

Roby	Scott, Austin	Walberg
Roe (TN)	Sensenbrenner	Weber (TX)
Rogers (AL)	Sessions	Wenstrup
Rogers (KY)	Smith (NE)	Westmoreland
Rohrabacher	Smith (NJ)	Whitfield
Rooney	Smith (TX)	Williams
Roskam	Southerland	Wilson (SC)
Ross	Stewart	Wittman
Rothfus	Stockman	Wolf
Salmon	Stutzman	Womack
Scalise	Thornberry	Woodall
Schweikert	Wagner	Yoho

NOT VOTING—7

Coble	Johnson, Sam	Young (AK)
Granger	Miller, Gary	
Hinojosa	Reed	

□ 1156

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

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

Mr. HINOJOSA. Madam Speaker, I regret that I was unavoidably detained in my district. Had I been present, I would have voted “nay” on rollcall vote 54 and “aye” on rollcall vote 55.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will remind all persons in the gallery that they are here as guests of the House and that any manifestation of approval or disapproval of proceedings is in violation of the rules of the House.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Ms. Curtis, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate has passed with an amendment in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H.R. 307. An act to reauthorize certain programs under the Public Health Service Act and the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act with respect to public health security and all-hazards preparedness and response, and for other purposes.

REMOVAL OF NAMES OF MEMBERS AS COSPONSORS OF H. RES. 88

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to remove all cosponsors from H. Res. 88.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. STEWART). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

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 majority leader, Mr. CANTOR, for the purposes 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

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. The last votes of the week are expected no later than 3 p.m. On Friday, the House is not in session.

Mr. Speaker, the House will consider a number of suspensions on Monday and Tuesday, a complete list of which will be announced by the close of business tomorrow. In addition, the House will consider a resolution to fund the government for the remainder of the fiscal year. I expect the resolution to also include bipartisan bills to fund the Departments of Defense and Veterans Affairs, thus providing more flexibility to our military and allowing the Pentagon to engage in new starts, something it would not be allowed to do under the CR.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to highlight two additional items.

On Tuesday, the House passed legislation to establish a nationwide academic competition in the STEM fields. This competition will encourage entrepreneurship and provide a unique opportunity for America's high school and college students in each congressional district to showcase their creative capabilities.

I thank Chairman CANDICE MILLER and Ranking Member BRADY for their hard work in making this bipartisan program possible, and I look forward to the success of the competition for years to come and of the benefit it will provide our institution.

Lastly, Mr. Speaker, I would like to highlight the Congressional Civil Rights Pilgrimage occurring this Friday through Sunday in Alabama, led by Congressman JOHN LEWIS—a true American hero and champion of civil rights and freedom. A bipartisan delegation of Members will participate in the 3-day journey through Alabama, concluding with the commemoration of the 1965 civil rights march across the Edmund Pettus Bridge in Selma.

Alongside the Democratic whip, I am honored to participate in this pilgrimage and to reflect on the sacrifice that shaped the greater democracy we live in today.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman for the information. I also thank him for his reference to the march over the Edmund Pettus Bridge from Selma to Montgomery, which we will commemorate. That march occurred on March 7, 1965.

Yesterday, we had the honor of dedicating and accepting a statue in memory of Rosa Louise Parks. Rosa Parks, of course, is known in many respects as the mother of the civil rights movement that led to America's perfecting its Union—to its allowing and making sure that every American, irrespective of race or color or nationality or religion, could be treated equally. It's appropriate that we participate in this

march across the Edmund Pettus Bridge to recall this country's commitment in 1965 to the Voting Rights Act, which ensured that every American would have what is intrinsic in the definition of democracy—the right to vote and the right to have one's vote counted.

I look forward to being the honorary cochair—with the majority leader—of this march with a true American hero, who is the chair, the leader, the person who has shown such extraordinary courage, not only on March 7, 1965, but years before that and every year thereafter, including until today.

□ 1210

So I thank the gentleman for calling attention to that march, and I look forward to participating with him in Alabama this weekend.

