

[Roll No. 629]

## AYES—325

Aderholt Garcia McKeon  
 Amodei Gardner McKinley  
 Bachmann Garrett Meadows  
 Bachus Gerlach Meehan  
 Barber Gibbs Meeks  
 Barletta Gibson Meng  
 Barr Goodlatte Messer  
 Barrow (GA) Gowdy Mica  
 Barton Granger Michaud  
 Bass Graves (GA) Miller (FL)  
 Benishek Graves (MO) Miller (MI)  
 Bentivolio Green, Al Miller, George  
 Bera (CA) Green, Gene Moran  
 Bilirakis Griffin (AR) Mullin  
 Black Griffith (VA) Mulvaney  
 Blackburn Grimm Murphy (FL)  
 Blumenauer Guthrie Murphy (PA)  
 Bonamici Gutiérrez Nadler  
 Boustany Hahn Neal  
 Brady (PA) Hall Neugebauer  
 Brady (TX) Hanabusa Noem  
 Brooks (IN) Hanna Nugent  
 Brown (FL) Harper Nunes  
 Brownley (CA) Hartzler Nunnelee  
 Buchanan Hastings (FL) O'Rourke  
 Buschon Hastings (WA) Olson  
 Burgess Heck (NV) Owens  
 Bustos Heck (WA) Palazzo  
 Butterfield Hensarling Pallone  
 Calvert Higgins Pascrell  
 Camp Himes Paulsen  
 Cantor Holding Pearce  
 Capito Honda Pelosi  
 Capps Horsford Perlmutter  
 Cárdenas Hoyer Perry  
 Carter Hudson Peters (MI)  
 Cassidy Huffman Peterson  
 Castro (TX) Hultgren Pittenger  
 Chabot Hunter Pitts  
 Chaffetz Hurt Poe (TX)  
 Chu Israel Polis  
 Clarke Issa Pompeo  
 Clay Jeffries Price (GA)  
 Cleaver Jenkins Price (NC)  
 Clyburn Johnson (OH) Quigley  
 Coble Johnson, E. B. Rahall  
 Coffman Johnson, Sam Reichert  
 Cohen Jordan Renacci  
 Cole Kelly (IL) Ribble  
 Collins (GA) Kelly (PA) Rice (SC)  
 Collins (NY) Kennedy Richmond  
 Conaway Kildee Rigell  
 Connolly Kilmer Roby  
 Cook King (IA) Roe (TN)  
 Cooper King (NY) Rogers (AL)  
 Costa Kingston Rogers (KY)  
 Cotton Kinzinger (IL) Rogers (MI)  
 Courtney Kirkpatrick Rokita  
 Crenshaw Kline Rooney  
 Crowley Kuster Ros-Lehtinen  
 Cuellar Labrador Roskam  
 Daines LaMalfa Ross  
 Davis, Rodney Lamborn Roybal-Allard  
 DeFazio Lance Ruiz  
 DeGette Lankford Runyan  
 Delaney Larsen (WA) Ruppertsberger  
 DelBene Larson (CT) Ryan (OH)  
 Denham Latham Ryan (WI)  
 Dent Latta Sánchez, Linda  
 DeSantis Lee (CA) T.  
 DesJarlais Levin Sanchez, Loretta  
 Deutch Lipinski Sanford  
 Diaz-Balart LoBiondo Scalise  
 Dingell Lofgren Schneider  
 Doggett Long Schock  
 Duckworth Lowey Schrader  
 Duffy Lucas Schwartz  
 Ellmers Luetkemeyer Schweikert  
 Engel Luján, Ben Ray Scott, Austin  
 Eshoo (NM) Scott, David  
 Esty Maffei Sensenbrenner  
 Farenthold Maloney, Carolyn  
 Farr Carolyn Sessions  
 Fattah Maloney, Sean Sewell (AL)  
 Fincher Marchant Shimkus  
 Fitzpatrick Marino Shuster  
 Fleischmann Matheson Simpson  
 Fleming Matsui Sinema  
 Flores McAllister Smith (MO)  
 Forbes McCauly Smith (NE)  
 Fortenberry McCaul Smith (NJ)  
 Foxx McClintock Smith (TX)  
 Franks (AZ) McCollum Smith (WA)  
 Frelinghuysen McGovern Southerland  
 Gabbard McHenry Speier  
 Gallego McIntyre Stewart

