

animals, contributes approximately 18 to 29 direct jobs and results in roughly \$890,000 to \$1.4 million of income from hunting tourism and related activities. By the Forest Service's own assessment, it is likely that economic benefits are currently being lost as hunters leave the area to pursue the sport elsewhere. This is having a tangible economic impact on our State, robbing it of even more jobs.

I would like to emphasize that the State of Louisiana, the Kennel Club, and Safari Club International support my amendment, and a similar amendment was accepted by the House with a voice vote last Congress.

I urge support of this amendment.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FLEMING. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. I thank the gentleman for yielding. I think this is a good amendment, and I support the amendment. The primary purpose of this legislation is to limit unjustified Federal bureaucratic limitations on hunting and fishing.

I also want to make a point here that it is important to recognize that the authority of States to regulate hunting and fishing should be paramount over the Federal Government. Individual Federal agencies should not preempt State laws, and it sounds to me like that is what the gentleman is talking about in his case.

I think the amendment is a good amendment, and I support it.

Mr. FLEMING. I thank the gentleman, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Oregon is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Chairman, we have talked about major problems confronting this Congress, and here we are now trying to resolve yet another local conflict.

After considerable complaints by private property owners about hunters encroaching on their land to retrieve their dogs that have gotten lost, driving on their land and that, the Forest Service decided because of the intermingled ownership to prohibit dog deer hunting.

Now comes the gentleman who says, well, we are going to reopen it. We will countermand the locally made decision, but we will have a new process where the private landowners can petition the secretary to re-close certain areas of the area that are now closed that he is reopening because of conflicts with their private property. However, these private property owners' petitions will have to go through the dreaded NEPA process, and that is, for deciding something as minor as that, kind of problematic.

You know, I guess maybe we should have a special day here, and I have some beefs with some Federal agencies

ongoing that I would like to settle with legislation, too. Maybe we should have an open amendment process some day where every little local issue we have been dealing with with a Federal agency which is contentious between conflicting users will be decided by the United States Congress in Washington, D.C., not at the local level. That is what we are doing here. It is pretty extraordinary.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. FLEMING. Mr. Chairman, I would like to address the issues brought up here.

First of all, the gentleman said there were multiple complaints. This was studied considerably. There was 1,237 responses to a request in 2009, and by October 6, we found that there were 77 percent, a clear majority of the respondents, who were actually in favor of continuing the practice of dog deer hunting. This was requested again in 2011, and there were over 1,300 respondents, and all but 16 were in favor of dog deer hunting and against the Forest Service proposed ban.

The other thing I would like to address, Mr. Chairman, is this was not a locally made decision. This was made in Atlanta. This is the problem. This has been going on for 300 years in the State of Louisiana. It is a big part of our heritage, and somebody over in Georgia, in Atlanta, representing the Federal Government, made this decision, not locally. There was no decision locally. The State supports this. The local residents support it by a vast majority.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. FLEMING. Mr. Chairman, in closing, I would like to just say that the people of Louisiana want to see this Forest Service ban overturned. This was a decision made outside of our borders. In effect, if you will, even though the people of Louisiana were asked and they gave the correct answer, it was ignored, and the decision was made by someone outside of our borders. This was a decision made by somebody in Atlanta, a Federal employee, interfering with a local issue.

This is a tradition that goes back 300 years, and I think it is pretty obvious that the people of Louisiana support the continuance of hunting deer with dogs.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. FLEMING).

The amendment was agreed to.

The Acting CHAIR. The Committee will rise informally.

The Speaker pro tempore (Mr. HOLDING) assumed the chair.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Ms. Curtis, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the

disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 2642) "An Act to provide for the reform and continuation of agricultural and other programs of the Department of Agriculture through fiscal year 2018, and for other purposes."

The message also announced that the Senate has passed a bill of the following title in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 376. An act to reauthorize the National Integrated Drought Information System, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Committee will resume its sitting.

SPORTSMEN'S HERITAGE AND RECREATIONAL ENHANCEMENT ACT OF 2013

The Committee resumed its sitting.

AMENDMENT NO. 10 OFFERED BY MR. HOLT

The Acting CHAIR (Mr. STEWART). It is now in order to consider amendment No. 10 printed in House Report 113-339.

Mr. HOLT. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of the bill, add the following:

TITLE IX—CLIMATE CHANGE

SEC. 901. AUTHORITY OF THE SECRETARY OF THE INTERIOR TO PLAN FOR A CHANGING CLIMATE.