Now, Mr. Leader, as all of us know, automatic, draconian—in my view, irrational—cuts will occur starting tomorrow as a result of the so-called sequester. I did not see any legislation on the floor for next week which would obviate the happening of that event, the sequester, although I do see that there is some desire, apparently, to make sure that the Defense Department and the Department of Veterans Affairs have the ability to manage those cuts in a way that will be least detrimental.

I would ask the gentleman—there are, of course, 10 other appropriation bills; there are 10 other major agencies and multiple departments and offices that will have a problem similar to that of the Department of Defense and the Veterans Administration—is the gentleman aware of any efforts that will be made to accommodate the domestic side of the budget?

Mr. CANTOR. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding; and I would say, Mr. Speaker, as the gentleman knows, the House has acted twice to offer alternatives to what we agree with is a very wrong way to go about cuts, which is the sequestration measure. But unfortunately, both times the Senate rejected or refused to take up the alternative. I'm aware that the other body is anticipating or at least attempting to vote on an alternative, both of which are predicted to fail in the Senate.

So I would say to the gentleman, Mr. Speaker, that he's right in saying that our intent is to try to provide the flexibility for the Defense Department in terms of its appropriations, as well as the MilCon bill; and we do so because there is bipartisan agreement around those two bills.

I would say to the gentleman that if bipartisan agreement somehow is reached in other bills, I would say to the gentleman we certainly would like to be able to take a look at that. But I believe, Mr. Speaker, it is prudent for us to try to do the things that we can do right now so that we don't have to bear the burden of the wrongheaded way of controlling spending, which is that sequestration.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman for his comments. Let me only observe that the bills which the gentleman has now discussed for 3 weeks running, on which we've had colloquies, are no longer available in either the Senate or the House. He knows that. They were in the last Congress, and they died in the last Congress. There has been no legislation in the 59 days that we've been here, put on this floor, and only the majority leader can put legislation on the floor, no legislation which would have an alternative to the sequester.

And, in fact, notwithstanding some of the representations that have been made, Mr. Speaker, there was a bill on this floor on July 19, 2011, which was called cut, cap, and balance; 229 Republicans voted for that bill. That bill had as its fallback, if the objectives of the bill were not reached, sequester. That was substantially before—many days before—the President, and through the person of Jack Lew, talked about making that a part of a piece of legislation that we needed so that we did not default on the national debt. And for the first time, not only since I've been serving in the Congress, some 32 years, but for the first time in history, as a result of that action of coming so close to defaulting on the national debt, this country was downgraded by a single point.

The gentleman talked about the STEM bill that was passed. He voted for it. I voted for it. An overwhelming majority of Democrats and Republicans voted for it to help our economy. That event substantially hurt our economy. Mr. Speaker, the inability to get to agreement on the sequester is hurting the economy. And I will tell my friend that we've offered three times to have a bill considered as an alternative to sequester which cuts spending, raises some additional revenue—and I know the gentleman is going to give me a lecture about raising taxes. I understand that.

But I would urge the gentleman, let a vote happen on this floor. Let the House, as you said in 2010, work its will. That's what the Speaker said he wanted to do. Let us vote on an alternative, not just blindly go down this road of sequester, not blindly go down this road that the gentleman has just agreed with me, and we agree together, I think most of us agree, the sequester is irrational. It should not happen. In fact, it was put in the bill on the theory that surely we wouldn't let it happen. But in 59 days, we've had no bill on this floor. All the gentleman talks about is a bill that is dead and gone and buried that we can't consider, that won't make a difference, that will not in any way ameliorate the sequester. And I regret that, Mr. Leader, because I think we can.

Frankly, next week we can put alternatives on the floor. If you have an alternative, put it on the floor. I may vote against it, but that's what the American people expect. They expect

us to try to solve problems, and they sent us here to vote on policy.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN, the ranking Democrat on the Budget Committee, has asked three times, Mr. Leader, to bring an amendment to this floor to provide an alternative to sequester.

