

Thompson (CA)	Vargas	Waters
Thompson (MS)	Veasey	Watt
Tierney	Velázquez	Waxman
Titus	Visclosky	Welch
Tonko	Wasserman	Wilson (FL)
Van Hollen	Schultz	Yarmuth

## NOT VOTING—12

Becerra	Granger	Miller, George
Campbell	Green, Gene	Rush
Cárdenas	Jones	Sires
Gosar	McCarthy (NY)	Tsongas

□ 1334

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated against:

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 587—Final Passage. Had I been present, I would have voted “no.”

Mr. BECERRA. Mr. Speaker, on Friday, November 15, 2013, I was unable to cast my floor vote on rollcall votes. Had I been present for the votes, I would have voted “nay” on rollcall vote 587.

## PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, I was unavoidably detained due to official business in California today and missed roll Nos. 583 through 587. Had I been present, I would have voted “yea” on roll No. 586. I would have voted “nay” on roll Nos. 583, 584, 585, and 587.

## THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the unfinished business is the question on agreeing to the Speaker’s approval of the Journal, which the Chair will put de novo.

The question is on the Speaker’s approval of the Journal.

Pursuant to clause 1, rule I, the Journal stands approved.

## LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

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

Mr. HOYER. Madam Speaker, I yield to my friend, Mr. CANTOR, the majority leader, for the purposes of inquiring of the schedule for the week to come.

Mr. CANTOR. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Maryland, the Democratic whip, for yielding.

On Monday, the House will meet at noon for morning-hour and 2 p.m. for legislative business. Votes will be postponed until 6:30 p.m. On Tuesday and Wednesday, the House will meet at 10 a.m. for morning-hour and noon for legislative business. On Thursday, the House will meet at 9 a.m. for legislative business. Last votes of the week are expected no later than 3 p.m. On Friday, no votes are expected.

Madam Speaker, the House will consider a few suspensions next week, a complete list of which will be announced by close of business today.

In addition, the House will consider three bills to increase domestic energy production, create American middle

class jobs, and lower the cost of energy for our families. These bills are H.R. 2728, the Protecting States’ Rights to Promote American Energy Security Act, sponsored by Representative BILL FLORES; H.R. 1965, the Federal Lands Jobs and Energy Security Act, authored by Representative DOUG LAMBORN; and H.R. 1900, the Natural Gas Pipeline Permitting Reform Act, sponsored by MIKE POMPEO.

Together, these bills represent our continuing commitment to energy independence and putting more money in the pockets of working middle class families.

Mr. HOYER. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman for that information.

I think, as the majority leader knows probably as well as any of us, and maybe better than most of us, we have 4 legislative days left in November and 8 scheduled legislative days in December, assuming we do, in fact, get out on the 13th, which is the last day that we are scheduled to be in session this year.

Having said that, there are a number of pressing items to address. As the majority leader knows, the unemployment insurance protections for folks expire on December 31—actually, I think it is December 28. The SGR provisions expire on December 31. If we do not do something with respect to them, there will be a substantial decrease in the reimbursement to doctors serving Medicare patients.

I know that the majority leader has, and we have, people who are willing to work together to address these issues. Knowing that there is usually uncertainty at the end of a session, I would ask the gentleman if he can give Members a sense of scheduling for the coming month, that is December, and I yield to my friend.

Mr. CANTOR. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman.

I would say to the gentleman we certainly have three conference reports we are looking at hopefully completing with the Senate. One is the WRRDA conference report that we voted on in the House this week to go to conference. The other is the farm bill conference report, as well as the NDAA, the National Defense Authorization Act.

□ 1345

I would say to the gentleman, Madam Speaker, those are certainly the conference reports we would like to see resolved so we can have a vote in the House. The gentleman correctly points out that the sustainable growth rate program and its formula expires at the end of the year. Certainly, our committees are at work trying to see a way forward, as well as trying to seek out the proper budgetary pay-fors necessary for the plan that has been put forward by Energy and Commerce, as well as the Committee on Ways and Means. I know there have been some bicameral discussions on that as well. I am hopeful we can resolve that, but

certainly knowing full well we have to act prior to the end of the year.

