

grandmother who raised him was diagnosed with cancer and came to rely on Meals on Wheels during the final part of her life.

He couldn't believe that after all the good work the Prince George's County Meals on Wheels office had done, that they were being forced to reduce their operations significantly as a result of the sequester.

Surely, Mr. Speaker, the richest country on the face of the Earth does not need to leave people, particularly seniors who can't get out, hungry.

Other harmful effects on the most vulnerable Americans include an 11 percent cut to emergency unemployment insurance payments and 125,000 fewer rental assistance vouchers.

Mr. Speaker, as many as 70,000 children could be kicked out of Head Start—they're only going to be 4 once—including approximately 800 children in my own State.

I read on Monday in The Washington Post about the Whitney Young Head Start Center in Yonkers, New York, Mr. Speaker, which has served primarily Hispanic families for more than 12 years, teaching kids English and providing them medical services and meals. It closed down on Friday, a victim of sequestration.

And on Monday, an article in the Huffington Post drew attention to an effect of the sequester that represents a dangerous undermining of justice, and that is the cut to public defenders who represent defendants in the Federal court system who cannot afford their own attorneys. This fulfills the Constitutional requirement that everyone is entitled to legal representation. It can't be waived.

That report in The Washington Post says, "The Public Defender system hasn't just been stripped bare by sequestration, its bones have been chiseled away as well."

Mr. Speaker, can we risk delaying justice for victims and their families because our country can't afford public defenders?

Do we want cases dismissed against people who have done wrong because the Constitution says they have to have a defense that we can't afford, apparently?

I met yesterday with Maryland District Court judges, about eight of them, and they raised this issue as one of critical importance. And one of the judges, a Reagan appointee, was obviously very animated at how we were undermining the very essence of the judicial system. Surely no one on this floor intends to do that.

At the Defense Department, 650,000 civilian workers are already being furloughed 2 days a month. That's an effective cut in pay of 20 percent for hardworking people on whom we rely to maintain the national security of our country.

On July 2, I visited with civilian defense workers from Pax River Naval Air Station in St. Mary's County, and I heard from my constituents there

who are being forced to stay home from work without pay. They were certainly concerned about their families' finances.

But Mr. Speaker, these hardworking and patriotic public servants were far more worried about furloughs' effect on our military readiness and support for our troops in the field on those Fridays when many are forced to stay home, and not at their post. Legally, they can't even come to work and volunteer their time.

The sequester is hurting morale and putting our security at risk, Mr. Speaker, at a moment when our troops are still in harm's way every single day, Fridays, otherwise known as furlough days, included.

I'll be going to another installation in Maryland's Fifth District on Friday, Mr. Speaker, the Naval Surface Warfare Center at Indian Head, to meet with civilian employees there. I will tell them that Congress has the ability to end the furloughs they are experiencing now.

We have the ability to keep those kids from losing Head Start, and our seniors from losing meals. We have that ability now. We can do so by coming together in a bipartisan way to replace the sequester with a balanced alternative that includes spending cuts and, yes, revenues.

This is what Budget Committee Ranking Member CHRIS VAN HOLLEN has put forward seven times, Mr. Speaker, only to see it prevented by the majority from receiving a vote.

The Speaker says, let the House work its will. Well, perhaps this is the will of the House. I hope not.

I urge my colleagues to work together across the aisle so we can end the sequester and restore fiscal discipline in a way that does not harm our security, our economy, the most vulnerable in our country, or America itself.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Members are reminded not to traffic in the well while another Member is under recognition.

FEAR OF MAN IS A SNARE

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

Mr. RIGELL. Mr. Speaker, I come to the floor this morning to call for a change in the House calendar.

Mr. Speaker, leaders set priorities. They identify the challenges and opportunities that face their organization, then they assess them and put them in the right order, and then they align their organization's calendar to make sure that those top priorities get addressed. That's what the American people rightfully expect of each of us.

Overall, our calendar and the priorities of the House are right on track.