Stivers  
 Stutzman  
 Swalwell (CA)  
 Takano  
 Terry  
 Thompson (CA)  
 Thompson (MS)  
 Thompson (PA)  
 Thornberry  
 Tiberi  
 Tipton  
 Titus  
 Tonko  
 Turner  
 Upton  
 Valadao  
 Van Hollen  
 Veasey  
 Velázquez  
 Wagner  
 Walberg  
 Walden  
 Walorski  
 Walz  
 Wasserman  
 Schults  
 Waxman  
 Webster (FL)

## NOES—91

Amash Gohmert Payne  
 Andrews Gosar Peters (CA)  
 Beatty Grayson Petri  
 Becerra Grijalva Pingree (ME)  
 Bishop (NY) Harris Pocan  
 Bishop (UT) Hinojosa Posey  
 Braley (IA) Holt Rangel  
 Bridenstine Huelskamp Rohrabacher  
 Brooks (AL) Huizenga (MI) Rothfus  
 Broun (GA) Jackson Lee Royce  
 Capuano Johnson (GA) Salmon  
 Carney Jones Sarbanes  
 Carson (IN) Joyce Schakowsky  
 Cartwright Kaptur Schiff  
 Castor (FL) Keating Scott (VA)  
 Cicilline Kind Shea-Porter  
 Conyers Langevin Sherman  
 Cramer Lewis Slaughter  
 Cummings Loebsack Stockman  
 Davis (CA) Lowenthal Tierney  
 Davis, Danny Lujan Grisham  
 DeLauro (NM) Tsongas  
 Duncan (SC) Lummis Vargas  
 Duncan (TN) Lynch Vela  
 Edwards Massie Visclosky  
 Ellison McDermott Waters  
 Enyart McNeerney Watt  
 Foster Moore Weber (TX)  
 Frankel (FL) Napolitano Wilson (FL)  
 Fudge Negrete McLeod Wolf  
 Garamendi Pastor (AZ) Yoho

## NOT VOTING—15

Bishop (GA) Herrera Beutler Radel  
 Campbell McCarthy (NY) Reed  
 Crawford McMorris Rush  
 Culberson Rodgers Sires  
 Doyle Miller, Gary  
 Gingrey (GA) Nolan

## ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). There is 1 minute remaining.

□ 1312

Mr. FINCHER changed his vote from “no” to “aye.”

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

## PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mrs. MCMORRIS RODGERS. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 623, on H.R. 3309, on Agreeing to the Amendment offered by Mr. GOODLATTE of Virginia, I am not recorded because I was absent due to the birth of my daughter. Had I been present, I would have voted “yea.”

Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 624, on H.R. 3309, on Agreeing to the Amendment offered by Mr. WATT of North Carolina, I am not recorded because I was absent due to the birth of my daughter. Had I been present, I would have voted “nay.”

Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 625, on H.R. 3309, on Agreeing to the Amendment offered by Mr. MASSIE of Kentucky, I am not recorded because I was absent due to the birth of my daughter. Had I been present, I would have voted “nay.”

Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 626, on H.R. 3309, on Agreeing to the Amendment offered by Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas, I am not re-

corded because I was absent due to the birth of my daughter. Had I been present, I would have voted “nay.”

Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 627, on H.R. 3309, on Agreeing to the Amendment offered by Mr. ROHRBACHER of California, I am not recorded because I was absent due to the birth of my daughter. Had I been present, I would have voted “nay.”

Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 628, on H.R. 3309, on Agreeing to the Amendment offered by Mr. CONYERS of Michigan, I am not recorded because I was absent due to the birth of my daughter. Had I been present, I would have voted “nay.”

Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 629, on H.R. 3309, on Passage, the Innovation Act, I am not recorded because I was absent due to the birth of my daughter. Had I been present, I would have voted “yea.”

## 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.

## REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBER AS COSPONSOR OF H. RES. 417

Mr. CHABOT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my name be removed as a cosponsor of H. Res. 417.

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

There was no objection.

## LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

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

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I yield to my friend, the gentleman from Virginia, the majority leader, for the purpose of inquiring of the schedule for the week to come.

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

Mr. Speaker, on Monday, the House will meet at noon for morning-hour and at 2 p.m. for legislative debate. As announced previously, no votes are scheduled on Monday. On Tuesday, Wednesday, and Thursday, the House will meet at 10 a.m. for morning-hour and at noon for legislative business. First votes of the week will occur no earlier than 2 p.m. on Tuesday. On Friday, the House will meet at 9 a.m. for legislative business. Last votes for the week are expected no later than 3 p.m.

□ 1315

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

On those suspensions, I am pleased to announce that the House will consider H.R. 2019, the Gabriella Miller Kids First Research Act sponsored by Representatives GREGG HARPER and PETER WELCH, which has over 2,000 citizen co-sponsors, and puts into practice what I hope we will all agree on, which is to place a priority on pediatric medical research over political party conventions.

In addition, Mr. Speaker, there are a number of legislative items which may become available for consideration next week, including legislation pertaining to the sustainable growth rate in Medicare, a budget agreement, and legislation pertaining to farm programs, including potentially a full farm bill conference report.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman for his information, and I appreciate the fact that he has put on there the sustainable growth rate in Medicare budget agreement, which hopefully we can get to, which will be bipartisan in nature and will be balanced and fair as well.

In addition, legislation pertaining to the farm program's farm bill is necessary. It has been in conference for some period of time. Hopefully, we can pass that as well.

I do note, however, with some degree of—actually, I said “some degree”—with very great disappointment that unemployment insurance extension is not listed by the leader. As the leader knows, 1.3 million people are going to have their unemployment benefits expire, I believe, on December 28. Those people will have no support structure. Very frankly, my own view is they will then go on some other support structure, some sort of welfare payment—SNAP payment, Medicaid—which they may be on already. But, in any event, it will not be at no cost. CBO estimates that it will cost as much as 300,000 jobs if we do not extend unemployment insurance.

We just had a hearing, Mr. Leader, where we had very, very compelling testimony from three people, with respect to—one of whom just found a job on Monday; she was very pleased at that—not only the economic damage that going off unemployment will cost them—and they have been looking for jobs—but also the psychological devastation to them and their families that that would cause.

Does the gentleman have any belief—I understand, and I read somewhere, the gentleman may want to comment on it. Some commented that there was no appetite for extending unemployment insurance on your side of the aisle—but can the gentleman give me any idea of the possibilities for having unemployment insurance extension on the floor so that we cannot see those 1.3 million people dropped off the rolls as of December 28?

I yield to my friend.

Mr. CANTOR. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I remind the gentleman that the expiration of the benefits that

he just referred to were benefits that were passed by this Congress 5 years ago as emergency spending, as emergency need, at a time in which we were facing near bottom in terms of our economy, the fallouts of the financial collapse; and those benefits, again, were brought about in those contexts.

I would say to the gentleman further, Mr. Speaker, that if he were to look at the jobs legislation that this House has passed, all of which is awaiting action in the Senate—the SKILLS Act, the Working Families Flexibility Act, the Keystone pipeline, the REINS Act, the Offshore Energy and Jobs Act, Federal Lands Jobs and Energy Security Act, Veteran Emergency Medical Technician Act, and the Veterans Economic Opportunity Act—all of these are measures which the House passed because, I think the gentleman would agree with me, the best way to address the chronically unemployed is to help them get back to work. These bills, especially the SKILLS Act, was one specifically designed to do that, to help those chronically unemployed to access the necessary skills that they need to enter the job market of today.