It seems strange that when both of us agree that sequester is wrong, irrational, will have adverse effects, and Ben Bernanke says it will substantially hurt the economy, that we don't provide alternatives, and all we talk about is something that we yesterday—actually, 3 or 4 months ago—that is dead and gone. We need to do something now, and we need to come together on a bipartisan basis.

I might say to the leader, we've had four major bills signed into law in this Congress by the President. Every one of those bills was passed in a bipartisan basis with an average of 168 Democrats voting for it, and an average of 124 Republicans voting for it. We saw a perfect example, Mr. Leader, on the floor today of making very good policy. How did we do it? We did it in a bipartisan vote. I suggest to my friend, the majority leader, that we could do that as it relates to the sequester if we would bring something to the floor, have a vote on it; and in my view in a bipartisan fashion, we could in fact set aside this irrational, negative sequester, and move on to a rational fiscal policy.

I would be glad to yield to my friend if he wants to make a comment on it. Mr. CANTOR. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman.

First of all, there would not be a bipartisan vote on the Democratic suggestion on how to deal with the sequester. As the gentleman rightfully suggests, that measure will include tax increases. You know, we've heard a lot of talk about balance, that we need to approach the situation in a balanced way. Well, the President has enacted \$149.7 billion worth of tax increases for this fiscal year. Sequestration results in \$85.3 billion worth of spending reductions.

As you can see, Mr. Speaker, the balance is clearly in favor of tax increases, taking people's money and then allowing Washington to decide how to spend it when most people realize the government is never the best one to spend and allocate someone else's dollars, which is why we insist on having a limited government, providing the necessary support and roles that it should, and not continuing to take other people's money and deciding how we spend it.

Now, I'd say to the gentleman, he knows as well as I do that the Senate refuses to take up whatever we send them. They have refused again and again. So we've got a real problem that somehow one House does its work. Twice this House went and passed bills with alternative measures to address sequestration, and a significant portion of both of those bills, one of which I sponsored, were provisions taken out of the President's own budget, not the tax

increases, but actually spending reductions that the President says are okay, but yet still the Senate failed to take them up.

□ 1220

So there's a meeting tomorrow at the White House, Mr. Speaker, and I know the gentleman shares the desire to perhaps have that meeting prod the Senate into acting. That's what we need to happen. The House does its work. The House can produce a plan, and has, twice, to replace this sequester.

Now, I'd say to the gentleman, he's concerned about the economy, and so are we, very concerned about the economy. We're concerned about the rating agencies' outlook on our fiscal situation as well, as the gentleman suggests. But, I'd like to remind the gentleman, Mr. Speaker, that the warnings from these rating agencies are not warnings that are wholly addressed by just coming to some deal. Those warnings from the rating agencies are directed at our doing something about the underlying fiscal problem this Federal Government has, which is the mountains of debt caused by the growth and the unfunded liabilities in our entitlement programs. And, as the gentleman knows, we failed to come to agreement in 2011 as to how to deal with those unfunded liabilities, which is why the sequestration is in place.

We've got to have that deal on the unfunded liabilities because that's what those warnings are about. That's what we should be concerned about, not raising more taxes. Those warnings are not about raising more taxes. It's about getting rid of the out-of-control liabilities that are racked up because of the spending, which is out of control.

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

It doesn't get—we've been here 59 days, in this Congress. Not a single bill has been brought to this floor which will deal with the sequester, not one. As a matter of fact, we've only met 17 of the 59 days this year. So my friend laments the fact that the sequester is going into effect and he talks about bills that, as he didn't deny, they're dead and gone. The Senate can't take them up.

So many folks want us to read the Constitution of the United States. I'm for doing that. It's Article I that gives to the House, as the leader, I'm sure, knows, the responsibility to raise revenues and to pass appropriation bills. It's the House that needs to initiate legislation, and we guard that pretty jealously. We guarded it—we just passed VAWA. There was a lot of discussion about VAWA having—in the last Congress, that passed overwhelmingly, was delayed because, very frankly, they had some money effect in that bill. We said that was subject, therefore, to objections on our side.