Nothing in this Act limits the authority of the Secretary of the Interior to include climate change as a consideration in making decisions related to conservation and recreation on public lands.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 470, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. HOLT) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. HOLT. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Sportsmen are among the first to notice the effects of our changing climate as changes in seasonal distribution of game and diminished natural habitats becomes more evident. As the climate continues to change, we will experience worse drought, flood, wildfire, and extreme weather events.

For public lands and recreation there, climate change will mean changes in hunting seasons, migratory patterns, and the native and invasive species populations. We will experience sea level rise, wildfire, drought, and other manifestations of climate change. All of these are altering the landscape and changing the existing opportunities for hunting, fishing, and recreation on public lands. These should be considered. These will have a greater effect on sportsmen and on fishermen and hunters than all of the other things we have been talking about today.

More than 75 percent of the Federal lands are open now for recreational

hunting, fishing and shooting, but climate change would transform irreversibly, and in fact is transforming irreversibly, our public lands in ways that will limit the ability of sportsmen to enjoy recreational activities in these areas.

So this amendment says the Department should consider those things. In fact, it is even more limited than that. It says nothing will prevent the Department from considering these things. That is what this amendment is. I would hope that the House will accept this. I have been joined by a number of members of the House Sustainable Energy Coalition in offering this amendment. It is supported by Defenders of Wildlife and the Wilderness Society and the Sierra Club and the Natural Resources Defense Council.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, the primary purpose of this underlying legislation is the premise that Federal lands should be open for hunting and fishing recreation rather than being closed. I believe this should be the policy of all of our multiple use Federal lands. The default option should be open regardless of whether your interests are mountain biking, rock climbing, hunting, fishing, logging, building a solar energy facility, mining, wind power, or developing oil and gas. Our Nation's multiple use lands were designed to be used for the benefit of the Nation. This open-before-closed concept is the foundation of what we are trying to do through this legislation.

□ 1600

We are trying to raise the bar of bureaucracy that the bureaucracy has placed between hunters and the outdoors.

Reckless disregard of our Nation's hunting and fishing traditions means too often our Federal lands are closed off arbitrarily, and not just without public input, but against public sentiment.

Now the gentleman is proposing that we give the Secretary another new tool to close lands, without scientific decisionmaking, without accounting for their actions. The gentleman proposes that we simply grant the Secretary the sole authority to dictate that we close off any and all of our Nation's lands from hunting and fishing based simply on the Secretary's mere opinion that hunting and fishing are a threat to our Nation's land because of climate change.

Hunting and fishing are traditions and foundations that this Nation was built upon. They are not burdens to our national lands. They are one of the many purposes of our national lands.

Just yesterday, Mr. Chairman, before the Rules Committee, one of my Democrat colleagues was commenting that he had a BB gun at age 7 and a .22 rifle at age 12. He talked about how, as a young man, he learned to respect guns and traditions. Yet that same Member is concerned about what children are learning today—the lack of respect for guns and the traditions of the outdoors.

Mr. Chairman, I believe that this is one of the many benefits and reasons that we are here today, to help restore the opportunity for hunting and fishing traditions to take root on our Federal lands, to remind our Federal land managers that the exercise of these traditions are not a burden on our lands but one of the foundations of our lands.

Finally, let me say this. Regardless of one's views on our climate, this amendment is not about climate change. It is about granting the Secretary a blank check to ban hunting and fishing. Nothing in the bill changes the Secretary's ability to manage our lands to ensure responsible management. The bill does require lands to be opened, however, before closed; but when closing lands, the Secretary must act in a measured fashion to ensure that our hunting and fishing traditions are protected and valued.

I urge my colleagues to reject what I consider to be an antihunting and -fishing amendment, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HOLT. Mr. Chairman, may I ask the time remaining on each side.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from New Jersey has 3 minutes remaining. The gentleman from Washington has 1½ minutes remaining.

Mr. HOLT. I thank the Chair.

I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. CONNOLLY), who is a leader of the Sustainable Energy and Environment Coalition Caucus and a cosponsor of this amendment.

Mr. CONNOLLY. Mr. Chairman, I thank my colleague.

As the cochair of the Green Dogs of the SEEC Caucus, I rise in support of this amendment and proud to cosponsor it.

The bill before us purports to be about expanding opportunities for sportsmen on Federal lands, yet it fails to recognize the significant effect climate change will have on such opportunities. For example, what will climate change mean for hunters who are forced away from parks because of drought or threat of wildfire? As we witnessed this year, wildfire seasons are now longer, larger, and longer-term than ever before because of climate change. The migratory patterns of ducks and, for that matter, the patterns of fish, to name just two species, are also being negatively affected.

