

hiring freeze. This move will stunt economic growth and be devastating to New Mexico's economy.

I ask unanimous consent to bring up H.R. 699, a balanced bill to replace the sequester with spending cuts and revenue.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. As the Chair previously advised, that request cannot be entertained absent appropriate clearance.

SEQUESTRATION

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

Mr. GARAMENDI. I rise today to tell the story of how northern California communities that I represent will be harmed by sequestration.

Travis Air Force Base in my district makes sure that the equipment and personnel that our military needs are delivered quickly and safely around the world. They're the world's first responder when disaster strikes. Thirty-two hundred civilians will be furloughed beginning next week. They will have a loss of some \$30 million of income over the next 6 months.

Near Marysville, California, Beale Air Force Base operates an intelligence, surveillance, and reconnaissance mission that supplies our Nation's military with timely information to save American lives on the battlefield. Fourteen hundred civilians will be furloughed, with \$13 million in lost wages.

Families and their income are important. But so is national security, which will be compromised by sequestration.

Yuba City, one of the major places in the United States prone to flood problems, will see their critical levee protection that the Army Corps of Engineers is working on delayed and not completed for next winter's floods.

The University of California-Davis will similarly be harmed.

It's time to end sequestration, and I ask unanimous consent that H.R. 699 be brought up for a vote.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. As the Chair previously advised, that request cannot be entertained absent appropriate clearance.

THE EFFECT OF SEQUESTRATION ON THE MILITARY

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

Mr. PETERS of California. Tomorrow is the last day we have to avoid sequester. I've spoken on the House floor about how San Diego will be disproportionately affected. Today, I want to address our national security.

Almost one in four jobs in San Diego County are defense related. Nearly 25 percent of defense contractors are small businesses. Already, shipbuilding and maintenance contracts have been canceled, including 10 ship repairs in

San Diego. Manufacturing companies that rely on defense funding could lose 223,000 jobs. Neglecting ship repairs will not only lead to job loss and threaten morale—it undermines our national security and our readiness.

Mr. Speaker, let's prove to San Diego and the America people that Congress is not broken. Let's work together to find a solution that doesn't compromise our national security and that balances fiscal responsibility with economic growth.

SEQUESTER

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

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to urge my colleagues to come together and avoid sequestration. Make no mistake: These cuts aren't just fodder for newspaper headlines. They are real. They are deep. And they will hurt.

Back home in my district in Taunton, Massachusetts, we have an active chapter of Jumpstart, a national literacy organization that pairs community volunteers with low-income preschool children. They operate in tandem with the local Head Start. If sequestration happens, over 70,000 children across the country could lose access to Head Start—1,500 in Massachusetts—jeopardizing the ability of Jumpstart to continue offering their services. On top of that, the organization is run on the hard work of volunteers, most of whom come through Federal work-study programs—800 jobs lost in Massachusetts alone—or AmeriCorps—\$38 million in cuts across the board.

Those are big numbers. But for a moment forget the numbers. The numbers are just a succinct way of saying there's a 4-year-old girl in Taunton, Massachusetts, whose single mother depends on Jumpstart to get her child up to speed for kindergarten while she works two jobs to keep food on the table.

Our budget is in difficult shape. It will require tough choices to clean up. But they have to be smart choices, worthy of our constituents back home who put their faith and trust in each and every one of us.

SEQUESTRATION

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

Mrs. DAVIS of California. The once inconceivable now seems to be becoming the inevitable. On Friday, the sequester, a plan designed to never be implemented, will be triggered. And now the question among the papers and pundits is exactly how bad sequester will turn out to be. My question is: Why aren't we debating how to stop it? Why are we not working together on a balanced fiscal plan? We all know it's

not the right thing to do. We all know it's not the smart thing to do.

My constituents in San Diego and everyone outside of D.C. knows that it's harmful. San Diegan air traffic controllers, our Border Patrol officers, and civilian defense personnel put on leave, making us less safe and less efficient? San Diegan senior citizens, many who have served our country, sent messages stating that they will not be able to receive the meals they depend on.