I would also point out to the gentleman that there is considerable work being done on the issue of patent reform, and we hope that comes to the floor prior to the end of the year. And obviously, the larger item having to do with the Budget Committee conference, headed up by Chairman PAUL RYAN and in the other body Senator PATTY MURRAY, and we look forward to a resolution there. That is certainly the intention, Madam Speaker.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the majority leader for that information, and I am pleased that he added to the WRRDA, farm bill, NDAA, and the patent reform issues the budget conference. My view is, as the majority leader probably knows, the most important thing we can do for our economy is to get our country on a fiscally sustainable long-term path.

Can the majority leader give us some information on the status of the budget conference? Certainly, from a public perception, it appears that not much progress has been made, which is worrisome in light of the fact that the target date for the reporting on the conference is the 13th—or, should I say, the legislative directive is to report by the 13th. As Mr. RYAN has pointed out, perhaps unfortunately so, there are no consequences of that not occurring. I had urged, myself, as the majority leader may know, that they report out by Friday of next week, the 22nd of next week, or Thursday of next week, so that we could have the conference report on the week we come back in December after Thanksgiving.

Could the gentleman give us any idea where he thinks the proceedings of the conference committee on the budget stand?

I yield to my friend.

Mr. CANTOR. I thank the gentleman for yielding and would say the gentleman is correct. Certainly, the sooner, the better, as far as I am concerned. I am concerned as well about any resolution on the Budget Committee conference. I know the gentleman has spoken to both Chairman RYAN as well as the other body’s chairman. In speaking to Chairman RYAN, he tells me that there has been a lot of discussion, not only public discussion in meetings, but certainly his meeting with the chairman from the Senate, in trying to find a way forward.

The gentleman knows that the issue that is central to these discussions is not unlike the issue that has been under discussion for some time here, and that is how do we go about seeking reform of some of the mandatory programs and trying to reach resolution there in exchange for a commensurate relief on the across-the-board budget cuts that are currently in place.

I don’t know, Madam Speaker, whether they are going to meet the deadline next week or not that the gentleman says will be preferable. I know that our chairman is very mindful that

the quicker, the better, so we can get on about our work here in the House.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman.

He mentions the sequester. Of course, almost everybody who has spoken about the sequester, including myself, the majority leader, and Mr. RYAN, has indicated the sequester is not the way to reduce spending. It is a meat-ax approach which is having very adverse consequences to our national security structure. I think almost every member of the Joint Chiefs of Staff has made that point. Certainly, General Dempsey has made that point. But also, on the domestic discretionary side, the sequester doesn't work, and the proof of that, of course, is that we haven't considered any of those bills on the floor; and the one that we considered, we pulled, the Transportation-HUD bill.

So I am hopeful, and I know Mr. ROGERS is, as is Senator MIKULSKI, the chairs of the Appropriations Committee, have both indicated that they hope to get a number early on, and that is why the 22nd was a preferable date, if we could have reached that, so that they would have a number to which they could mark bills. Obviously, if there is not an agreement on the 302(a), as the gentleman knows, it is very difficult, then, to try to bring those bills together in a conference because they are so far apart.

I am hopeful that the majority leader will use his good offices to urge resolution on the budget conference differences and report out as soon as possible so we can get to that process.

The gentleman I am sure shares my view that the shutting down of government is extraordinarily disruptive, both to the general public and to those who work for the Federal Government, so that it would be incumbent upon us, I think, to try to get out of this gridlock on the budget process that we have been in. I would urge him to exercise whatever, because he has substantial influence to try to get us to a resolution of this issue, and I will tell him I will do the same.

Another issue which you did not mention, Mr. Leader, is immigration. As you know, this issue passed very handily through the United States Senate on a vote of 68-32, and I am very hopeful that we could move this legislation. I think the Senate bill or a variation of the Senate bill would pass. We have introduced an alternative for which we have Republican cosponsorship, H.R. 15, which is a comprehensive immigration bill which incorporates the security provision that was adopted unanimously in this House by the Republican-led Homeland Security Committee. We believe it has bipartisan components to it, and the balance of the bill has bipartisan support in the United States Senate. The gentleman knows, you passed a number of bills out of your committees, and they were passed, of course, with partisan votes. We do not believe these bills are bills that we would support, but we are won-

dering whether any of them are going to be brought to the floor.

H.R. 2278, which is the Strengthen and Fortify Enforcement Act, which allows the State and local authorities to enforce Federal immigration laws, as you know, we think that is bad policy, but it did come out of the Republican-headed committee in the Judiciary Committee. I am wondering if that might be brought to the floor.

