

It seems what matters is only a commitment to deep austerity and a weakened government. This ideology has achieved a dangerous manifestation in the sequester, which has been the Republican policy all along, and which, as I have pointed out in the past, was included in their Cut, Cap and Balance bill passed in July of 2011, when 229 Members of their caucus voted for sequester as an option.

Now we have further evidence the sequester is their policy, as Republicans double down on these irrational cuts and refuse to negotiate.

There is, however, Mr. Speaker, an alternative. That is a balanced bill that will replace the sequester entirely. The ranking member of the Budget Committee, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, has put forward a proposal that deserves a vote.

The Speaker so often says, "Let the House work its will." In fact, he has asked for a vote on it six times, VAN HOLLEN has, and will ask for a seventh time at the Rules Committee today, but Speaker BOEHNER and Republican Leader CANTOR have so far said, no, the House cannot work its will; the House cannot consider this option.

The American people deserve to see where their representatives stand on a balanced alternative to the sequester, and they deserve a Congress where real compromise proves stronger than partisan maneuvering.

If the Van Hollen alternative were to come to the floor for a vote, I would hope that a majority of Members would vote for it. A majority of Democrats certainly would and I believe a substantial number of Republicans who are concerned about our fiscal future.

HAL ROGERS, in fact, the chairman of the Appropriations Committee, has opined how much pain the sequester would be causing and how much dysfunction it would be causing. It's exactly the kind of compromise approach we need, the Van Hollen alternative.

All we're asking to do, in the immediate term, is for Speaker BOEHNER to let the House work its will and have a vote on Mr. VAN HOLLEN's alternative, and to follow regular order and agree to go to conference. That's what they said they wanted to do. That's what they said they would do, but they're not doing it.

It's time for Democrats and Republicans to work together, in a bipartisan way, to rise to our budget challenges and set our country back on a sound fiscal path.

Let us have regular order. Let us have a vote, and let us restore sanity to this House, and replace the sequester with a balanced solution.

□ 1010

THE "SOME LIVE AND SOME DIE"
CZAR

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

Mr. MCCLINTOCK. Mr. Speaker, last week, the Nation learned of the plight of Sarah Murnaghan, the 10-year-old who will die within weeks unless she gets a desperately needed lung transplant. There are no pediatric lungs available, but there may be adult lungs, which her doctors say would be entirely satisfactory for her condition. But because she's nearly 11 years old and not 12, the bureaucratic regulations prohibited it.

As Secretary of Health and Human Services, Kathleen Sebelius could have modified those regulations to conform to the judgment of the doctors, but she wouldn't. Her warm words of sympathy for Sarah and her family at a Congressional hearing last week were horrific: "some live and some die." Fortunately, a Federal judge intervened and concluded what Sebelius wouldn't, that the regulations are arbitrary and capricious. Thank God, Sarah is now on the adult transplant list, but the incident provided all of us with a chilling look at what health care will be like when bureaucrats like Kathleen Sebelius are making more and more of our health care decisions.

Sebelius constructed a straw man to argue with. She said that we shouldn't have public officials making these choices, and a lung provided to Sarah necessarily means a lung denied to someone else. That is utterly disingenuous. Sarah's family, joined by many Members of the House, were not calling for Sebelius to pick winners or losers but, rather, were calling for her to place the judgment of the doctors ahead of the rigid one-size-fits-all diktats of the Federal bureaucracy in all such cases, not just this one.

The fact is, Ms. Sebelius is picking who lives and who dies. The difference is that she is doing so not by deferring to the judgment of doctors but, rather, by conforming to the cold and rigid regulations that cannot discern between individual cases.

This is the process to which we are about to consign every American as government dictates every detail of their health coverage: sorry, you're a few months too young or too old. Tough luck, some live and some die.

My chief of staff grew up in the Soviet Union where the first question asked when an ambulance was called was, "Well, how old is the patient?" That's what bureaucracies do. They choose who wins and who loses, who lives and who dies, and they do so in a blind, cold, unthinking, and unreasonable manner.

