

### THERE HAS NOT BEEN FULL COMPLIANCE

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

Mr. CHAFFETZ. Mr. Speaker, despite what has been said here, it is the duty and obligation of this body to address a duly issued subpoena that has not been complied with. There has not been full compliance here. There has not been cooperation here. There has not been a willingness to share the information that is found within the Department of Justice.

We have a dead Border Patrol agent. We have more than 200 weapons that were used to kill people in Mexico. We have thousands of missing weapons. We have an Attorney General who said that this Fast and Furious program was fundamentally flawed. And yet here we stand today after doing more than just bending over backwards for more than a year, not having been given the documents that we need, as a body, to make a proper decision.

This should be bipartisan in our quest to right a wrong. It's not about Eric Holder, but it is about the Department of Justice and it is about justice in the United States of America. I am proud of the fact that we are bringing up this contempt.

It's sad that we got to this day. We have no other choice. But we, as a body, as an institution, as a separate branch of government, have a duty and an obligation, and we are fulfilling that here today.

### WHAT CHANGES HAVE REALLY OCCURRED?

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

Ms. RICHARDSON. Mr. Chairman, I come here today because when I was 6 years old, in 1968, I saw the hate-filled work of the civil rights movement, of laws that needed to be changed. And now I'm here with an opportunity to be here in Congress, and I kind of wonder what changes have really occurred.

I see today that Chief Justice Roberts stood, and he did the right thing because he ruled on behalf of the American people. And I will say that this motion that's going to come forward will not have bipartisan support of this Member because it's not done in a bipartisan manner. It's done in a hateful manner.

And why?

Because we have an Attorney General where this has never been done—we need to stress that again—never been done in this Congress, where materials have been provided, and where this committee has failed to accept a single witness requested by the other side. That's not bipartisanship. That's politics at its worst.

I urge the American people to look and to urge us to get back to work and

do what you sent us here to do, which is to take care of you.

□ 1220

### WHAT PERCENTAGE OF THE TRUTH?

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

Mr. GOWDY. Mr. Speaker, my question is simply this: What percentage of the truth do you want? When we're asked to negotiate; when the Attorney General comes and asks us for an extraordinary accommodation, whatever that means; when we're asked to compromise; my question for our colleagues on the other side of the aisle, Mr. Speaker, is this: What percentage of the truth will you settle for? If you have ever sat on the other side of the table from parents who have lost a loved one, is 50 percent enough? Is that enough of the documents? Seventy-five percent? A third?

The truth, the whole truth, so help me God—that is what we ask witnesses to do, jurors to do, and that's not too much for us to ask for the Attorney General of the United States of America to do.

### HEALTH CARE

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

Mr. LARSEN of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to declare that the Supreme Court ruling on the Affordable Care Act affirms there's no going back to the health care of 2009 or even to the health care of 1789. Improvements to health care are taking root right now in this country. That progress must continue. The Supreme Court decision today is a welcome victory for middle class families and bolsters the necessary changes taking place in health care today.

Now we must keep Medicare sustainable and affordable by closing the prescription drug doughnut hole and cracking down on fraud. Now we must make sure middle class families have diverse options for high-quality, affordable health care. Now we must ensure that we meet the needs of northwest Washington State seniors, veterans, and families. Northwest Washington has already seen improvement. Seniors in the Second District who were in the doughnut hole have saved more than \$800 on prescription medications so far this year. More than 173,000 people in northwest Washington State have health insurance that covers preventive care without copays or deductibles.

It is time to move forward on health care. And today, America took a great step.

### AFFORDABLE CARE ACT DECISION

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

Mr. BUTTERFIELD. Mr. Speaker, as a former judge of the North Carolina State Supreme Court, I've come to the well today to applaud the United States Supreme Court for its courage and for ruling on the side of constitutionality of the Affordable Care Act. This is a win, Mr. Speaker, for 48 million Americans, Democrats and Republicans alike, who will receive stable, secure, and affordable health coverage forever.

I believe that much of the public confusion surrounding the bill was because Americans outside of the Washington Beltway simply did not understand what the Affordable Care Act means for them. So to put it plainly, Americans can now enjoy coverage without worry or jeopardy, regardless of pre-existing conditions. Uninsured young people up to age 26 will be able to receive coverage. If you become gravely ill, there are no limits on your benefits. If you are a woman, you can't be charged higher premiums. If you need preventive care, you won't have a copay or deductible. If you lose your job, you won't lose your coverage. And if your employer doesn't provide coverage, you will be able to buy it at affordable prices.

The political theater Republicans orchestrated around health care is over. Congress debated, the Court decided. This is done.

### WE DESERVE TO KNOW WHAT HAPPENED

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

Mrs. ADAMS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today not only as a congressional Member but also a widow of a law enforcement officer who lost his life in the line of duty. I rise to speak on behalf of all those families that have lost a loved one in the line of duty, and especially for Brian Terry and his family. The Terry family deserves to know what happened. The American people deserve to know what happened. And Congress deserves to know what happened. But let us not forget, Officer Terry's family deserves to know what happened.

I stand here on behalf of all of those families who have lost law enforcement officers throughout our great Nation in the line of duty. We must not waiver. We, as a Congress, need to find out what happened so it never happens again. And that's something that we never should lose sight of. We need to make sure that whatever took place, it doesn't happen again. We should not be losing our officers this way.