I'm so proud of the legislation that we've passed that would move America to energy independence and create hundreds of thousands of jobs.

But in one very critical area we're seriously off track. Our calendar does not reflect the challenges and the top priorities of our country. Specifically, we're not on track to pass all 12 appropriations bills that fund the Federal Government for 2014.

The fact is, we're not even close to passing those bills. And with our current congressional calendar, I cannot possibly see a way that we can pass those bills by September 30, which is the end of the current fiscal year.

This is not without consequence. It damages our economy, job creation. It damages our military in a very real way. And ultimately, it hurts hard-working American families.

Now, let's look at the status of the 12 bills, and then look at the time that remains on the congressional calendar to debate and pass those bills in time to avoid what's referred to as a continuing resolution.

And make no mistake here. A continuing resolution is wholly inadequate as a financial vehicle to fund this government. It has serious adverse consequences, and that's why this topic merits the careful attention of this body, and that's why it merits a change in our congressional calendar.

Well, here are the 12 bills that must be passed. We've passed four of them. Well, that leaves eight. My math's pretty good—there are 12 bills, 4 have been completed.

Now, they're not past due right now, but they surely will be, at least some of them.

As I mentioned, this has serious repercussions. I've spent a tremendous amount of time in our district listening to the hardworking men and women who keep our country safe and those who support them.

Every time we pass a continuing resolution, our military reels with uncertainty. We have a deep obligation to the young men and women around the world who are keeping this country safe to use every dollar wisely to ensure that we get the very best equipment and support to each of them.

That's why I feel so strongly about this issue, and it burdens me when we fail the American people in this respect.

Well, let's look on at the calendar and see what we've got to work with here.

□ 1015

Mr. Speaker, we have 15 calendar days. They're indicated right here in the teal green color. These areas here represent constituent work periods. I work really hard in our constituent work periods. I know that every Member here does. It's important that we're in our districts. There's value to that—to listen and to be accountable to the good folks who sent us here.

That said, a principle function and what the American people are expecting of us is that we pass these 12 appropriations bills. So if what is referred to as the August recess is brought to this body for a vote, I will vote “no.” I’ll encourage every Member of this body to vote “no,” Democrat and Republican. When an organization is facing profound challenges, you do what you must do to set it on a better course. It may be House tradition to break, but I submit that it’s not wise.

Mr. Speaker, I really believe we ought to be in session 6 days a week, starting at 8 a.m.—earlier, if it were up to me—and then end around 7 p.m. Six days a week. I’m convinced that just that pressure alone would help us to find some common ground that I know exists in this place. That’s why I call for a change in the calendar.

THE FUTURE OF PUBLIC BROADCASTING

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

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, I listened to my friend from Virginia. I respect his opinion; but with all due respect, I think we’ve got a more fundamental problem than the calendar. The Republican leadership refuses to allow a conference committee on the budget between the House and the Senate to reconcile our differences. We can be here 24 hours a day, 7 days a week; but if the Republican leadership refuses to allow the process to work, we’re not going to get anywhere. And that’s where we are right now.

My friends on the Appropriations Committee refuse to deal with the budget level that was passed into law 2 years ago that fixed us on a course. They have a level of funding that is literally slashing and burning Federal spending. The latest manifestation of this battle is putting in jeopardy the very existence of public broadcasting.

I would have hoped that we were past that when the last Congress targeted NPR and tried to defund the Corporation for Public Broadcasting. Luckily, the 170 million Americans who don’t just listen or watch public broadcasting, but depend on it, unleashed an unprecedented show of support. As a result, the Republican leadership walked it back.

One good thing about that budget battle 2 years ago was that it called for a study to look for alternatives for the 14 percent of Federal money that supports public broadcasting. The study is in and it clearly shows there’s no viable alternative to those 14 cents on the dollar.

Many of the proposals that have been suggested would actually result in less money, overall, for public broadcasting in the long term. Yet the House appropriations bill, we’re told, is going to eliminate Corporation for Public Broadcasting funding.