What will climate change mean for anglers who find streams drying up and killing fish? Last September, Montana officials closed the Blackfoot River—not the Secretary, they did—the iconic

backdrop for the book and film, “A River Runs Through It,” to protect fish from the stress of low-level river flows.

Mr. Chairman, if we really want to protect and expand outdoor recreational opportunities, shouldn't we understand what climate change will mean, not only for hunters, but for the affected wildlife and their habitat?

I urge my colleagues to support this simple, commonsense amendment.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time and advise my friend I have no requests for time. I am prepared to yield back if the gentleman is prepared to yield back.

Mr. HOLT. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself the remaining time just to address a couple of points that my friend, the chair, from Washington has raised.

There is nothing in this amendment that gives the Secretary any new authority. It simply says that the Secretary should consider climate change in policies for managing these lands.

Climate change is the problem that needs to be addressed. You can deny it all you want, but climate change will do more to restrict hunting and fishing and recreation on public lands than these imagined administrative reductions or restrictions or lawsuits or restrictions on lead shot or any of those things.

There are a variety of adaptation strategies to promote resilience of fish and wildlife populations and forests and plant communities and freshwater resources and ocean resources. These are being studied by academic and scientific and, yes, government and non-profit organizations.

A great deal of thought is going into this. We want to make sure that there is nothing that restricts the Secretary from using these best adaptation strategies, these best management practices, to take into account what is real. It is not imagined. The climate is changing. It is affecting the ecology of all of these public lands.

I urge support of this amendment and yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself the balance of my time.

I just want to point out that the gentleman wanted to clarify by saying this doesn't give authority, but the Secretary should consider. What if the Secretary considers under current law and then decides to take action?

That is the point of the argument that I made, and that is that that action, then, on climate change could cause limited or no access to our public lands. That is why I said this amendment is kind of cloaked in different clothing, because it does not speak to climate change; in fact, it speaks to the potential closing of our public lands.

I urge my colleagues to vote “no” on the amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. HOLT).

The question was taken; and the Acting Chair announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. HOLT. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New Jersey will be postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 11 OFFERED BY MR. POLIS

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 11 printed in House Report 113-339.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Chairman, as the designee of Mr. KILDEE, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of the bill, add the following:

TITLE IX—SENSE OF CONGRESS REGARDING SNOWMOBILES ON NATIONAL FOREST SYSTEM LANDS

SEC. 901. FINDINGS AND PURPOSE.

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress finds the following:

(1) The clear identification of roads, trails, and areas for motor vehicle use in each National Forest will improve management of National Forest System lands and protect these national treasures, enhance opportunities, and address access for motorized recreation experiences on National Forest System lands and preserve areas of opportunity in each National Forest for non-motorized travel and experiences.

(2) The sport of snowmobiling supports thousands of jobs across the country and provides a variety of enriching recreational opportunities for both families and individuals.

(3) In 2005, the Forest Service promulgated a Travel Management Rule that required travel management plans for off-road vehicles, with the exception of snowmobiles, on all lands managed by the Forest Service.

(4) Under the 2005 Travel Management Rule, the Department of Agriculture deemed that the use of snowmobiles on National Forest System lands presented a different set of management issues and environmental impacts on National Forest System lands than the use of other types of motor vehicles. Therefore, the final rule exempted snowmobiles from the mandatory designation scheme provided for under section 212.51 of title 36, Code of Federal Regulations, but retained the National Forest System's ability to allow, restrict or prohibit snowmobile travel, as appropriate, on a case-by-case basis.

(5) In 2013, the Ninth U.S. District Court of Idaho ruled in the case captioned as *Winter Wildlands Alliance v. US Forest Service*, Case No. 1:11-cv-00586-REB, ruled that the Forest Service must promulgate travel management rules that include snowmobiles. The Ninth U.S. District Court of Idaho required that the final rule be promulgated by September 14, 2014, barring no additional extension.

(b) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—It is the sense of Congress that the Forest Service should continue to allow snowmobiles access to National Forest System lands at the same levels as were allowed as of March 28, 2013, subject to closures for public health and safety at the discretion of the respective agencies, until a final travel management rule is promulgated for snowmobiles.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 470, the gentleman

from Colorado (Mr. POLIS) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Chairman, in 1972, President Nixon signed Executive Order 11644, which required that the U.S. Forest Service create travel management plans for the operation of off-road vehicles in our national forests, including snowmobiles. These travel management plans were designed to address the concerns of different users. They can be simple or detailed enough to affect noise, carbon emissions, traffic patterns, and protect animal migratory patterns.

In 2005, the Forest Service finalized its travel management rules for off-road vehicles in the national forest system except for snowmobiles, which were granted an exemption.