San Diego teachers furloughed, disrupting our children's education? Blindly taking an ax to our budget is not a solution, it's a problem.

With that, I ask unanimous consent to bring up H.R. 699, a balanced bill to replace the sequester with spending cuts and revenues.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. As the Chair previously advised, that request cannot be entertained absent appropriate clearance.

SEQUESTRATION

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

Mr. CROWLEY. Starting Friday, careless and devastating across-the-board spending cuts will hit America's economy and stifle our recovery. But the only thing my colleagues on the other side of the aisle can say is: It's about time.

Do we need to address our Nation's deficit? Absolutely. But cutting 750,000 American jobs, food safety inspections, and health care benefits for our 9/11 first responders isn't the right way to do it. The U.S. can't lead the world in medical research if we aren't funding the National Institutes of Health. We can't protect ourselves from cybersecurity threats if the very people who work on this issue are laid off. And we can't expect our children to compete in tomorrow's global economy if we deny them access to critical programs like Head Start today.

It doesn't have to be this way. Democrats and President Obama have a solution. Our plan will put an end to the slash-and-burn cuts and replace it with reductions to our deficit through the closure of tax loopholes and an end to wasteful spending.

So, Mr. Speaker, there's a way out. There's another path forward that will ensure we protect investments in our Nation's future.

I will ask that tomorrow the Speaker ask unanimous consent to bring up H.R. 699, a balanced plan to reduce our deficit.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. As the Chair previously advised, such a request cannot be entertained absent appropriate clearance.

□ 1630

VIOLENCE AGAINST WOMEN ACT

(Mr. FARR asked and was given permission to address the House for 1

minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. FARR. Mr. Speaker, tomorrow, we have two choices. We will be able to vote on this floor on a Senate version of the Violence Against Women Act. We will also have a House version that will try to be amended to that bill.

There are several reasons why the House version is not a good bill and ought to be opposed. In my district, the immigrant provisions left out of the House bill will have a profound impact on my constituents. Immigrant women are at risk of domestic violence more than any other women, and they are less likely to report their attackers due to fear of deportation. The Senate version offers protections that the House bill does not.

I have several college campuses in my district. The Senate bill would help combat violent crimes on college campuses; the House bill does not. The Senate version of the Violence Against Women Act also includes the reauthorization of the Trafficking Victims' Protection Act; the House bill does not.

Mr. Speaker, sadly, domestic violence affects the entire country. That is why it is absolutely a shame that the Republican leadership has brought up a House bill that will jeopardize the safety of millions of women by making it even harder to receive the services and programs that are available.

THE SEQUESTRATION MYTH

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

Mr. WESTMORELAND. Mr. Speaker, I'm joined by some of our colleagues tonight here to talk about the sequester. We've heard a lot about it in the last, I guess, 10 or 12 1-minute speeches about the sequester and how bad it is and how it's going to wreck our economy.

We know that it is going to affect some people's lives, and we hate that. We much preferred a different way to do the cuts. We actually have passed two bills to address the cuts in the sequester that better address the needs of this country and our spending habits and didn't affect the many thousands of people that will either have to go to part-time work or no work due to these cuts.

It's been over 300 days since we passed the first bill out of this House; yet the Senate did not take it up. And so 2 months later we passed another one that the Senate has not taken up.

The President, over the past 3 weeks or so, has traveled a little over 5,000 miles, going down to North Carolina, to Georgia, to West Palm Beach, to Ohio, to Virginia, talking about the problems. Yet even though he's traveled that many miles, it's only 1.7 miles from the White House over to the Senate. So he could have cut down on

all those trips of the rhetoric and the campaign-type attitude that he's put towards governing just by traveling 1.7 miles down to the Senate Chamber and sitting down with the majority leader over there and the rest of his party and saying, look, we need to offer something back because we believe in regular order.

