

Miller (FL)	Rigell	Southerland
Miller (MI)	Roby	Speier
Miller, George	Roe (TN)	Stewart
Moore	Rogers (AL)	Stivers
Moran	Rogers (KY)	Stutzman
Mullin	Rogers (MI)	Swalwell (CA)
Murphy (FL)	Rooney	Takano
Murphy (PA)	Ros-Lehtinen	Terry
Nadler	Roskam	Thompson (CA)
Napolitano	Ross	Thompson (MS)
Neal	Rothfus	Thompson (PA)
Neugebauer	Roybal-Allard	Thornberry
Noem	Royce	Tiberi
Nolan	Ruiz	Tierney
Nugent	Runyan	Tipton
Nunes	Ruppersberger	Titus
Nunnelee	Ryan (OH)	Tonko
Olson	Ryan (WI)	Tsongas
Owens	Salmon	Turner
Palazzo	Sánchez, Linda	Upton
Pallone	T.	Valadao
Pascarella	Sanchez, Loretta	Van Hollen
Pastor (AZ)	Sanford	Vargas
Paulsen	Sarbanes	Veasey
Payne	Scalise	Vela
Pearce	Schakowsky	Velázquez
Pelosi	Schiff	Visclosky
Perlmutter	Schneider	Wagner
Perry	Schock	Walberg
Peters (CA)	Schrader	Walden
Peters (MI)	Schweikert	Walorski
Peterson	Scott (VA)	Walz
Petri	Scott, Austin	Wasserman
Pingree (ME)	Scott, David	Schultz
Pittenger	Sensenbrenner	Waters
Pitts	Serrano	Waxman
Pocan	Sessions	Weber (TX)
Poe (TX)	Sewell (AL)	Webster (FL)
Polis	Shea-Porter	Welch
Pompeo	Sherman	Westmoreland
Price (GA)	Shimkus	Whitfield
Price (NC)	Shuster	Williams
Quigley	Simpson	Wilson (FL)
Rahall	Sinema	Wilson (SC)
Rangel	Sires	Wittman
Reed	Slaughter	Wolf
Reichert	Smith (MO)	Womack
Renacci	Smith (NE)	Woodall
Ribble	Smith (NJ)	Yarmuth
Rice (SC)	Smith (TX)	Yoder
Richmond	Smith (WA)	Young (IN)

## NAYS—19

Amash	Grayson	Rohrabacher
Bentivolio	Jones	Rokita
Broun (GA)	Labrador	Stockman
Burgess	Massie	Yoho
DesJarlais	Mulvaney	Young (AK)
Duncan (TN)	O'Rourke	
Gibson	Posey	

## NOT VOTING—13

Amodi	Gutiérrez	Rush
Butterfield	Honda	Schwartz
Campbell	McCarthy (NY)	Wenstrup
Coble	Miller, Gary	
DeBene	Negrete McLeod	

## □ 1233

Messrs. ROKITA and YOHO changed their vote from "yea" to "nay."

Messrs. PALAZZO, McNERNEY, and WEBER of Texas changed their vote from "nay" to "yea."

So (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated for:

Mr. GUTIERREZ. Mr. Speaker, I was unavoidably absent in the House chamber for votes today. I would like the record to show that, had I been present, I would have voted "yea" on rollcall vote 148.

## PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Ms. DELBENE. Mr. Speaker, on Wednesday, March 26th, 2014 and Thursday, March 27th, 2014 I was unable to be in Washington, DC and vote on the legislative business during these two days. Unfortunately, the tragic

mudslide in Snohomish County, Washington required me to return to my district to help my constituents in the aftermath of this disaster.

I would now like to submit how I would have voted had I been present.

I was unable to vote on rollcall No. 142: On Ordering the Previous Question for consideration of H. Res. 524, a resolution providing for consideration of H.R. 1459, the Ensuring Public Involvement in the Creation of National Monuments Act. Had I been present I would have voted "no."