I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. CANTOR. As the gentleman knows, we have had the discussion before about the majority's position on the Senate bill. We don't support the Senate bill. The Speaker I think spoke out on that this week. Our Members don't support the Senate bill. We have said all along Chairman GOODLATTE and his committee are going about a much more deliberative process, a step-by-step approach in trying to address the problems with a broken immigration system. I do think, and I will tell the gentleman that there is consensus on our side of the aisle as well as his, that the system is broken and needs to be fixed. Certainly there are differences on how to go about doing that.

We remain committed, as does the chairman, in trying to move in a step-by-step manner to address the various issues involved with immigration reform, but not to do it the way the Senate did because, as we have seen, many of those who actually voted for the Senate bill in the other body now say they regret that vote or they perhaps would do some differently. I guess it is up to the House to try to address it much more deliberatively and try to fix the problems that exist so we don't see them happen again.

I would say to the gentleman, the House will continue its work; and, as the gentleman knows, the news of this week, unfortunately, has been many, many Americans very unhappy with the work product coming out of this town as far as health care is concerned. I would posit to the gentleman that a bill like ObamaCare or a bill like the Senate immigration bill produces the kind of impact and effect that we are seeing this week and last week and the prior. We don't want to commit that same kind of mistake. We want to be smarter about it.

As the gentleman knows, our committees are hard at work in trying to identify how we can help people with their health care right now since they are facing the very real prospects of not having the health care insurance plans that they like, contrary to the promises that were made when that comprehensive bill was passed a couple of years ago in the same way the Senate bill, the immigration bill, was passed, with not a lot of focus on the detail.

We intend to try and focus on the details of immigration reform, try to come together, see if we can actually have some positive reception on the gentleman's side of the aisle both in this House and the one across the way

as well as the White House to actually work together finally to produce a bipartisan outcome that will be satisfactory because none of these partisan bills have ended up working. As you see, ObamaCare, case in point. That is why we have the train wreck that is upon us. It was a strictly partisan bill that came out of the Congress, House and Senate, and look what has happened.

So I say to the gentleman, we do care about the immigration issue and want to go about reform in a smart way.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman for his comments, Madam Speaker, and I wish that they had been demonstrated on the farm bill and on the Homeland Security appropriation bill, both of which were reported out of committee on a bipartisan basis but were made very partisan on the floor of this House. I thought that was unfortunate, but that is what happened.

I would like to repeat my question. The gentleman said he wanted to deal with the immigration bill in a very thoughtful, considered way and that he did not support the Senate immigration bill. I was not surprised with that response. The Speaker has also made that very clear; he does not support it. And, very frankly, the majority of Republicans have made it clear they do not support the comprehensive immigration reform bill.

However, Mr. Leader, what I asked you was are you going to bring H.R. 2278 which passed out of the Judiciary Committee, presumably in a thoughtful, considered, discrete way, that is dealing with individual subjects, which is the Strengthen and Fortify Enforcement Act, which allows States and local authorities to enforce Federal immigration laws—my question to you, Mr. Leader, are you going to bring that bill to the floor, or any of the other four bills, which I will mention as well, to the floor, because presumably you believe those were considered in a thoughtful way, were reported out of your committee, were reported out with all of your Republican members, I believe, voting for it, at least 20 of them voting for it. My question to you is: Are you going to bring that bill to the floor?

I yield to my friend.

Mr. CANTOR. I would say to the gentleman, Madam Speaker, it is under consideration as to the timing when we bring that bill to the floor.

I would again reiterate that Chairman GOODLATTE is trying to take a holistic approach to the immigration reform issue—the bill that the gentleman mentioned is obviously one of the pieces in trying to figure this out—and do so in a way that we can effect a positive result, not just result for result's sake. And I again direct the gentleman's attention, Madam Speaker, to what is going on with ObamaCare right now and how many millions of Americans are extremely disappointed in their government and certainly in the representations that were made by the

White House and President insofar as that law is concerned. I don't think that we ought to be engaging in those kinds of commitments when you can't deliver.

So again, we want to be working together. We want to be deliberative about this process, and hopefully we can move forward in a way that is expeditious and thoughtful.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the leader.

I said I wanted to mention the other bills because we understand, A, you would like to talk about health care without focusing on anything else. I get that. We have a disagreement. We will see whether the American people believe that making sure that affordable, quality health care is available to all Americans is something they are for or whether they are against. We will see on that. That issue was joined in the last election. The last election didn't have much effect in this body in terms of the issues that were contended in that election.