Last summer, I had a fascinating conversation with my friend Ken Burns, who pointed out that his six projects in the pipeline would never have been made, let alone be seen, without funding for the Corporation for Public Broadcasting. So I hope you enjoyed his show last fall about the Dust Bowl, because if the Republicans have their way, you will never see his programs about the Roosevelts, Jackie Robinson, Vietnam, or Hemingway.

Remember how well it worked for Governor Romney when he singled out broadcasting as one of the five projects that he would defund? The Republicans, sadly, pander to a tiny fraction of the American public that is even a minority in their own party. Polls show two-thirds of Republicans surveyed would either keep funding for public broadcasting where it is or increase it. What resonates with some Republican primary voters is not what America wants, needs, or believes.

The unprecedented threat comes at exactly the time when America needs public broadcasting the most. “NPR News,” the object of the greatest Republican scorn, is the most trusted brand in American news media. PBS shows like “Sesame Street” have helped three generations of parents raise their children with effective, commercial-free educational program.

Locally owned news is becoming only a memory for most America, as large corporations buy up local stations and newspapers. There’s no money to be made by commercial stations that cater to the special needs of rural and small-town America. Luckily, public broadcasting is there because their mission is to inform and serve, not just make money.

We must stop the attack on this critical service, especially for rural and small-town America. It’s time for the 170 million Americans who depend on public broadcasting every month to again fight back and for Congress to finally listen. The radical proposal to slash public broadcasting, defund NPR, to terminate public broadcasting as we know it is a powerful signal of how far out of step the Republican leadership is from the country they’re supposed to represent.

There’s no reason to make public broadcasting, which Republicans including Barry Goldwater, helped launch, into a partisan issue. Public broadcasting has broad support from Republicans, independents, and Democrats alike. That’s why PBS and its member stations were named number one in public trust and an excellent use of tax dollars for 10 years in a row.

It’s time for the people who believe in public broadcasting to stand up to this extremism and settle the question once and for all about the future of public broadcasting. Unless we fight now, there may be nothing left to defend.

RULE OF LAW

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

Mr. GOSAR. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to shed light on Attorney General Eric Holder’s blatant disregard for the rule of law. Mr. Holder’s violations of the law are egregious, and he should not be immune from prosecution or given license to act without restraint.

An ordinary citizen would go to jail for selling guns to Mexican drug cartels. An ordinary citizen would go to jail for secretly obtaining phone records and emails. An ordinary citizen would go to jail for lying to Congress about an investigation. What would happen to an ordinary citizen for lying to a judge? This is just a small part of what Attorney General Eric Holder is responsible for.

As Supreme Court Justice Brandeis said:

In a government of laws, the existence of the government will be imperiled if it fails to observe the law scrupulously. If government becomes a lawbreaker, it breeds contempt for law. It invites every man to become a law unto himself. It invites anarchy.

I ask you, has Attorney General Eric Holder invited anarchy?

I will continue to make this case here in the people’s House at the people’s pulpit. Folks, I will be back.

COAL ASH AND ENERGY

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

Mr. QUIGLEY. Mr. Speaker, we can do better. When it comes to legislatively establishing a national energy policy to address climate change, we can and must do better. But we’re not. As Members of this body, we’re not doing anything. Why?

We are hamstrung by our inability to work together to do great, important, vital things here in this Chamber: things like addressing our national debt, tackling comprehensive immigration reform, and to ever, in the history of this Nation, establish a national energy plan. The only way forward is to establish a national energy plan to address climate change, something this great Nation has always lacked, and to work with public and private entities alike to get this done.

For the climate doubters out there who still question climate change, I remind them that over 200 peer-reviewed scientific studies have said that climate change is real and that man contributes significantly to it. And zero scientific peer-reviewed studies have said the opposite.

So we must craft a plan that focuses on working with the business community hand-in-hand to be competitive internationally. We must go toe-to-toe with India and China. We must craft a plan that focuses on public transportation and green infrastructure. We must pass a multiyear transportation bill. We must focus on conservation, as