I was unable to vote on rollcall No. 143: On Adoption of H. Res. 524, a resolution providing for consideration of H.R. 1459, the Ensuring Public Involvement in the Creation of National Monuments Act. Had I been present I would have voted "no."

I was unable to vote on rollcall No. 144: On motion to suspend the rules and pass H.R. 1228, Corporal Justin D. Ross Post Office Building in Green Bay, Wisconsin. Had I been present I would have voted "yes."

I was unable to vote on rollcall No. 145: On Agreeing to the Tsongas Amendment No. 3 to H.R. 1459, the Ensuring Public Involvement in the Creation of National Monuments Act. Had I been present I would have voted "yes."

I was unable to vote on rollcall No. 146: On the Motion to Recommit with Instructions H.R. 1459, the Ensuring Public Involvement in the Creation of National Monuments Act. Had I been present I would have voted "yes."

I was unable to vote on rollcall No. 147: On Passage of H.R. 1459, the Ensuring Public Involvement in the Creation of National Monuments Act. Had I been present I would have voted "no."

I was unable to vote on rollcall No. 148: On motion to suspend the rules and pass H.R. 4278, Ukraine Support Act. Had I been present I would have voted "yes."

## □ 1245

## LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

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

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I rise for the purpose of inquiring of the majority leader the schedule for the week to come, and I am pleased to yield to my friend, Mr. CANTOR, the majority leader.

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

Mr. Speaker, on Monday the House is not in session. On Tuesday, 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 Wednesday and Thursday, the House will meet at 10 a.m. for morning-hour and noon for legislative business. On Friday, the House will meet at 9 a.m. for legislative business. Last votes of the week are expected no later than 3 p.m.

Mr. Speaker, the House will consider a few suspensions next week, a complete list of which will be announced by close of business tomorrow. In addition, the House will consider an important bill next week to address the mid-

dle class squeeze by making sure that government policies do not provide incentives for employers to cut hours for their employees. H.R. 2575, the Save American Workers Act, sponsored by Representative TODD YOUNG of Indiana, will protect hardworking Americans from losing up to 25 percent of their wages as a direct result of ObamaCare's 30-hour rule.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, I expect the House to consider the first of three budget process reform bills next week to help reduce out-of-control spending and improve accountability to the taxpayers. Representative TOM PRICE's Pro-Growth Budgeting Act, H.R. 1874, will require CBO to provide detailed information on the economic impacts of major legislation as a supplement to CBO cost estimates.

With that, I thank the gentleman.

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

The gentleman released an agenda memo about a week ago and talked about a budget coming to the floor of the House of Representatives. My understanding is that the budget will be marked up in committee next week, and my presumption is when we come back, the budget will be on the floor. Is that correct? And if the gentleman can give me maybe some week that it will be on the floor, if not the day.

I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. CANTOR. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman, and he is correct. The Budget chairman, Mr. RYAN, intends to hold a markup next week in his committee, and the expectation is, once that markup occurs next week, that we will have the budget on the floor the following week.

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

Further, it is my understanding, Mr. Leader, that the budget number that the committee will mark to is the budget number that was included in the Ryan-Murray agreement that was adopted by the Congress and signed by the President at \$1.014 trillion in discretionary spending. Is that accurate?

Mr. CANTOR. Mr. Speaker, I would say to the gentleman, that is accurate.

Mr. HOYER. Reclaiming my time, I appreciate that that is being honored. Can the gentleman tell me whether or not the firewall that is also included in the Ryan-Murray agreement will be honored as well? The firewall, just an explanation, and I know the majority leader knows, but the firewall between discretionary defense spending and discretionary nondefense spending.

Mr. CANTOR. Mr. Speaker, I would say to the gentleman, I have not had discussion with the chairman on that particular issue. I am aware of the gentleman's concern, and I think the gentleman represents his caucus in the desire, unfortunately, to limit the defense spending. I think the question is probably aimed at the fact that we have differences on that because, given what is going on in the world right now, I feel very strongly for the need

for American military power and our ability to project that, not always necessarily to use it, but necessary in our diplomatic role as well, so I don't have an answer to the gentleman on that and refer him to the Budget chair. I am glad to engage in any conversation with him going forward.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman.