We haven't met very often, and when we do meet, the only real bills we pass are passed in a bipartisan fashion, as happened today.

And when we talk about balance—and I get very frustrated. Take somebody else's money. Did you want to take it out of your pocket? Was the Constitution of the United States, which formed a more perfect Union, designed to take the Chinese money or European money and fund our education, our health care research, our highways, our national security? Of course not.

It is our money. Each one of us individually works hard, and we apportion a part of our earnings to the common good, to the common defense, to the common investment in our future, in education, in innovation, in infrastructure. Yes, we do that.

And I will tell my friend, and he well knows this, I get somewhat frustrated when I hear this. When I served in this Congress from 2001 to 2008, when the economic policy that was in effect was all your party's economic policy, and you cut revenues substantially and you increased spending substantially and we went from surplus to deep deficit, we need to solve that. I agree with the gentleman. We need to solve it, but we need to do it on a bipartisan basis.

That's why I point out the only bills of substance that have been signed by the President, that weren't suspension bills on which we all agree, were bipartisan bills that had an average 124 Republicans voting for them and an average 168 Democrats voting for them. Both parties joined together to solve problems. That's what needs to happen.

And I will tell the gentleman, he can talk about confidence all he wants, talk about why the rating agencies downgraded us. There were a number of reasons. But the greatest reason was—and they articulated it, Standard & Poor's articulated it—they weren't confident that we could solve problems, and we're not doing that.

The gentleman continues to not want a balanced program. Every group, every group that I've seen or read about or talked to people about has said, you cannot get from where we are in the deep debt that was created in the last decade to where we need to be, a balanced fiscal and sustainable plan for America for the years to come, without addressing both the spending side and the revenue side.

The example I use is, we are selling a product, Mr. Leader, that many of us have voted for it, and you want to accommodate on the defense side, which costs \$23, and we are pricing it at \$15. No business in America or in the world could survive with that imbalance. We need to bring that in balance. And you're not going to get to the 15 percent of revenues that we're collecting, or now maybe 16 or 17 percent, simply by savaging either defense or non-defense spending or entitlements.

And so I would certainly hope, Mr. Leader, that we would come together. You and I have talked about this a lot. Every Member goes home and says how bipartisan we're going to be.

On our side, I will tell you, we are prepared. We understand there are

going to be things that we have to do that we won't like. On your side there will be things to do that you won't like. That will be a compromise. That's the definition of a compromise. Our country needs it. Americans want it.

I would hope that we could, in the coming days, not only address the sequester, but address the need, over the next 10 years, to get this country back to balance where we were in 2000, where we had a balanced budget, the debt was coming down, and, in fact, some people were concerned that it was coming down too fast.

Mr. CANTOR. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOYER. I yield to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. CANTOR. I appreciate the gentleman's yielding, Mr. Speaker.

The gentleman loves to go back and talk about that period from 2001 to 2008 and the fact that there were too many tax cuts in place and without the control on spending.

Mr. HOYER. Can I just reclaim my time? Because my point, I'll tell the leader, is that we didn't pay for what we bought. We kept buying but we didn't pay.

I yield to my friend.

Mr. CANTOR. Mr. Speaker, I was saying that there were too many tax cuts in place. And I agree with the gentleman, Mr. Speaker, not on the fact that there were tax reductions and cuts in place, but the fact there wasn't a control on spending. And that is a problem here, Mr. Speaker.

But, ironically, the gentleman has consistently been in support of and just voted to extend 98 percent of those tax cuts. And so what we're saying right now is we've got to do something about the spending.

You just got \$650 billion in tax increases, Mr. Speaker, over the course of the next 10 years through the fiscal cliff deal. And I, just prior, spoke about the imbalance this year, FY 2013, of the amount of new revenues versus the actual spending that is being projected to be reduced in this sequester.

I agree, let's get back to balance. Let's go ahead and increase the spending reductions. Washington does have that spending problem. The gentleman agrees.

So, again, I think it's unfair to say that there's just no agreement on the fact that we ought to go and reduce tax rates and taxes, because the gentleman supports doing that. So let's talk about balance.