Each year, outdoor enthusiasts contribute enormous amounts to our economy, and snowmobiles support thousands of jobs not only in my district, but across the country. Not only do many of our residents enjoy snowmobiling, but it attracts significant tourism to areas like Eagle and Summit and Grand Counties and actually creates jobs in those areas.

Although snowmobiles were exempted from this rule, individual forest managers were still able to restrict snowmobile travel as appropriate on a case-by-case basis through individual travel management plans which met the unique needs of each area.

In 2013, however, a Federal District Court in Idaho in the *Winter Wildlands Alliance v. U.S. Forest Service* ruled the Forest Service must develop an overarching travel management rule that includes snowmobiles to comply with President Nixon's original executive order.

This amendment states that while the National Forest Service develops this travel management plan, it is a sense of Congress that the Forest Service should continue to allow snowmobiles on Federal lands during this rule's development with the same restrictions that were in place prior to the *Winter Wildlands Alliance* decision to ensure that the ability of snowmobilers to recreate is not interfered with because of this period where we are developing our permanent policy.

Given the breadth of outdoor activities, it makes simple sense that public lands should be available for multiple uses, including snowmobiling. About a quarter of Americans who participate in outdoor recreation enjoy motorized vehicles as part of that activity. Like other outdoor enthusiasts, snowmobilers contribute to communities by renting equipment, staying in hotels, purchasing souvenirs, enjoying local restaurants, and more.

As off-road vehicle use expands, it becomes increasingly important for the U.S. Forest Service to issue its rules to determine whether areas are open or

closed to snowmobiles. This sense of Congress will allow that certainty that will allow our tourism industry to continue and our residents to continue to enjoy snowmobiling.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. POLIS. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I say on a personal note, I was looking for you on the floor at the end of last week. I was prepared to take Seattle and offer you 34 points. I think you probably would have taken that bet.

I just want to make this point. If the gentleman will say that the results on the gridiron in New Jersey last Sunday, if the gentleman will say that the better team won—and you don't have to make any other adjectives—but if the gentleman will say that, I will be more than happy to accept this amendment.

Mr. POLIS. I will be happy to say on the record that the better team on that particular day won. There is still some doubt about whether that was, in fact, the Denver Broncos that took the field.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Well, I knew that the gentleman would find something to say.

I just want to say, dealing with the amendment, I think this amendment, again, in the spirit of adding more activity on Federal lands, I think this adds to it. I am prepared to support the amendment.

Mr. POLIS. I thank the chair.

I yield to the ranking member, Mr. DEFAZIO.

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I congratulate Mr. POLIS and Congressman KILDEE, who is detained at the White House, for offering this amendment.

I appreciate that the majority has accepted it. This will be a temporary provision until such a time as the final rule is adopted. There was never, I don't think, intent to have this sort of a blanket ban on snowmobiles, and this would correct that error by the Forest Service as they go through a deliberative process on where, when, and how snowmobiles will access Federal forest lands on a unit-by-unit basis.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Washington for his remarks. You know that when the defense of one team scores more points than the offense of the other team, your team is not in good shape. But I congratulate the gentleman on the 12-second, fastest ever score in a way that was quite embarrassing for the Broncos, but we will be back next year. We look forward to challenging in the NFL.

I appreciate the support from both the chair and the ranking member for Mr. KILDEE's and my amendment. This rule will help the U.S. Forest Service improve management, prevent the disruption of the tourism industry, allow for the continued enjoyment of residents in snowmobiling, and ensure that

off-road vehicles are used in a manner that protects natural resources, minimizes conflict with other users, and provides and protects motorized recreation.

Until we finalize the travel plan, snowmobilers will be able to, under this sense of Congress, enjoy their favorite activity, and communities should continue to reap the economic benefits of hosting these winter sport enthusiasts.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. Does anyone seek time in opposition?

Seeing none, the question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. POLIS).

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. MULLIN) having assumed the chair, Mr. STEWART, Acting Chair of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 3590) to protect and enhance opportunities for recreational hunting, fishing, and shooting, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

□ 1615

CONTINUATION OF THE NATIONAL EMERGENCY WITH RESPECT TO THE SITUATION IN OR IN RELATION TO CÔTE D'IVOIRE—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 113-90)

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

Section 202(d) of the National Emergencies Act (50 U.S.C. 1622(d)) provides for the automatic termination of a national emergency, unless, within 90 days prior to the anniversary date of its declaration, the President publishes in the *Federal Register* and transmits to the Congress a notice stating that the emergency is to continue in effect beyond the anniversary date. In accordance with this provision, I have sent to the *Federal Register* for publication the enclosed notice stating that the national emergency declared in Executive Order 13396 of February 7, 2006, with respect to the situation in or in relation to Côte d'Ivoire is to continue in effect beyond February 7, 2014.