I would also further point out, Mr. Speaker, that this week, December 3, the Congressional Budget Office issued a report in response to a request for the extension of unemployment benefits in which it said that some unemployed workers who would be eligible for those benefits would reduce the intensity of their job search and remain unemployed longer, which would tend to decrease output and employment. This is the Congressional Budget Office speaking on the question that the gentleman raised.

Mr. Speaker, I would say that such policies, if we were to continue, would lead to greater Federal deficit, which would eventually reduce the Nation's output and income slightly below what would occur under current law. So I think that we should be focused on how we get folks back to work. That is where the House has been focused. Unfortunately, after 140-some bills we passed over to the Senate, they still await even consideration at all by that body.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman for his comment.

We neither have the time nor do I have the inclination to go through each one of those bills to which the gentleman refers as “jobs bills.” Of course, we have an alternative; and Mr. VAN HOLLEN will be talking about that in terms of jobs, investment, infrastructure, investment, education, and growing jobs for our people.

But the fact of the matter is, Mr. Speaker, there are 1.3 million people who can't find a job. To say that they will be disincentivized because we continue to give them some support so that they can survive and their families can survive during the period of time that they are looking for a job, there are three people looking for every one job that is available, and

most of those jobs that are available have skill sets that, unfortunately, the unemployed have not had.

We are for, on this side, skills training; we are for investing in education. We share the majority leader's view on that; but it is not going to be much solace for them, Mr. Speaker, and their families to say, well, we dropped you off the rolls, you won't be able to pay your mortgage, you won't be able to put food on your table because the Senate hasn't acted.

Whether the Senate should act on the bills in question I think is debatable. I opposed many of those pieces of legislation myself, as did others; but we have a crisis, and that crisis is we have 1.3 million. And that same CBO to which the majority leader referred said that not to pass this extended benefit will, in fact, undermine the economy and could cost as many as 300,000 jobs of people who are working now, but who will not be working because of the lack of resources of those 1.3 million consumers. Whether they are consuming food, housing, clothing, necessities of life, we are going to be undermining jobs in America and our economy. Almost every economist that I have talked to shares that view.

In any event, I want to make it clear to the majority leader that our side will be vigorously opposed and will oppose adjourning of the House as is scheduled on Friday the 13th of this month if, in fact, we have not passed unemployment insurance. We believe that is a critical thing to pass.

We also agree with the majority leader, however, that passing the sustainable growth rate is something that we ought to do before the end of the year. That will expire on December 31. The reimbursement of doctors to serve Medicare patients will be substantially reduced as a result of that. That is bad policy, not only for those on Medicare who are seeking medical services, but it is bad policy for the doctors and medical providers that will serve those people.

So I am pleased that he mentions SGR, the sustainable growth rate, the doc reimbursement, but not pleased that we do not have listed the unemployment insurance. We will be very adamant next week that that needs to be done. I understand that we may have a difference on that, but I want to let the majority leader know that that will be our position.

In addition, I do not see on there the defense authorization bill. I know that that is not the majority leader. We passed the defense authorization bill through here. I am hopeful that the Senate will move on that intelligence authorization.

The Senate has passed, Mr. Speaker, a comprehensive immigration reform bill. They passed it with 68 votes. We are very disappointed on this side of the aisle that the Senate bill has not been put on the floor. Our bill, H.R. 15, which is a bipartisan bill on which there are Republican sponsors of that

bill, or one of the four bills that has been reported out of the committee which was supported by the Republican Party in the Judiciary Committee and reported out four bills, they have not been brought to the floor.

We believe that comprehensive immigration reform is a critically important action for this Congress to take this year now. We have options available. We would hope that any one of those three options would be brought to the table, or, if you count four bills, seven options be brought to the floor.