And we've got the highest level of revenues. It's been reported that we have the highest level of revenues coming into the Federal Government this year, ever. And the gentleman does know, as well, the spending is out of proportion in terms of history, in terms of the percentage of GDP. So why can't we focus on that? We've got to get this economy growing.

And the gentleman is correct in saying the government needs to be adequately funded, but we've got to take a

look at what we're funding. That's what we're talking about in replacing the sequester is prioritizing. What are the functions of government? And the sequester, it does cut spending, but we'd rather cut it in smarter ways.

□ 1230

Again, I hear the gentleman talked about he would like to be here on the floor passing bills. We would, too. Get the Senate to act. We have a bicameral process here, and the Senate has not acted.

The White House, the President hasn't even sent up his budget, Mr. Speaker. The President has that obligation at law and has not presented his budget to the House. The Senate refuses to do anything.

And what is the White House doing right now? The President has been going around the country campaigning for the past 2 months scaring people, creating havoc. That's supposed to be leadership? The President says to the Americans that their food is going to go uninspected and that our borders will be less patrolled and unsafe. His Cabinet Secretaries are holding press conferences and conducting TV interviews, making false claims about teacher layoffs.

I just feel that people ought to take a look and say, hey, these sequester spending levels—not the sequester, but the spending levels, and say, in 2009 was food not inspected? Because that's what the claim is, Mr. Speaker, that somehow if we were ever to reduce spending at all, we couldn't have food inspectors. Did we have any border patrol agents in 2009? Of course we did; of course we did. They will be funded at the same levels under the sequester. And that's our point: replacing the sequester with smart cuts.

But the other side, Mr. Speaker, the gentleman and his Caucus, won't join us in doing that, because all we hear again and again is: Raise taxes. And I have said, as the gentleman knows, we can't, in this town, be raising taxes every 3 months. That's just not the way we can get this economy back on track.

Did the FAA shut down in 2009? That's the claim. That's the claim that the President is saying: Shut down the FAA, stop air travel as we know it, or give us higher taxes. That's the false choice that this President and his administration are out there hawking. We can't have that. That's not leadership. Let's come together.

I agree with the gentleman. Let's stop the false choice, stop the games, and let's get it done.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman said a lot, and I could have a lot of comments on that, but I will say this. As long as the gentleman believes it's only us saying that we need a balanced program, he will oppose it because we are Democrats.

If the gentleman listens to independent advice all over this country, from all sorts of sources, Republicans

and Democrats, conservatives and liberals, they will say you need a balanced approach. We need to cut spending. We need to restrain spending and we need to balance the cost of what we provide with the income that we have. Every businessperson, small, medium, and large, understands that concept. We have not followed it, and we did not follow it in the last decade.

I regret the fact that the gentleman doesn't like the President going around the country and telling the truth saying what the consequences may well be. Now, are they going to be on March 1? No. But will they inevitably occur if the sequester stays in place? The answer to that I think is an emphatic, "Yes." I think the President is going around the country saying these are the alternatives.

And saying that the Senate won't act or the President won't act—people did not elect me, I will tell you, to make the President act or to make the Senate act. They didn't think I could do that. What they did think I could do was make STENY HOYER act. And if I were the majority leader, they expected me to have the House act, even if people didn't agree with legislation I put on the floor. They expect us to do our job, not to cop out, with all due respect, to the fact that the President is not doing something or the Senate is not doing something.

We have a responsibility here in this Chamber, the people's House, as representatives of 435 districts, to do our job. And if the other folks don't do their job, we can lament that, we can criticize them, we can inform the American public of that, but we cannot say that's why we are not acting.

So I would hope that next week we would, in fact, act and bring legislation to the floor. And I would be, as the gentleman knows, my friend knows, I'm for a big deal. I'm for getting us to that \$4 trillion that Simpson-Bowles recommended, because I think that would give real confidence to our economy, really grow businesses and put our country on a fiscally sustainable path.

I yield back the balance of my time.