The fact is we don't want officials making these choices, which is exactly what Ms. Sebelius is doing. Those decisions should not involve the government but, rather, should be determined by the individual judgment of the professional physicians directly involved. Until the court stepped in, that's what this administration was impeding. And that shouldn't surprise us. This is the same administration that has substituted the individual medical insur-

ance choices once made by families with the one-size-fits-all mandates of the very same Federal officials who dismissively tell dying 10-year-olds "some live and some die."

Mr. Speaker, this incident was a dire warning to us all of the danger that lies ahead for every American. Remember that the same IRS that abused its fearsome authority to harass and intimidate ordinary Americans for political reasons next year will have the power to enforce the regulations over our families' choice of health plans under ObamaCare.

Mr. Speaker, each of us as Americans may one day face the same peril as Sarah Murnaghan because of what we set in motion by empowering this government to take an ever-widening role in our health care decisions. We have taken a process that once was determined by individual choice and was once guided by the professional judgment of the physicians who actually gathered around the patient's bed and turned those decisions over to the likes of Kathleen Sebelius.

I'm afraid in coming years we will pay dearly for that duplicity as we move ever closer toward the "Brave New World" of bureaucratically controlled health care that we can already see so clearly through a 10-year-old's life-or-death battle with the Federal bureaucracy.

STATE ETHICS LAW PROTECTION ACT

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

Mr. QUIGLEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to announce my reintroduction of the State Ethics Law Protection Act. At a time when indictments and allegations of ethics violations of our elected leaders have become all too common, now more than ever we must use every tool at our disposal to fight corruption.

Unfortunately, the Federal Government is currently preventing numerous States from using one of the most important tools we have to fight cronyism, corruption, and waste. My home State of Illinois, which is no stranger to these issues, along with several other States around the country, has taken a stand against corruption by passing laws to eliminate shady pay-to-play contracting.

Pay-to-play politics is the practice of trading campaign contributions for lucrative government contracts. Pay-to-play practices erode the integrity of our public works projects and allow individuals to profit at the expense of American taxpayers. It is the most common example of government corruption.

Fortunately, it is also one of the easiest to solve. Anti-pay-to-play laws are designed to ensure that the competitive bidding process for government contracts is open and fair, not rigged or otherwise biased by lining the

campaign pockets of those responsible for awarding the contracts.

Amazingly, a loophole created in a previous administration in the Federal Highway Administration's contracting requirements is making it difficult, if not impossible, for States to implement these anticorruption laws. The Federal Government has threatened to cut off highway funds to any State that passes an anti-pay-to-play law. The Highway Administration's competitive bidding requirements have been interpreted to mean that States can't weed out corrupt contractors.

Clearly, this was not the intent of Congress when it passed these requirements. That is why I'm reintroducing the State Ethics Law Protection Act. This important measure simply amends the Federal Highway Administration's contracting requirements to allow States to pass these important laws. It ensures States that do pass anticorruption laws do not face financial penalties for doing so.

It is time for us to make it clear that Congress supports the right of States to fight corruption as they see fit. States have the right to ensure their contracting conforms to the highest ethical standards and offers the best value to taxpayers. It is not the Federal Highway Administration's place to second-guess a State on how to best ethically award contracts. States like Connecticut, New Jersey, South Carolina, Pennsylvania, and Kentucky have all passed laws like Illinois to root out this kind of blatant corruption.

These States should be applauded, not punished, for doing the right thing. By amending the Federal Highway Administration's contracting requirements, we can ensure that States have every tool at their disposal to encourage transparency and accountability. Our States have shown they are ready to reform. It is now our duty to ensure they have the ability to implement these reforms.

I am often asked what the true cost of corruption is. I will tell you, in my view, coming from Illinois, it is the loss of the public's trust. We cannot lead without this trust. And at this critical juncture, we must do all we can to restore trust and inspire the confidence of people across this country.

TRUST, ANTITERRORISM, AND BREACH OF TRUST BY OBAMA ADMINISTRATION

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

Mr. BROOKS of Alabama. The Justice Department targets Associated Press, FOX News, and other journalists. For political reasons, the State Department and White House contrive a false story about Americans murdered in Benghazi. Cover-ups ensue. The President promotes rather than fires the principal deceiver. The President promises to punish the Benghazi

murderers, yet the only person jailed is a scapegoated filmmaker the White House falsely blamed for inspiring the Benghazi attacks.