The situation in or in relation to Côte d'Ivoire, which has been addressed by the United Nations Security Council in Resolution 1572 of November 15, 2004, and subsequent resolutions, has resulted in the massacre of large num-

bers of civilians, widespread human rights abuses, significant political violence and unrest, and fatal attacks against international peacekeeping forces.

Since the inauguration of President Alassane Ouattara in May 2011, the Government of Côte d'Ivoire has made progress in advancing democratic freedoms and economic development. While the Government of Côte d'Ivoire and its people continue to make progress towards peace and prosperity, the situation in or in relation to Côte d'Ivoire continues to pose an unusual and extraordinary threat to the national security and foreign policy of the United States. For these reasons, I have determined that it is necessary to continue the national emergency and related measures blocking the property of certain persons contributing to the conflict in Côte d'Ivoire.

BARACK OBAMA.

THE WHITE HOUSE, February 4, 2014.

SHERIFF WINDERS

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

Mr. HOLDING. Mr. Speaker, last week, North Carolina lost a real leader and a good man—my loyal friend, Sheriff Carey Winders of Wayne County. He was only 57 years old.

Carey was one of the youngest men to be elected as sheriff in Wayne County, and 2015 would have marked his 20th year of service. He was dedicated to the people he served and respected by all. Carey was a lifelong member of Union Grove Free Will Baptist Church, where he met his wife of 33 years, Teresa. Family was everything to Carey. Carey had three daughters—Jessica, Ashley and Carianne—and two granddaughters.

Mr. Speaker, Carey was devoted to Wayne County and driven by his faith, his family and his commitment to the citizens who put their trust in him. While it is a dark time in Wayne County, we know that the light of his life and his principled example will illuminate this community in the days ahead.

THE GOP DOCTORS CAUCUS: THE AFFORDABLE CARE ACT

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

Mr. GINGREY of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, here we are now in February 2014, and the second session of the 113th Congress has begun. The administration still has to deal with daily headlines speaking of the disaster of—you guessed it—the Affordable Care Act. I have to sometimes refer to that as the "Unaffordable Care Act."

Today, the news came from the non-partisan CBO, the Congressional Budg-

et Office. My colleagues are all familiar with that. Their report states that the administration's rosy projections are a mere fairy tale. If you take a dive into these numbers from the CBO, Mr. Speaker, you will see last year's goals amended lower as the low participation and atrocious rollout of the exchanges have finally caught up with those estimates.

Let me just give you, colleagues, a few highlights:

The CBO lowered the estimate of exchange enrollees to 6 million. That is 1 million less than they estimated at this time last year. Now, this isn't all that surprising given the problems with the Web site—healthcare.gov—and the rest of the implementation of ObamaCare, but it definitely reinforces the notion that this plan is not working.

The CBO estimates that 31 million Americans will still be uninsured in 2024. Colleagues, when this bill was being discussed in Energy and Commerce way back in 2009—in 2008 even—the Democratic majority at the time said there were 45 million people who were uninsured. That number really shrunk down considerably when you realized that there were a number of people who were eligible for Medicaid who just didn't know it. It could have been as many as 10 or 11 or 12 million. Obviously, there are a lot of people in this country illegally uninsured but who are not eligible. Then there were the people making \$75,000 a year in their households who could afford health insurance but who just chose, because of the Constitution—their personal liberty—to pay as they went. It is not something I recommend. The CBO estimates now that in 2024—10 years later—after its passage and full implementation on October 1 of this year, 2014, that there will still be 31 million Americans uninsured. What have we really solved here? It doesn't sound like we have really helped very much.

Now, this bill was sold to the American people as the solution to eliminating the uninsured. Instead, the bill only, really, adds cost in the form of very expensive mandates to everyone who already had insurance. A lot of them now are just saying, Heck, I will be one of these who will go bare. I will, maybe, set up my own savings account for health care, and will put \$100 a month—or whatever—in a checking account and get a physical when I need it annually or biannually, and I will pay my own way—that has happened—and pay the little fine of \$95.

So that is what is happening, and it is quite a legacy for the President's signature piece of legislation. I don't think it is the legacy that he anticipated, and it is certainly not the one that he wants today.

Finally, there is the headline from the newspaper, *The Hill*. Most of us read that, don't we, colleagues? We read all of these newspapers if we don't run out of time. In *The Hill* today, here is its headline: "CBO: O-Care Slowing