Just to make it clear, as I know he would want me to do: I am opposed to the sequester because I think the sequester damages our national security and domestic investments. Frankly, although the 1.014 number is not the sequester number, as the gentleman knows, the following year will be the sequester number because the agreement only lasts for 2 years. My own view is that the number that we are marking to in 2015 is not substantive enough, not sufficient funds to fund the kind of national security that we need in this country, so I am in agreement with the gentleman, but it is a direct consequence, in my view, of the fiscal policies that we have been pursuing. So I want to say to my friend, the majority leader, Mr. Speaker, that we on this side—certainly me for 33 years, I have been a very strong supporter of a robust national security because I believe that is essential if we are going to maintain freedom around the world, as well as safety here at home. I know the gentleman and I share that view, and I appreciate his view on that.

Unless he wants to respond, I will go to another issue.

As you know, we filed a discharge petition on H.R. 15, which is the comprehensive immigration bill that we have introduced that reflects, we think, a fix of a broken system, which the majority leader has made clear he shares the view that the system is broken. We would hope that that bill could be brought to the floor. We would hope that at least 218 Members would sign that. We have approximately 235 Members who have said publicly to the press and to the public that they are for comprehensive immigration reform. We would hope that that would lead them to sign the discharge petition so we in fact could bring that bill to the floor.

Does the gentleman have any idea when or if some immigration reform legislation will be brought to this floor so that we can deal with a system that is obviously causing a great deal of difficulty in our country and is, in fact, a broken system?

I yield to my friend.

Mr. CANTOR. Mr. Speaker, I would say to the gentleman, and he knows and he and I have spoken, that most of our conference feels strongly that the existing system is broken. We have got to do something about maintaining the enforcement and implementation of the law. We have to do something about the antiquated system of legal immigration to address the needs of our country.

The problem has been, Mr. Speaker, that there is a serious deterioration in

the trust factor with what is going on in terms of the White House and its execution and implementation of the laws. I recall, Mr. Speaker, a prior conversation that my friend, the Democratic whip, and I have had on this floor about the trust factor. I in one instance even indicated to the gentleman that the comprehensive health care law that was passed, now in the vernacular known as ObamaCare, is an example of where we have seen that the White House has by whim, seemingly, chosen to either waive provisions, extend deadlines without consultation with Congress, seemingly without awareness of what the law says. That is not a good way to operate. It is not something that increases the confidence and trust of the American people. So I would say to the gentleman, there is no interest in picking up a comprehensive bill like that if we can't trust that once the law is set, that the White House is going to necessarily implement the law as it stands.

So I am sorry to say to the gentleman that the situation of trust is how it is, but perhaps he could do some good by talking to the White House and telling the White House the law is the law, and for their unilateral actions taking place and failing to implement the law is a very troubling thing for a lot of us and a lot of the constituents that we represent.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Speaker, when I ask this question we usually do change the subject to get on the Affordable Care Act. There is hardly any subject that motivates my friends on the other side of the aisle more to say something than the Affordable Care Act.

If the gentleman believes that trust is the issue and that we can't trust the President to do any of the laws that we pass, then we ought to just stop doing things. As a matter of fact, that is just about what we have done, Mr. Speaker. Maybe that is the strategy—to pass message bills with no expectation that they will pass either the Senate and be signed by the President, and maybe all we are doing is treading water.

My own view would be that the American public expects more than that. If it is broken, as the gentleman says it is, and he says just now a significant number, I don't know if it is a majority of his caucus, believe it is broken, then they have passed out bills out of their committee. This is not a question of trust; this is a question of can this House act. We can't control what the President does. We can't control what the United States Senate does. But as the majority leader well knows, Mr. Speaker, in times past I have said what we can control is what we do. What we can do is pass policy that we think is good policy, or at least that a majority of us think is a good policy, to fix a system.

