

It does not mean that we cannot continue the work that we are doing on the appropriations bills and on the other policy measures that are coming to this floor in hopes of finding areas we can agree on. But there is a strong one we disagree on—and that is the issue of additional revenues in an environment where Washington doesn't spend what it does spend well.

We're trying to get to the bottom of that, effect good policy, act in a deliberative manner, and are willing to work with the Senate. The problem is the Senate hasn't even begun their appropriations process on the floor there. And that was my point about bicameral and, hopefully, in a bipartisan way.

Mr. HOYER. I'm surprised to hear the majority leader say budget has no relationship to the appropriations process or the continuing resolution.

Mr. CANTOR. I didn't say no relationship. I said the gentleman knows that we're talking about two different things when we're talking about a budget blueprint and the spending bills. Two different things.

Mr. HOYER. I've been on the Appropriations Committee, as the gentleman knows, for 23 years. I'm not on it now. And you've adopted a budget, not because the budget passed but because you deemed the budget passed, you've pretended it passed. We did that ourselves to get a number. Why is that important? Because that's the spending number. Ours is \$967 billion. The Senate's is \$1.058 trillion. It's some \$91 billion more.

So there's a very substantial difference between the two Houses. It has to be resolved. Maybe the gentleman can tell me, since we don't have a resolution of what the number is going to be, which is what a budget conference does, and what I hear the gentleman saying is, unless the Senate agrees with your perception of revenues—and I know that you repeat that all the time. I get it. I know your position. I know the position of your party. My position, of course, is we need to pay for what we buy. You're right. If we don't buy it, we don't have to pay for it. And we have to make that judgment on behalf of the American people. That's what they sent us here to do.

But the fact of the matter is, if your position is that unless they agree with your perception—they have a different point of view. They were elected by the American people. By the way, this side was elected by the American people, 1.4 million more of whom voted for us than voted for your side of the aisle. You have the majority. Redistricting provided for that, God bless you. I wish I were in your position, not in mine, from that standpoint. But the fact of the matter is more of the American people voted for us than they voted on your side. But you have the majority.

You ought not to be in the position, I suggest, respectfully, Mr. Leader, of saying unless the Senate will accede to our position, we're not going to go to

conference. I don't understand saying you want a bicameral, bipartisan agreement without going to conference.

Let me ask you about immigration. There's nothing on here about immigration. The Senate has passed a bipartisan bill. Does the gentleman have any reason to believe that we're going to move ahead on immigration? President Bush said just the other day the system is not working. The system is broken. Your chairman of the Budget Committee, talking about the budget, said we have a broken immigration system that needs to be fixed.

Can the gentleman tell me whether there's any action contemplated on immigration?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Members are reminded to address their remarks to the Chair.

Mr. CANTOR. Mr. Speaker, I say to the gentleman that, as he correctly indicated, our chairman of the Judiciary Committee, the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. GOODLATTE), has said that our system of immigration is broken and that he and the members of that committee are fast about trying to look at the complex issues of our immigration system and trying to deal with them in a fashion that is discrete on each issue, with a solution thereto. And in that committee we are in the process, as the gentleman knows, of looking at all of that and intend on making sure we get it right. The chairman has said rather than just doing it, we want to do it right. And we intend to do so.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Leader, the last question. You said the defense authorization bill is coming to the floor. Can the gentleman tell me whether that will be coming to the floor under an open rule or a rule other than open?

Mr. CANTOR. Mr. Speaker, I would say to the gentleman that the DOD approps bill will be coming to the floor, and the Rules Committee will decide on the structure and how that debate will occur. We will announce that, obviously, upon the Rules Committee meeting.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman, and I yield back the balance of my time.

ADJOURNMENT TO MONDAY, JULY 22, 2013

Mr. CANTOR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet on Monday next, when it shall convene at noon for morning-hour debate and 2 p.m. for legislative business.

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

There was no objection.

□ 1200

OBSERVANCE OF FIRST ANNIVERSARY OF AURORA THEATER MASS SHOOTINGS

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

Mr. COFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, tomorrow we will mark the first anniversary of the mass shooting that took place in my hometown of Aurora, Colorado, in the early morning hours of July 20 of last year.

We must never forget the names of those who lost their lives in this senseless tragedy:

Matt McQuinn,
Micayla Medek,
Jessica Ghawi,
Gordon Cowden,
Jesse Childress,
John Larimer,
Jonathan Blunk,
Veronica Moser-Sullivan,
Alex Sullivan,
Alexander Teves,
Rebecca Wingo,
and AJ Boik.

Aurora was devastated in the aftermath of the shooting, but we have come together as a community in a demonstration of both strength and resilience, and tomorrow we will come together again to remember those who were lost last year.

AURORA REMEMBRANCE

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

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today with Mr. COFFMAN, Ms. DEGETTE, Mr. POLIS, and Mr. GARDNER in remembrance of the 1-year anniversary of the Aurora theater shooting.

Over the past year, victims and their families and those who lost loved ones have shown incredible courage in the face of such a terrible tragedy. That fateful night claimed the lives of those we will never forget and whose lives we will honor every day. This tragedy has not and will not define the city of Aurora, or the Denver area, or Colorado.

We want to thank and recognize the outstanding work of the police officers, medical staffs, and first responders who acted bravely and selflessly on July 20 and continue to serve the people of Aurora and Denver every day.

Mr. Speaker, I ask for a moment of silence for those who were killed and for those who were maimed physically and emotionally last year in the Aurora, Colorado, theater shooting.