Armed Federal SWAT agents raid Gibson Guitar and threaten to put Gibson Guitar out of business. Why? Gibson Guitar imported the same guitar materials they have imported for years; yet Martin & Company, a Gibson Guitar competitor, imports the same guitar materials with impunity. The difference? Gibson Guitar contributes to Republicans like Congresswoman MARSHA BLACKBURN and Senator LAMAR ALEXANDER of Tennessee, while Martin contributes \$35,000 to Democrats.

The IRS targets law-abiding citizens who use names like "Tea Party" and "Patriots" and dare exercise their freedom of association and speech rights. In one particularly outrageous example, Texan Catherine Engelbrecht is investigated and harassed by the IRS, the FBI, the Occupational Safety and Health Administration, and Alcohol, Tobacco, and Firearms. Why? Engelbrecht founded the King Street Patriots, which hosts weekly discussions on economic freedom, and True the Vote, which trains volunteers to fight voter fraud.

□ 1020

The White House manages the Fast and Furious gunrunning scandal that left hundreds of Mexicans and an American Border Patrol agent dead. Health and Human Services Secretary Kathleen Sebelius unethically—and perhaps unlawfully—shakes down companies she regulates for donations to support ObamaCare.

President Obama thumbs his nose at America's immigration laws by not only giving millions of illegal aliens a free pass; Obama rewards illegal conduct by giving illegal aliens work permits in direct violation of American law, thereby undermining the ability of Americans to obtain good-paying jobs.

America is in uncharted waters when our own Federal Government aggressively undermines our rights to freedom of speech and association—rights won with American blood on the battlefields of Lexington and Concord, Trenton and Princeton, Saratoga, Cowpens and Kings Mountain, and Yorktown.

Mr. Speaker, America faces a policy debate between privacy and national security. Fifty years ago, our foes were well-known nation-states like Communist China and the Soviet Union. Now, our enemies may be foreign neighbors, foreign tourists, or even foreign students.

Foreign terrorists seek chemical, biological, or nuclear weapons of mass destruction that can destroy an American city or murder hundreds of thousands of Americans in a single attack.

As America seeks the proper balance between our privacy rights and national security, one thing stands out: Americans must be able to trust our

Federal Government to do the right thing with the privacy information Americans give up. If we cannot trust the Federal Government to use our private privacy information solely for antiterrorism purposes, then the balance shifts. We will not give up our privacy information, thereby increasing the risk of a successful weapon of mass destruction terrorist attack on an American city.

More and more, our own Federal Government disregards the rule of law that is essential to avoid the strife and bloodshed of anarchy. More and more, the Federal Government targets American citizens who differ politically with the White House.

While the IRS, Gibson Guitar, Benghazi, Fast and Furious, and numerous other scandals are troublesome, the bigger picture is that this White House, this administration, has breached the public's trust. The bigger scandal is that this White House, this administration, by their breach of trust, has undermined America's national security and thereby risked American lives.

Mr. Speaker, the White House can still do the right thing, but the right thing is not coverups. The right thing is not rewarding and promoting political cronies and lawbreakers. The right thing is, with full and open candor, telling the American people the truth about these scandals. The right thing is very publicly and aggressively firing offending Federal employees. The right thing is very publicly prosecuting lawbreakers. Then and only then will the trust of the American people in the Federal Government be restored. Then and only then can America fight the war on terror with certainty that we will win.

RICHMOND OFFICE OF NEIGHBORHOOD SAFETY PEACEKEEPER FELLOWS

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

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise to commend two young men from Richmond, California, who will begin classes this fall at Tallahassee Community College in Tallahassee, Florida. Sounds pretty straightforward, I know, but these are no ordinary students.

What makes these young men from my congressional district stand out is their background. It's not just that most people thought they would never go to college—in fact, most people thought they would never make it out of the neighborhood. People thought they would end up in jail, or even worse.

D'vondre Woodard and Eric Welch are two senior fellows at the city of Richmond's Office of Neighborhood Safety Peacekeeper Fellowship, an office that does a remarkable job of changing violent lives. D'vondre and Eric are shining examples of what remarkable