In addition, the Senate has passed in a bipartisan way the ending of discrimination in employment. We talked about jobs; we talked about giving economic opportunity. We ought to do that in a nondiscriminatory way. The Senate has passed such a bill. That is not on the agenda for next week either.

I have an agenda which has a lot of bills on it: Make It In America. I notice we do have a suspension bill that has been specifically referenced. We will get into a debate on that next week, so I won't debate that bill today; but we have a suspension bill that we have been urging that is reported out of committee on voice vote, passed this Congress with, I think, over 350 votes—I know over 300 votes last Congress—that has not been brought to the floor, which simply says that we ought to have a plan and that plan ought to be a plan to expand manufacturing, grow jobs, grow profits, and grow salaries for individuals. And it is Mr. LIPINSKI's bill. I have been urging that that be put on the suspension calendar. I notice that that has not been put on either.

Trade adjustment assistance and tax extenders have been referenced. Hopefully, we can do all of those. Of course, we have a very short period of time left to do that.

□ 1330

Let me ask the majority leader, given that short time, does the majority leader have a high degree of confidence that, in fact, he will be seeking to follow the calendar that has been set out by the majority leader to end this first session of this Congress, indeed, on the scheduled date of December 13?

And I yield to my friend.

Mr. CANTOR. I thank the gentleman for the recitation of his desired wish list for what he would like to see on the floor. I would also like to remind the gentleman, Mr. Speaker, this House has passed well over 149, 150 bills, very much focused on job creation, very much focused on trying to make sure that we address the needs of those who are most vulnerable right now, trying to make sure that we can sustain the safety net while equipping those that are without the tools necessary to get up on that ladder of success.

Unfortunately, Mr. Speaker, the Senate has just refused to take up most of those bills. In fact, the House has passed and sent 189 bills to the U.S.

Senate so far this Congress, and that is excluding what we've done this week. And of those 189 House bills, 41 have been signed into law by the President; 148 bills have stalled in the Senate.

The Senate has, so far this year, passed only 43 bills this Congress; and out of those 43, only 14 have been signed into law by the President.

So, Mr. Speaker, we have done our work. We have got a lot more work to do on behalf of the American people.

One of the things I did not hear the gentleman, the Democrat whip, mention was the issue of health care. And obviously health care has been very, very much on the minds of America right now as they have witnessed the utter disaster of a rollout of ObamaCare.

As the gentleman knows, his constituents, as well as mine, are faced with higher premiums, faced with the realization now that the President has broken a major promise when he had said to the American people that they could keep their health care plans if they liked it. We know now that wasn't true, and so people are having to go and figure out what kind of plans are actually there for them.

The administration has claimed this week the Web site is working just fine. Well, we know good and well that the back end of that Web site is not working just fine. I am glad that people are able maybe to get on and see what is there. We don't really know because of the lack of transparency as to how successful the signups and enrollments are.

We do know now, though, that most Americans in the individual plan arena are facing higher premiums. Those that have had to give up their plans are facing higher premiums and plans that they don't necessarily choose, that they are now forced to have because of the operation of this law. I would say to the gentleman we need to focus on that very issue. What are we going to do? What are the alternatives?

We Republicans have an alternative. We voted on that alternative back in 2009. It was a plan that was centered on patients first. It was a plan that the Congressional Budget Office said would reduce premium costs for taxpayers, for patients out there. We have not resolved this question of health care. There is a better way; and I would say to the gentlemen, we ought to be spending some time focused on how we are going to resolve that for the millions of Americans who are very, very unhappy right now, given their options for healthcare under ObamaCare.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I am not surprised that the majority leader wants to talk about health care, because much of that legislation he has talked about then, 42, 43, 44, 45, 46 times that the Republican Party has tried to repeal health care.

My view, I want to make it very clear, is that this bill is substantively a very positive bill for the American people. A bill to which the gentleman

referred that Republicans offered in 2009 covered less than 3 million people of the 30 to 40 million people that had no insurance in America. So less than 10 percent were covered by the Republican bill.