But let me ask you about H.R. 2131, which is the Supplying Knowledge Based Immigrants and Lifting Levels of STEM Visas Act.

□ 1400

As the gentleman knows, there are a lot of people very interested in this issue. This would eliminate the diversity visa program, transfer 55,000 green cards available under that program to a new STEM program that employers can use to hire foreign workers with advanced STEM degrees—master's degrees, Ph.D.s, et cetera—from universities. It was being marked up and, I understand, passed out 20–14. Again, that was with an overwhelming Republican vote, if not unanimous vote. Again, the gentleman indicates we want to consider the immigration issue in a thoughtful, discreet, and, as the Speaker has said, bill by bill way.

Is there any expectation that the gentleman has that that bill will be brought to the floor before we adjourn for the year?

I yield to my friend.

Mr. CANTOR. Madam Speaker, I would say to the gentleman if he recalls that in the not too distant past, it was his side that opposed that bill when it was brought to the floor.

My response will be the same. We want to bring bills together. We can work in a cooperative fashion to effect a result. Unfortunately, as the minority opposed stapling green cards to diplomas on that bill that was brought in the past, we are trying to figure out a way where we can bring something forward and actually get it across the finish line with the other body.

Mr. HOYER. I think the majority leader knows, and I know, he has 218 votes on his side of the floor. As a matter of fact, he has substantially more than that.

If the last bill was so good, bring it to the floor and pass it. That is what the Speaker says you want to do, you want to pass bills item by item. What

is happening is you are passing bills out of committee and they languish there, just as the farm bill, to which the gentleman referred in the early part of our discussion, languished in the last Congress and was not reported to the floor.

I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. CANTOR. Madam Speaker, I would say to the gentleman that the purpose is not just to make sure that a vote occurs and then nothing happens. The purpose is to pass bills and then allow for the bicameral effort to get a result. That is the frustration.

If the gentleman would also note, on the farm bill, we actually have a conference committee ongoing now. So the reason we employed the process we did was to get in a position that we could actually get a result and not just say we did something and fail to deliver for the people.

I would say to the gentleman again, these bills that he is bringing up all fit into a larger puzzle. We need some indication from the White House and from the majority in the Senate that they will actually work with us. Given the track record that this administration has amassed since 2009, there is not a lot of indication they are willing to work together.

Again, I would point to the prospects of that being what is key, because this week is demonstrative of what happens when you just move without bringing everyone together. The effects of this health care law are going to be lasting on people. They are scared to go to the exchanges. They are worried they are not going to have insurance. This is the impact and result of passing laws by just one body and expecting the other body to just go along. We can't do that now because we are two separate bodies, and we need the White House and the Senate to cooperate with the majority in the House.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman for that point.

He passed a Homeland Security bill that he knew the Senate wasn't for. He passed appropriation bills that he knew the Senate wasn't for. He passed, Madam Speaker, the farm bill amendments that he knew were not going to be supported in the Senate.

Madam Speaker, we think immigration is a critically important subject. We believe immigration is, in fact, broken. We have an alternative. He doesn't like our alternative. I understand that. We understand that on this side. Perhaps the American people will also understand. They don't like our alternative.

It passed with 68 votes in the United States Senate. He now says people have changed their mind. Maybe that is the case, but it passed with 68 votes in the United States Senate. They don't like it. Madam Speaker, I understand that. I get it.

They don't like the health care bill. By the way, Madam Speaker, I am starting to get that message. I am pretty thick and it takes some time,

but on 46 votes to repeal or to undermine, I get it. You don't like that bill. You think it is a bad bill. We have a disagreement on that, Mr. Leader.

However, apparently we don't have a disagreement on the fact that the immigration system in America is broken. What I am asking you—you have passed out of committee the Agricultural Guest Worker Program. It creates a new Temporary Agricultural Worker Program. That also passed on a partisan vote. None of these votes were bipartisan. There was no effort to work with the Democrats on the committee to bring a bipartisan bill, unlike Mr. LUCAS or Mr. CARTER, who brought bipartisan bills to the floor and saw them turned into partisan pieces of legislation with the help, frankly, of the majority party.

I am asking you regarding the Agricultural Guest Worker Act, are we going to bring that to the floor? Again, a discreet, thoughtful, I am sure on your side of the aisle, addressing of a broken program, but if we don't bring it to the floor, we don't consider it, we can never get to conference, which is what the gentleman says he wants to do.