OBAMACARE

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

Mr. RICE of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, Democratic Senator MAX BAUCUS was dead-on when he called the

President's health care law a "train wreck." Its effects are becoming clear and undeniable. It is stifling economic growth and job creation, premiums are skyrocketing, and record numbers of employers are delaying hiring or hiring part time to avoid the employer mandate.

I recently heard from a hardworking small business owner, Sue Lee, who owns a hardware store in Latta, South Carolina. Since the passage of ObamaCare, she has seen her insurance premium balloon to more than \$2,100 per month, or \$26,000 per year, for three employees. That's outrageous. How can we expect our small businesses to grow and expand when they are forced to comply with more and more burdensome Federal regulation?

I am so glad we have the Federal Government to dictate to we helpless citizens which coverages we need. We can't be trusted to make that choice ourselves. How can we expect our small businesses to hire when they can't afford to buy maternity coverage on every employee, regardless of their age, mental health coverage on every employee? And substance abuse coverage on every employee is mandated by this ill-conceived and poorly drafted law.

The American economy would have already recovered if we could get the Federal Big Brother out of the way. I'm glad we delayed the employer and individual mandates, but the only way to relieve this law's enormous drag on our economy and get hardworking Americans back to work is full repeal.

SUCCESSFUL LAUNCH OF SECOND MOBILE USER OBJECTIVE SYSTEM SATELLITE

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

Mrs. DAVIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the uniform and civilian employees at the Navy's Space and Naval Warfare Systems Command, or SPAWAR, and their successful launch of the second Mobile User Objective System satellite MUOS-2.

With the MUOS-2 launch just hours ago, our services will have a next-generation narrowband tactical satellite communications system designed to significantly improve ground communications for U.S. forces. This achievement comes at a time when most DOD civilians, including those who worked on this project, are being forced to take a pay cut because Congress cannot fix sequestration.

It would be natural for our Federal workers to listen to the debate in Washington about the budget and feel that their work is not valued. Mr. Speaker, I value our Federal workers. And MUOS-2 is only the latest example of the important role they play even in these troubling times.

EMAIL SPYING BY GOVERNMENT AGAINST CITIZENS

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

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, a few minutes ago, I sent out an email. I tweeted about an hour ago and posted on Facebook this morning. We have a world of instant, unlimited email storage, high-speed broadband, social media, and cloud computing. However, after 180 days, government agencies can snoop through everything I just mentioned. How in the cloud is this possible?

Because current law allows spying government to seize without warrant or probable cause emails over 180 days old. Big Government can demand a private company turn over a citizen's information without their consent, without their knowledge, or telling citizens later their emails have even been seized. This is a violation of the Fourth Amendment.

That's why Representative ZOE LOFGREN and I have introduced bipartisan legislation to protect a citizen's right of privacy against government. Our legislation will update the Electronic Communications Privacy Act. Government can't seize and snoop through your mail. It shouldn't be able to seize and snoop through your emails without warrant or probable cause.

And that's just the way it is.

WE HAVE A PRESIDENT, NOT A KING

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

Mr. STEWART. Mr. Speaker, I wish that our President had the same respect for our Constitution that our Founding Fathers had, but he doesn't. He simply doesn't; for far too many of his political decisions are made with little regard for the sacred document that has guided our Nation for more than 200 years.

Several weeks ago, the President announced that he is not going to enforce certain provisions of ObamaCare. Now, whether it is a good policy or bad policy is not the point. The point is the President does not have the authority to make such a decision. The President is constitutionally bound to enforce the laws of the land.

How would my Democratic friends feel if Mitt Romney had been elected and in his first day in office he had decided that he was going to pick and choose which parts of ObamaCare he was going to enforce? Or what if he decided that the capital gains tax was a drag on the economy and he was no longer going to enforce that law?

The President's willingness to pick and choose which laws he will enforce is dangerous and demeaning to our democracy. It's demeaning to the very

idea of an elected form of government. We have a President, not a King.

I hope the President will remember his constitutional oath.

THE HUMAN TOLL OF PRESIDENT OBAMA'S WAR ON LOW-COST AMERICAN ENERGY

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

Mr. ROTHFUS. Mr. Speaker, this afternoon, I'm heading home, heading home to western Pennsylvania. People back home are being negatively impacted by President Obama's war on low-cost American energy and all the regulations that are emanating from the unelected Federal elites here in Washington, D.C. We've got power plants closing back in western Pennsylvania, resulting in hundreds of lost jobs. We've got miners with middle class incomes also being laid off. We've got truckers and shippers jobs also being threatened.

President Obama's anti-energy agenda hurts all of those folks in western Pennsylvania and around the Nation. These hardworking moms and dads are losing their jobs, their livelihoods, and their ability to support their families and communities. This is the human toll of President Obama's war on low-cost American energy. It's a tragedy, and it must end.

WORLD EVENTS

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

Mr. GOHMERT. Mr. Speaker, so much is happening in the world today, so much that is really earthshaking in its potential effect.

In the Middle East, I've spoken before about the potential rise of a new Ottoman Empire that, unfortunately, our own country, this Obama administration, has helped jump-start.

In Egypt, we supposedly had a friend. There were comments to direct attention to. Back on June 2, the BBC reported an interview in 2009 where during the interview the President was asked:

Do you regard President Mubarak as an authoritarian ruler?

President Obama said, in part:

He has been a stalwart ally in many respects, to the United States. He has sustained peace with Israel, which is a very difficult thing to do in that region. But he has never resorted to, you know, unnecessary demagoguing of the issue, and has tried to maintain that relationship. So I think he has been a force for stability and good in the region.

He points out, obviously there have been criticisms, but he saw him as a force for good in the region.

That's rather amazing when you look at what happened—we recall it was an