Tens of millions of people, I predict, by the middle of next year, are going to be having coverage and having health care assurance because we passed this health care insurance bill.

He is right, the rollout was terrible. We are all disappointed with that, the President is disappointed with that, and it is being worked on. Now he doesn't recall, of course, perhaps, or he hasn't mentioned the rollout of the prescription drug bill, which wasn't too smooth, either. And, of course, the health care bill is broader even than that. He may not recall that Medicare had a tough rollout for a couple of years. But there is nobody on this floor who is saying, I am not saying that they don't believe it because I think there are people who believe we ought not to have Medicare. As a matter of fact, a former majority leader, not this majority leader, said we shouldn't have Medicare in a free society. That was a Republican majority leader, Mr. Speaker.

The fact of the matter is the health care bill is going to work, but it is interesting that when you ask a specific question about some critical issues that have passed the Senate in a bipartisan fashion overwhelmingly, they are not mentioned. Just go to the health care bill. Why? Because that is the politics. That is the politics of the issue right now.

Mr. CANTOR. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOYER. I am glad to yield to my friend.

Mr. CANTOR. I say, Mr. Speaker, no, it is not politics. Mr. Speaker, it is about what people right now are concerned about. They send us here to reflect their problems and to try to reach solutions for the problems that they are facing. Right now more people in America, I would venture to say, are concerned about the choice they have for health care right now and how they will seek coverage for their family. And it is not about the politics. There are some things that actually do transcend Washington partisan politics, and right now, that is about health care.

We care about health care. Republicans care about health care. Democrats care about health care. Right now there is a serious problem given this ObamaCare law. We need to address that for the people. We need to help people, and that is what I am talking about, Mr. Speaker. I am not talking about the politics of it. I am talking about what is on the minds of millions of Americans right now as they are losing the coverage that they know and they have chosen and they can afford, facing the opposite. It is a disaster right now concerning ObamaCare. We have got to help the people of this

country when it comes to their health care. That is what it is about.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman.

Governor Steve Beshear of Kentucky spoke to us this morning. Now, Kentucky is not the center of Democratic politics in America, as MITCH MCCONNELL would quickly observe. Thousands of people are signing up in Kentucky—thousands of people—successfully. Thousands of people are coming forward. About 70,000 people have already signed up in Kentucky. Thousands of people are coming forward in New York and California, all over this country, who are saying I want the assurance and coverage of health care.

What have they spent their time on? Trying to repeal health care. They have talked about repeal and replace. We haven't had much replace, but we have had a lot of repeal. And what does the majority leader refer to, Mr. Speaker? A 2009 bill. It is a bill from three Congresses ago that he is talking about, and all we have had on this is repeal. If they are concerned about health care, then there ought to be an alternative that the other side offers; but, frankly, Mr. Speaker, they have not done that.

I would be glad to move to another subject. I am sure we can go back to health care because the majority leader, notwithstanding his assertion that this is not about politics, I will tell him that the majority of the American people in poll after poll after poll says they don't want health care repeal. They want it fixed, and they want it to work right and the assurance that it is available to them, but they do not want it repealed.

Right now, even though they are upset, as we all are, as I am and as the President is, about the rollout and about the Web site not working as effectively as we would like, Americans right now, I will tell the majority leader, the majority in polls say they don't want it repealed. They want it fixed and they want to have it work. Very frankly, I think that is where they are. Not everybody. Not everybody, I understand that, and certainly not some factions of the Republican majority's party. They have made that very clear in statements on this floor. But my view is that we ought not to simply distract from some of the important things that need to be done.

I was interested in Senator CORNYN's response when he talked about the Iran deal, which 65 percent of the American public says was a worthwhile effort to make. We need to carefully review it, and we need to oversee it and make sure it works, and the majority leader and I have to work on that. But when Senator CORNYN said this was just a ruse—and I don't think he used the word "ruse," but just an effort to distract from health care, I think that sort of indicates the extraordinary focus that this issue has energized the Republican Party, Mr. Speaker, over the last 3 or 4 years.