I yield to my friend.

Mr. CANTOR. Madam Speaker, I will say to the gentleman again, the track record of this administration and the majority in the Senate has indicated an unwillingness to sit down and talk. They have not done so. Certainly, the White House has not done so on the immigration issue, did not do so on the health care issue. Again, it doesn't help the American people for this insistence on "my way or the highway" kind of mode of operation.

We have gotten the message now. If it is going to be my way or the highway, we will try to do whatever we can to help people, as we did today on the floor with a bipartisan vote. The gentleman continues to say that we don't like the health care bill. That is true. I think the American people have spoken out pretty loud and clearly over the last 10 days or so, as indicated by the White House and the President's move yesterday. Obviously, the law is not working.

We don't want to get into another situation like that. We want to make sure we work together comprehensively because there are step-by-step actions that need to be taken, but we need results. We need the White House to sit down and talk to us. We don't need any more speeches, and we don't need any more press conferences by the President. We need some actual talk.

On the immigration issue, they have just not come forward. They have said "my way or the highway." I say to the gentleman that is not how you work in a bipartisan process.

The gentleman complains about partisan action on the floor. Well, there is an inherent partisanship when you have a majority versus a minority, and the will of the House is reflected in the votes here. The Senate is controlled by

the gentleman's party, and so is the White House. So to get any kind of result, such as the farm bill, we are going to need a bipartisan result. He is correct on that. It doesn't mean that if we pass something in the House it automatically has to be something the Senate will support.

Again, I would say to the gentleman, let's all try to work together. I think our side has indicated a willingness to do that. Obviously, we want to go and get these conference reports out, but we have not seen a willingness on the part of the gentleman's party, this President, to say we can work together to effect positive immigration reform—not just my way or the highway.

Mr. HOYER. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman for his observations.

I must say I am somewhat amused, Madam Speaker, because there are few people in America who believe it is our party that is my way or the highway. There are few people in America who didn't see 198 Democrats vote to keep their government working. It is not my way or the highway. We didn't get what we wanted. We didn't want that number that was passed. 198 Democrats, without exception, voted to keep this government open; 198 Democrats voted to pay the bills of the United States of America. It wasn't a question of my way or the highway. It wasn't a question of repeal or I will vote to shut down the government. 147 Republicans, Madam Speaker, voted to keep the government shut down because they didn't get their way. 147 Republicans, including in both instances, the chairman of the Budget Committee, Mr. RYAN, voted to not pay the bills of the United States of America. And they voted against the majority leader's advice and against the Speaker's advice. That is a problem. I agree that that is a problem.

No matter how much, Madam Speaker, the majority leader says it is the President and the United States Senate that are undermining, in fact, the United States Senate has been passing time and after time after time bipartisan bills and has sent them to the House, where they have languished or been opposed, and finally, they were supported. That was true in the Violence Against Women Act. It was true on a bill that the majority leader and I were for, Madam Speaker, and that is for giving Sandy relief. He couldn't get more than 25 percent of his party to support that.

All I am saying is that, if immigration is a problem and we all say it is, and you think it needs to be dealt with in a discrete way, and you have passed bills out, why don't you bring them to the floor? H.R. 1772, the Legal Workforce Act, makes E-Verify immigration status programs for prospective employees mandatory. Again, I presume that this is one of Mr. GOODLATTE's thoughtful, considered steps to fix a broken immigration system.

All I am asking is—now for the fourth time—will you bring one or

more of these bills to the floor? We may not be for them, but at least they put, as the gentleman keeps saying, a bill before the House so the House can work its will. Frankly, if they are defeated, then it would be incumbent upon us to move in a different direction, but if they are just sitting there without consideration by the House, without the ability of the House to work its will, then it continues to cause inaction on a subject that all of us have expressed needs action.

If the gentleman wants to respond to that, I will yield. If not, I will go on to another subject. I am going to go on to another subject.

Rather than go on to another subject, let me urge the gentleman, again, because when the gentleman says, "Let the House work its will," that is a wonderful phrase. Hopefully, it resonates with the American people. But the House is not allowed to work its will. Ultimately, of those bills I have just referenced, we did work our will, and we worked our will, frankly, with mostly a majority of Democrats and a minority of Republicans joining together to pass critically important legislation for this country. We couldn't get the majority of your party to vote for many of those bills.