We think the best business that we can have and we think that our Founders and the way our Constitution is set up, that we work under regular orders. If the House passes a bill, we send it to the Senate. If the Senate doesn't agree with it, then they can either put their own bill, send it back over to us and we'll go to conference, or they can amend our bill and send it back. And then if we can't agree with that, we'll go to conference.

But that's not the way things have been operating over here.

It's been a failure, in my opinion, on the majority leader's part in the Senate that he just refuses to take them up. We're not going to do it. We're not going to debate it. It's either my way or the highway. I think the American people deserve better than that.

I'm going to give Mr. GOHMERT a few minutes, if he would like to take the time, before he has to make one of his dignified appearances, so I'll yield to him.

Mr. GOHMERT. I appreciate my friend from Georgia hosting this hour and also yielding. This is a very important topic, and people need to understand what's going on.

Now, as someone who was totally opposed to the deficit ceiling bill back in July, 1½ years ago, I told our conference the Democrats and the President are never going to allow the supercommittee to reach an agreement because they want to blame cuts to Medicare on Republicans, when the fact is that ObamaCare cuts \$700 billion from Medicare, and it has been and it's starting to be and it's going to get really much worse because of those cuts from ObamaCare.

To ourselves here in the House, over the last 2 years we have cut our own budgets—the Senate hasn't, but we've cut our own budgets here in the House over a 2-year period by over 11 percent, about 11.5 percent. This sequester is going to cut us another 11 percent. We're going to have cut nearly 23 percent of our own budgets. How did we do that? Did we lay off all our staffs and have a big press conference and talk about how terrible it was going to be? No. I know in my office we basically have what you'd call a hiring freeze. If we lost somebody, we haven't replaced them.

TOM COBURN first raised this point in a letter to the Deputy Director of Management for the White House, with all this gloom and doom about all the people that the President's going to have to fire because of the sequestration, because of a cut of about 2 percent of the budget, they're going to be firing all these people or furloughing all these

people. At the same time, you can go online, you can order books, and you can see all the Federal jobs that this administration is still offering.

So an easy suggestion is how about instead of firing and furloughing all these people, just hold up on hiring some folks for a while. Across America, people know how to do that in business. Instead of firing everybody that's been with you for years, that's counting on that salary, if you have to cut the budget, the first thing you do is you maybe wait to hire somebody for a bit. That would be more caring—unless of course this administration is more concerned with showing that they hired somebody instead of just maintaining what they have.

□ 1640

We will have cut our ourselves here in the House, our own budgets 23 percent, approximately, over a 3-year period. If we can do it and still get the job done, then I feel sure the people in the White House, the people in the executive departments and all those people at the EPA that are trying to shut down our own energy production and put those people out of work, heck, maybe if they just shut down EPA for a little bit and let the States continue, like Texas has, to get their water cleaner and their air cleaner, maybe the jobs would increase. The President could take credit for that just by slowing the amount of regulation this President has been throwing on the American economy.

Another thing we hear today is that the President is now saying that on Friday, after the sequestrations have started and the military is having all these massive layoffs—and actually, the truth be known, after the President will have gotten what he had been hoping and trying to get for years, even as a U.S. Senator, and that is big cuts to the Defense Department—after the Defense Department cuts kick in, then, and only then, is he going to sit down and talk to congressional leaders.

Well, that's not hard to figure out. What a great political ploy, what a great political plan. A year and a half ago, the President and the White House came up with the idea of this massive sequester, and the biggest loser would be the Defense Department. Reluctantly, some people like me said, let's don't do this, let's have other cuts, let's don't let the President's plan, with all his massive cuts to defense and basically 2 percent cuts to other entities, let's don't let that happen. Let's really cut departments, cut things we really don't need.

But we ended up going along with the President's idea for sequester. Then after he gets the cuts to defense that he's been pushing for years and years, going back to his days as a U.S. Senator, he gets to come forward and spend millions and millions of dollars running around on Air Force One condemning Republicans in the House for cutting defense.