ADJOURNMENT TO MONDAY, MARCH 4, 2013

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

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

There was no objection.

PENNSYLVANIA SPECIAL OLYMPICS

(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. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to recognize

more than 20,000 individuals who represent the Pennsylvania Special Olympics.

The Special Olympics is about people helping people. It's a global movement that has flourished due to the commitment and passion of its local volunteers and the determination of its participants and athletes.

In March of each year, the Pennsylvania Special Olympics hosts more than 300 athletes and 100 coaches for the State Floor Hockey Tournament. This year's 2-day competition in team and individual skills floor hockey will be held at my alma mater, the Bald Eagle Area High School in Centre County, Pennsylvania, where I will have the opportunity to attend and lend a helping hand on Saturday, March 2.

I would like to commend the Pennsylvania Special Olympics for their years of hard work, from expanding an ever-growing volunteer base to providing more opportunity for athletes to develop physical fitness, courage, and the lifelong relationships that are gained as a result of these games.

I look forward to sharing these experiences with our local community and wish all of our participants the very best in this week's competitions.

SEQUESTRATION

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

Mr. PETERS of California. Mr. Speaker, the sequester is scheduled to go into effect in less than 24 hours, and I stand today to call out a particularly objectionable concept that this is not taking effect today, that this is going to somehow not affect people today, it's going to roll out over time; and that's just not the case. Because if you're a family who is facing layoffs or furloughs; or if you're an admiral or a general who is trying to figure out how to defend the country and you've got to be spending your time worrying about what jobs you're going to stop and who you're going to lay off; or if you're that scientist, that budding scientist, who is thinking about where are you going to do your science, whether it's here in a country that invests in science or abroad, someplace where it looks like you will get better opportunity, those impacts are happening today.

And that's why, today, we should not adjourn. We should be staying here, working on the sequester, avoiding these cuts. Let's stay at work and get this problem solved.

SEQUESTRATION

(Ms. FOXX asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, the President seems to think that the only way for us to replace the arbitrary spending cuts, known as the sequester—the sequester which the President's own

operatives came up with—is to enact more tax increases. But should we really be talking about raising taxes when so many examples of government waste abound?

Do we need to spend \$1.2 million to have the National Science Foundation pay people to play video games?

Do we need the EPA to give away over \$100 million in grants to foreign countries like China?

Or what about bankrolling Tax TV? The IRS spends \$4 million of our tax dollars every year to run its very own full-service television studio.

Instead of raising taxes, let's get serious about cutting waste. The House has acted to replace the sequester with commonsense cuts and reforms. It's time to see a serious plan from the President.

□ 1240

IT'S A BEAUTIFUL DAY IN WASHINGTON STATE

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

Mr. HECK of Washington. Mr. Speaker, it's a beautiful day back in my hometown of Olympia, Washington—of course it's raining cats and dogs, but that's what passes for beauty in our corner of the world.

It's a beautiful day at the Nisqually National Wildlife Refuge near Olympia, and it's a beautiful day at Mount Rainier National Park, which you can see from my neighborhood. But Mr. Speaker, if we don't replace sequestration, I'm worried about how many more beautiful days there are ahead.

If we don't replace sequestration, then some of the 7.5 million visitors who are scheduled to visit one of our 13 national parks aren't going to be able to. They have already announced that they are closing the Ohanapecoh Visitors Center at Mount Rainier. All of this because Congress can't—or won't—do its job.

Mr. Speaker, it is a beautiful day in Washington State, but I don't know for how long.

LAKELAND LINDER REGIONAL AIRPORT

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

Mr. ROSS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to express my strong support for Lakeland Linder Regional Airport.

Unfortunately, with the pending sequester, the Federal Aviation Administration announced that they may close 238 control towers, including the tower at my local airport.

Lakeland Linder Regional Airport hosts the annual 6-day Sun 'n Fun fly-in that celebrates aviation and is the second-largest event of its kind in the world. This Sun 'n Fun fly-in is also the second largest convention in the State of Florida. It provides a \$50 million economic impact to the region