I would ask the gentleman that if he really wants the House to work its will, and he believes that H.R. 15, the comprehensive immigration bill, is a bad bill, bring it to the floor and see if the House thinks it is a bad bill, see if the House believes that it is a bill that is not worthy to be considered and passed as a fixing of a broken immigration system.

I urge my friend to bring that bill to the floor. He has the power to bring that bill to the floor. I urge him to do so.

I yield to my friend.

Mr. CANTOR. Madam Speaker, I would just say to the gentleman that we don't want a repeat of what is going on now with ObamaCare. That bill constructed as it is by the Senate is a last-minute effort to get it across the finish line. I think there is a lot that could be done a lot better in that bill. The gentleman, I believe, knows that, as well. If he doesn't share my opinion, then we can agree to disagree on that.

I would just say again, let's be mindful, Madam Speaker, of what happens when you put together a bill like ObamaCare. There are real consequences for millions of Americans right now, and they are scared that they are not even going to have health care insurance that they have today come January 1. There are plenty of reasons for that: the mishaps with the Web sites, the call centers, the stolen identities. All the things that don't seem to be working right now are scaring people out of even considering in a rational way what is going on. How could they? There are no answers being given. I would say to the gentleman it is largely due to the unfortunate architecture of that bill, some of which can

be blamed on the process by which it was put together. We don't want to the make that mistake again.

I would say to the gentleman that I look forward to working with him in a deliberate and thoughtful approach. We are not bringing up the Senate bill. We are not going to do that. I have said that to the gentleman. Hopefully, we can work in a much more positive way.

Mr. HOYER. In closing, Madam Speaker, let me simply observe that this is somewhat ironic because the gentleman has repeatedly said he doesn't like the Senate bill.

□ 1415

I hear that. He then says, we need to consider a more thoughtful way of doing this. I get that.

I have then pointed out that the committee, which is headed by Mr. GOODLATTE, Republican leader of the Judiciary Committee, has passed a number of bills, presumably, in that quest for a more thoughtful consideration to fix a broken system.

The gentleman has not said he is going to bring any of those bills to the floor, so he knows what he is against, Madam Speaker. He knows what his party is against, Madam Speaker, but he cannot tell us what he is going to do to fix a broken system because, apparently, the four bills that I have asked about are not being brought to the floor, are not part of the solution of which the gentleman speaks, and that is regrettable.

Let me say, in closing, Madam Speaker, I hope we can work in a bipartisan fashion. It didn't occur after the election, where the very issue was whether or not we ought to extend affordable health care to millions of people, some 30 to 40 to 50 million people who did not have health care security.

They continue to be scared. They continue to be presented with a message that this is a failed program, frankly, before it even starts.

Now, it has started. In terms of access, it doesn't start, as the gentleman knows, until January 1. But for some people, for some people it has started. For some parents with children with a preexisting condition, who could not get insurance, it is working.

For young people who couldn't find a job but needed insurance and were less than 26 years of age, they could stay on their parents' policy. It was working.

For seniors who were confronted with a doughnut hole that put them deeply in debt for prescription drugs they needed for lifesaving and life quality, it is working.

It is working for those people who did not go bankrupt and won't go bankrupt in the future because there are not the limits that can be imposed upon them when they get really sick.

So, yes, we will have a debate on that, but it ought not to simply divert us from all of the other issues that we need to deal with.

The budget—we need to get this country on a fiscally sustainable path. I know the leader agrees on that.

We need to fix a broken immigration system. I know the leader believes that as well. We need to invest in growing our country, to get rid of the sequester because the sequester is going to hurt our country. And, frankly, I think the leader agrees on that. We may not agree on how to do it, but I think he agrees on the objective.

So, Madam Speaker, on all of those, we ought to be giving our best efforts, not in a partisan way, but in a bipartisan way, as Americans, not as Democrats and Republicans.

Madam Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

#### HR OF MEETING

Mr. CANTOR. Madam 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 legislation business.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. WALORSKI). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia? There was no objection.

#### THE KEEP YOUR HEALTH PLAN ACT

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

Mr. REED. Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize the effort that we took today, this afternoon, in this Chamber with the passage of the Keep Your Health Plan Act. This act honors a promise that the President made to all of America, you can keep your health care if you want, and that is what we did today.

I have been hearing, Madam Speaker, from constituents all over western New York, in my district. Two, in particular, I spoke to yesterday. One, from Ithaca, New York, after meeting with a navigator as a small business owner, trying to get health insurance because he received a cancellation notice that they were going to lose their insurance this January 1, told me that he decided to forego health insurance next year because of the cost associated with it.