Can I ask the majority leader about the budget conference, whether he has

any idea—he has talked about, on the schedule, the budget conference coming forward. Does he have any idea whether a budget conference agreement has been reached, number one; and number two, if an agreement is reached, will it manifest itself in the form of a budget conference report?

I am informed, maybe correctly or incorrectly, that there will never be a budget conference report. Does the gentleman know whether that is the case or not, and whether or not some agreement might be manifested by a bill and not by a conference report?

I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. CANTOR. Mr. Speaker, I would say to the gentleman that the discussions that I have had with Chairman RYAN would lead me to some optimism that the two sides actually can come to an agreement. The agreement has not been made, so I don't want to say that there is a deal; but I am optimistic that, in fact, this time of year when the differences between the two sides have certainly been on display all year long, that perhaps we could agree that we need to reduce the deficit. We need to do something about the wasteful spending. And once again, I don't think the gentleman, nor I, thinks that the sequester is the best method to cut spending. It is indiscriminate. It cuts bad programs the same way as good programs, to put it simply. There are better ways.

Our side has always said, Mr. Speaker, that we have got to do something about the mandatory programs, the autopilot spending of the Federal Government that is disproportionately causing our deficit. I am hopeful that next week we can show the people of this country that we can produce something that is smarter than the way we are going about things now.

Obviously, a big concern to me is the national security and the defense of this country, as I know it is for the gentleman. And so again, I am hopeful that will be the case.

Now, the form that that agreement may or may not take I think right now is undetermined. I think it would be premature to even guess at that, and I would say to the gentleman that I know that he joins me in hoping that there is an agreement where we can maintain the trajectory in reducing spending and do it in a smarter way so we can get about the business of prioritizing the expenditure of taxpayer dollars here in this House.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman for his comments. I will say that he and I, as he has articulated, do agree that the sequester is not good policy. As a matter of fact, Chairman HAL ROGERS, the chairman of the Appropriations Committee, said it best when he said that the sequester cuts are ill-conceived and unrealistic and that he believes that the House action has indicated that that is the case. We have not done appropriation bills consistent with the sequester levels that as I understand were agreed at Williamsburg to be offered, but they haven't worked.

My own view, Mr. Speaker, of what is being discussed in the budget conference, some of the things that I have heard, strike me as being unbalanced, unfair, irresponsible, and unacceptable. Unless we have a balanced agreement, which in my view should replace the sequester because, as the majority leader indicates, it is not the rational way to go, as Mr. ROGERS indicates, it is not the rational way to go, and as every chairman of the appropriations subcommittees on the Republican side have said, it is not the way to go and ought to be replaced.

□ 1345

I am hopeful that any agreement will, in fact, replace the sequester. I am hopeful, Mr. Majority Leader, as you well know, that we will get a big deal—not a little deal, not nibbling around the edges so that what occurs is we do this every 6 months and we never get to a stability that I know the majority leader and I believe would give confidence to our economy, to the business community, and to our people if we got a big deal. Unfortunately, that does not seem to be, at least at this point in time, in the discussion. I think that is unfortunate.

As I said, what I have heard so far seems to me to be unbalanced, unfair, irresponsible, and, from my perspective, unacceptable. So I am hopeful that the Budget Committee conference will revisit or at least come up with a product that is not yet being discussed, which will accomplish the objective of putting this country on a fiscally sustainable path for the long term, not just the short term.

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

#### ADJOURNMENT TO MONDAY, DECEMBER 9, 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 (Mr. SALMON). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

#### WATER FOR THE WORLD: TURN ON THE FAUCET

(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, when you and I are thirsty, we walk 3 feet to the nearest faucet or grab a bottle of water out of the fridge; but that isn't so for thousands of people living around the world.

Each morning in Africa, women and young girls, like this girl in Tanzania, wake up and walk for miles just to collect water for their family. The walk can be dangerous because some wells