### HEALTH CARE VICTORY

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

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, today is a great day for the American people. The Supreme Court's decision to uphold the Affordable Care Act reaffirms our Nation's commitment to make sure that all Americans have access to quality, affordable health care and health insurance. For the millions of Americans who have gone without health insurance; the seniors who have struggled due to inadequate coverage; the women, children, and young adults that have been denied coverage for pre-existing conditions, the Court's ruling is not only a victory but a validation that they deserve to have the most basic of human needs met—and that is access to health care.

The ACA addressed so many gaps in the American health care system, from closing the Medicare part D doughnut hole to stopping the practice of denying those with preexisting conditions insurance coverage to claiming womanhood as a preexisting health condition to allowing young adults to stay on their parents' coverage.

This law has changed the way our country manages and delivers all phases of our health care system, and I'm proud to have been part of its creation, and prouder still today to learn that the Court's decision was to uphold its constitutionality.

#### HEALTH CARE WIN-WIN

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

Mr. FARR. I rise today because I think everybody in this country is always worried about health care and whether they're going to be able to have access to it, whether they can afford insurance, whether the complications of that insurance will knock them off health care by putting caps on it or saying you have a preexisting condition. But those worries are over. America has health safety now. Everybody in this country will be able to have access to health care. The Supreme Court made the decision that no one without health care cannot be treated.

So I think it's a really happy day. There's going to be a lot of discussions here about pros and cons on how it's all worked out, but each individual, I think, will be able to decide: I can go to a doctor and I can get the kind of care that I need, and it's going to get paid for so doctors and hospitals will make it. That's the bottom line.

I left my office this morning, and one of my interns is 25 years old, and she says, I've got health care insurance because of the law you passed. Until I'm 26, I can stay on my parents' health care insurance, and I otherwise would have none. Because she's already graduated from college.

So this is a win-win for everyone. It's a great day for America.

RELATING TO CONSIDERATION OF HOUSE REPORT 112-546 AND ACCOMPANYING RESOLUTION, AND PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF HOUSE RESOLUTION 706, AUTHORIZING COMMITTEE ON OVERSIGHT AND GOVERNMENT REFORM TO INITIATE OR INTERVENE IN JUDICIAL PROCEEDINGS TO ENFORCE CERTAIN SUBPOENAS

Mr. NUGENT. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 708 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

#### H. RES. 708

*Resolved*, That if House Report 112-546 is called up by direction of the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform: (a) all points of order against the report are waived and the report shall be considered as read; and

(b)(1) an accompanying resolution offered by direction of the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform shall be considered as read and shall not be subject to a point of order; and

(2) the previous question shall be considered as ordered on such resolution to adoption without intervening motion or demand for division of the question except: (i) 50 minutes of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform or their respective designees; (ii) after conclusion of debate one motion to refer if offered by Representative Dingell of Michigan or his designee which shall be separately debatable for 10 minutes equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent; and (iii) one motion to recommit with or without instructions. The Chair may reduce the minimum time for electronic voting on the question of adoption of the motion to recommit as though pursuant to clause 9 of rule XX.

SEC. 2. Upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order without intervention of any point of order to consider in the House the resolution (H. Res. 706) authorizing the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform to initiate or intervene in judicial proceedings to enforce certain subpoenas. The resolution shall be considered as read. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the resolution to adoption without intervening motion or demand for division of the question except: (1) 20 minutes of debate equally divided and controlled by the Majority Leader and the Minority Leader or their respective designees; and (2) one motion to recommit.

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

□ 1230

Mr. NUGENT. Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts, my colleague on the Rules Committee, Mr. MCGOVERN, pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume. During consideration of this resolution, all time yielded is for the purpose of debate only.

#### GENERAL LEAVE

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. NUGENT. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of this rule and the underlying resolution it brings to the House floor.

The rule provides for consideration of two contempt of Congress charges laid against Attorney General Eric Holder. You're going to hear a lot of folks say how historic today is. That "historicalness" is why the rule provides for debate and separate votes on both contempt charges. The rule also provides for a motion to refer the criminal contempt charges, if offered by Mr. DINGELL, as well as motions to recommit both resolutions.

I don't assume to put words in his mouth, but I'm sure and I'm willing to bet that Mr. MCGOVERN is sitting over there getting ready to tell me it's not enough time. I'm not going to disagree.

But as we all know, before we leave Friday evening to go to work in our districts, we have a lot to get done here. We need to reauthorize our Nation's highway and infrastructure systems. We need to save college students and recent graduates from student loan interest rates that are 2 days away from doubling. We need to move forward with the open amendment process and finish considering the appropriations bill to fund our transportation and housing programs. It's a lot to get done in 2 days. And, frankly, if we didn't put a time limit on today's contempt debate, we could spend days on end talking about nothing but this one issue.

But beyond all of that—beyond floor schedules and expiring authorizations, we're left with this truth: Border Patrol Agent Brian Terry was shot on December 14, 2010, and died of those injuries the next day. His family has been looking for answers about what led up to and caused his death for over a year and a half. If we can do anything to answer those questions, then we cannot and should not do anything to make them wait any longer—not another month, not another day, not another hour. Today, the House of Representatives is going to do what we can to get those answers for the Terry family.

Thanks to whistleblowers at the Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco, Firearms and Explosives, Members of Congress were alerted to the fact that Agent Terry was killed by guns—AK-47 assault rifles, specifically—that our government allowed to walk into Mexico. When confronted with these claims, the Justice Department denied the whistleblowers' claims. What we now know all too well is just how right the whistleblowers were. However, it took the Department of Justice 10 months after their first denial, almost a year after Border Patrol Agent Terry's death, to formally retract their denial about the reckless program that contributed to the deaths of Agent Terry and hundreds of Mexican citizens.