I talked to a young man from Bath, New York, who told me, My employer just notified me that my hours are going to be cut from 35 hours a week down to 25 hours, and he didn't even receive health insurance from that individual, but yet was told it was because of ObamaCare, and they would need to put him under a part-time status and lose those hours of work. Well, those hours of work are real dollars out of his pocket and his family's pocket.

I applaud the bipartisan effort we did today. Thirty-nine Democrats joined us on this side to allow Americans to keep their health care.

#### CONGRATULATING NINA DAVULURI

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

minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. MAFFEI. Madam Speaker, it is my pleasure to rise today to congratulate Nina Davaluri on winning the 2014 Miss America competition, and to proclaim our welcoming her back to central New York for her homecoming celebration this weekend.

I had the privilege of meeting Nina when she was Ms. Syracuse, and I can tell you that she will be a different kind of Miss America. She graduated from Fayetteville-Manlius High School and then went on to the University of Michigan, where she earned a degree in brain behavior and cognitive science. She was an exemplary student and, during her time in college, made the Dean's List and won several scholastic awards.

She is also very involved in the community. She is talented and driven and civic-minded, and she believes in empowering women around the world through education and opportunity, and that is what she has been doing as Miss America.

She has also already broken down barriers and changed the face of the Miss America competition as the first Indian American woman to be crowned Miss America.

Madam Speaker, I would ask my colleagues in the House of Representatives to join me in congratulating Nina Davaluri on her victory at the 2014 Miss America competition and wish her the best of success in all her future endeavors.

#### THE AFFORDABLE CARE ACT

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

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Madam Speaker, I rise today to voice the concerns of a small business in Pennsylvania's Fifth Congressional District, whose economic security is in jeopardy due to the Affordable Care Act.

The is the story of a sixth-generation, family-run business that has been marginally profitable over the years. The business has grown through tough times, while staying committed to always providing health care insurance through policies that allow their employees the choice and the flexibility to have the doctor that they want.

Since the ACA has taken effect, this business is now facing drastic increases in costs, which threaten their profitability and, in turn, this threatens jobs in our community.

The President has offered the American public little assurance that he can save the plans, plans that he originally said we could keep. The public doesn't need another press conference or PR fix. They need real solutions moving forward.

I commend my 39 Democratic colleagues on the other side of the aisle who joined us in passing the Keep Your

Health Plan Act today. These Members realize there needs to be accountability in government. The American people deserve as much.

#### THE AFFORDABLE CARE ACT

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

Mr. HORSFORD. Madam Speaker, it is past time for this Congress to work together to improve the Affordable Care Act. This law can be improved, but it is also helping people throughout this country and in my home State of Nevada.

One example that I would like to share with you today is that of Michelle, a constituent from Pahrump, Nevada. Michelle enrolled in a plan on the exchange that will save her \$200 per month and allow her access to OB-GYN services closer to home. She called her enrollment in the program an overwhelmingly positive experience.

Michelle is currently on a HIPAA-guaranteed plan that costs her \$565 a month. If she gets sick and needs an urgent visit, mammogram or other OB-GYN services, she has to drive to Las Vegas from Pahrump.

After enrolling in the Affordable Care Act, she will save more than \$200 a month and have access to local urgent visit and OB-GYN services in Pahrump.

Madam Speaker, now is not the time to turn back the clock or leave constituents like Michelle behind. If Republicans are successful in defunding or even delaying the Affordable Care Act, Michelle will lack insurance. She will have to go back to the predatory plan that offered her no real coverage and costs even more.

I ask my colleagues on the other side, let's work together to make the Affordable Care Act work for the American people.

#### RECOGNITION OF INTERNATIONAL 15Q DAY

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

Mr. ROKITA. Madam Speaker, today I rise in recognition of International 15q Day.

Now, what is International 15q Day? It is a day to raise awareness of the similarities between Angelman, Prader-Willi, and Chromosome 15q Duplication syndromes. All three are genetic disorders originating in the 15th chromosome.

My offices are supporting these efforts today to shine a light on those that suffer from these disorders. These disorders are so rare that they do not get the attention or dedication to research that many other diseases and disorders do.

My son, Teddy, now almost 6 years old, was diagnosed with Angelman syndrome in early 2010. Angelman significantly impairs his capacity for motor