

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 Com-

mittee 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 recommend 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 hoo-ha 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 pre-

pared 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 run-

ning 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 seques-

tration 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 treat-

ments. 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 | Duffy | Joyce |
| Alexander | Duncan (SC) | Kelly (PA) |
| Amash | Duncan (TN) | King (IA) |
| Amodei | Ellmers | King (NY) |
| Bachmann | Farenthold | Kingston |
| Bachus | Fincher | Kinzinger (IL) |
| Barber | Fitzpatrick | Kline |
| Barletta | Fleischmann | Labrador |
| Barr | Fleming | LaMalfa |
| Benishek | Forbes | Lamborn |
| Bentivolio | Fortenberry | Lance |
| Bera (CA) | Fox | Lankford |
| Billirakis | Franks (AZ) | Latham |
| Bishop (UT) | Frelinghuysen | Latta |
| Black | Gabbard | LoBiondo |
| Blackburn | Garcia | Long |
| Bonner | Gardner | Lucas |
| Boustany | Garrett | Luetkemeyer |
| Bridenstine | Gerlach | Lummis |
| Brooks (AL) | Gibbs | Maffei |
| Brooks (IN) | Gibson | Marino |
| Broun (GA) | Gingrey (GA) | Massie |
| Buchanan | Gohmert | McCarthy (CA) |
| Bucshon | Goodlatte | McCaul |
| Calvert | Gosar | McClintock |
| Camp | Gowdy | McHenry |
| Campbell | Graves (GA) | McIntyre |
| Cantor | Graves (MO) | McKeon |
| Capito | Griffin (AR) | McKinley |
| Carney | Griffith (VA) | McMorris |
| Carter | Grimm | Rodgers |
| Cassidy | Guthrie | Meadows |
| Chabot | Hall | Meehan |
| Chaffetz | Hanna | Messer |
| Coble | Harper | Mica |
| Coffman | Harris | Miller (FL) |
| Cole | Hartzler | Miller (MI) |
| Collins (GA) | Hastings (WA) | Miller, Gary |
| Collins (NY) | Heck (NV) | Mullin |
| Cook | Herrera Beutler | Mulvaney |
| Costa | Holding | Murphy (FL) |
| Cotton | Horsford | Murphy (PA) |
| Crawford | Hudson | Neugebauer |
| Crenshaw | Huelskamp | Noem |
| Culberson | Huizenga (MI) | Nugent |
| Daines | Hultgren | Nunes |
| Davis, Rodney | Hunter | Olson |
| DeFazio | Hurt | Owens |
| Denham | Issa | Palazzo |
| Dent | Jenkins | Paulsen |
| DeSantis | Johnson (OH) | Pearce |
| DesJarlais | Johnson, Sam | Perry |
| Diaz-Balart | Jones | Peters (CA) |
| Duckworth | Jordan | Petri |

| | |
|--------------|---------------|
| Pittenger | Rothfus |
| Pitts | Royce |
| Poe (TX) | Runyan |
| Pompeo | Ryan (WI) |
| Posey | Salmon |
| Price (GA) | Scalise |
| Radel | Schweikert |
| Reed | Scott, Austin |
| Reichert | Sensenbrenner |
| Renacci | Shimkus |
| Ribble | Shuster |
| Rice (SC) | Simpson |
| Rigell | Sinema |
| Roby | Smith (NE) |
| Roe (TN) | Smith (NJ) |
| Rogers (AL) | Smith (TX) |
| Rogers (KY) | Southerland |
| Rogers (MI) | Stewart |
| Rohrabacher | Stivers |
| Rokita | Stockman |
| Rooney | Terry |
| Ros-Lehtinen | Thompson (PA) |
| Roskam | Thornberry |
| Ross | Tiberi |

NAYS—177

| | | |
|---------------|----------------|-------------------|
| Andrews | Gutierrez | Pallone |
| Barrow (GA) | Hahn | Pascrell |
| Bass | Hanabusa | Pastor (AZ) |
| Beatty | Hastings (FL) | Payne |
| Becerra | Heck (WA) | Pelosi |
| Bishop (GA) | Higgins | Perlmutter |
| Bishop (NY) | Himes | Peters (MI) |
| Blumenauer | Hinojosa | Peterson |
| Bonamici | Holt | Pingree (ME) |
| Brady (PA) | Honda | Pocan |
| Braley (IA) | Hoyer | Price (NC) |
| Brown (FL) | Huffman | Quigley |
| Brownley (CA) | Israel | Rahall |
| Bustos | Jackson Lee | Rangel |
| Butterfield | Jeffries | Richmond |
| Capps | Johnson, E. B. | Roybal-Allard |
| Capuano | Kaptur | Ruiz |
| Cardenas | Keating | Ruppersberger |
| Carson (IN) | Kelly (IL) | Ryan (OH) |
| Cartwright | Kennedy | Sánchez, Linda T. |
| Castor (FL) | Kildee | Sanchez, Loretta |
| Castro (TX) | Kilmer | Sarbanes |
| Chu | Kind | Schakowsky |
| Ciilline | Kirkpatrick | Kuster |
| Clarke | Kilpatrick | Langevin |
| Clay | Kliver | Larsen (WA) |
| Cleaver | Kline | Larson (CT) |
| Clyburn | Kirkpatrick | Lee (CA) |
| Cohen | Kliver | Lee (CA) |
| Conyers | Kilmer | Levin |
| Cooper | Kind | Lewis |
| Courtney | Kirkpatrick | Lipinski |
| Crowley | Kliver | Loebsack |
| Cuellar | Kliver | Loeb |
| Cummings | Kliver | Loeb |
| Davis (CA) | Kliver | Lowenthal |
| Davis, Danny | Kliver | Lowey |
| DeGette | Kliver | Lujan Grisham |
| Delaney | Kliver | Maloney |
| DeLauro | Kliver | Maloney, Sean |
| DelBene | Kliver | Maloney, Sean |
| Deutch | Kliver | Matheson |
| Dingell | Kliver | Matheson |
| Doggett | Kliver | Matsui |
| Doyle | Kliver | McCarthy (NY) |
| Edwards | Kliver | McCollum |
| Ellison | Kliver | McDermott |
| Engel | Kliver | McGovern |
| Enyart | Kliver | McNerney |
| Eshoo | Kliver | Meeks |
| Esty | Kliver | Meng |
| Farr | Kliver | Michaud |
| Fattah | Kliver | Moore |
| Foster | Kliver | Moran |
| Frankel (FL) | Kliver | Nadler |
| Fudge | Kliver | Napolitano |
| Gallego | Kliver | Neal |
| Garamendi | Kliver | Negrete McLeod |
| Green, Al | Kliver | Nolan |
| Green, Gene | Kliver | O'Rourke |
| Grijalva | Kliver | |

NOT VOTING—24

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