE.
H. Res. 104: Ms. WILSON of Florida.
H. Res. 108: Mr. CÁRDENAS.
H. Res. 112: Mr. COFFMAN and Mr. TONKO.
H. Res. 131: Mr. CARSON of Indiana.
H. Res. 147: Mr. GRIFFIN of Arkansas, Mr. WALBERG, and Mr. MILLER of Florida.
H. Res. 153: Mr. LABRADOR.
H. Res. 167: Mr. CARTWRIGHT and Mr. POE of Texas.
H. Res. 170: Mr. STOCKMAN and Mr. SESSIONS.
H. Res. 173: Mr. LANKFORD and Mr. TIPTON.
H. Res. 174: Mr. MURPHY of Florida, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Mr. MORAN, Mr. CARTWRIGHT, Ms. BROWN of Florida, Mr. COSTA, Ms. SPEIER, Mr. HOLT, Ms. ZOE LOFGREN, Mr. SWALWELL of California, Mr. MAFFEI, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Ms. SHEA-PORTER, Mrs. BEATTY, Mr. COHEN, Mr. BISHOP of New York, Mr. PAYNE, Ms. KUSTER, Mr. SHERMAN, and Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York.
H. Res. 177: Mr. STIVERS, Mr. HULTGREN, Mr. WEBER of Texas, Mr. WESTMORELAND, Mr. TIBERI, and Mr. LAMBORN.

DELETIONS OF SPONSORS FROM PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were deleted from public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 1445: Mr. BISHOP of New York, Mr. RUNYAN, Mr. GRIMM, and Mr. LOBIONDO.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 3 of rule XII, petitions and papers were laid on the clerk's desk and referred as follows:

7. The SPEAKER presented a petition of the Commissioner of Gray County, Texas, relative to a Resolution affirming the rights of our citizens under the 2nd Amendment; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

8. Also, a petition of the Board of Supervisors, Monterey County, California, relative to Resolution No. 13-089 urging the Congress to enact comprehensive immigration reform; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

9. Also, a petition of the Pima County Board Supervisors, Arizona, relative to Resolution No. 2013-19 urging the Congress to enact comprehensive immigration reform; to the Committee on the Judiciary.