We believe strongly that a comprehensive immigration bill is good for this country. Not only do we believe it is morally right to do, but we also be-

lieve that economically it is right to do. In fact, CBO scores the passage of a comprehensive immigration bill as a substantial help to the budget deficit. That we take people, put them on the tax rolls, make sure they are paying the taxes that are due, and make sure that our country is getting the revenues that it should be getting from those who are working in our country.

In fact, of course, in addition to that, if you talk to many people in industry, that is why the U.S. Chamber of Commerce has urged us to pass a comprehensive reform bill, it is why the AFL-CIO has urged us to pass a comprehensive immigration reform bill, and it is why the agricultural community, the growers of America, have urged us to pass a comprehensive immigration bill, and it is why farm-worker representatives have urged us to pass a comprehensive immigration reform bill, and why most faith-based organizations in America have urged us to pass a comprehensive immigration bill.

I know there are some Members who would vote against it, but I urge my friend, the majority leader: bring it to the floor. I have said this before, but the Speaker made it very clear that he was going to lead this House in a way that would allow the House to work its will. If the majority of this House doesn't trust the President and they don't want to vote for H.R. 15, so be it. They will do that; they will vote "no."

But I believe there are the votes on the floor to pass comprehensive immigration reform, and the only reason it is not passing is because it is not brought to the floor. For that reason, Mr. Majority Leader, I would ask you, as respectfully as I can, to put the bill on the floor. You may well be right. Your party, which if it all votes together, could defeat a comprehensive immigration bill. If your party believes that is good policy and because of a lack of trust of the President, that should be the road that you go down, then fine. Let the American people see that.

If, however, there are at least very close to half of this House who are going to be signing that discharge petition, believe that it is good policy, and if, in fact, Speaker BOEHNER meant what he said, that he was going to allow the House to work its will, I would urge the majority leader to let the House work its will and bring that bill to the floor. Open it up for amendments. If the gentleman's party wants to offer amendments or my side wants to offer amendments, let that be the case. But let us let the House at least have the opportunity to work its will on this very, very important bill that we think is one of the most critical issues that we ought to be addressing.

I yield to my friend if he would like to respond.

□ 1300

Mr. CANTOR. Mr. Speaker, all I would like to say to the gentleman is

he and I disagree that there would be a majority of votes for H.R. 15. It is a reflection of the comprehensive Senate bill, and I don't believe we have a majority in this House for that bill.

I would furthermore ask the gentleman whether he thinks—or I would just say that perhaps it would be more constructive that we sit down and begin to talk about where we can go in a direction that we have in common, that we feel that we can agree on things rather than differences; rather than filing discharge petitions, perhaps it would be a little more constructive to sit down, instead of demanding our way or the highway.

Again, too much of that has been the way this town has worked over the last several years, and it is unfortunate.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for his remarks. He and I have a difference of opinion. We discussed this the last time, as I recall. We have a difference of opinion. He thinks it would not pass. I think it would pass.

The good news for America is there is a very easy way to determine who is right and who is wrong. Put the bill on the floor, give the House a vote, give America a vote. If I am wrong, I will stand up on the floor of the House and say I was wrong.

I am sure that my friend, the majority leader, will do the same if, in fact, he is wrong, but we have an easy way in America to resolve such differences because we all have differences of opinion.

In a democracy, you vote. In a democracy, you resolve differences by coming together. I look forward to sitting down with the gentleman on this issue. I would reiterate I look forward to dealing with him on other issues as we have been able to do in many instances. I thank him for that opportunity.

We can resolve this difference by simply bringing the bill to the floor, giving America a vote, and letting the House work its will. Unless the gentleman wants to say something further, I yield back the balance of my time.

#### --- **HOOR OF MEETING ON TOMORROW**

Mr. CANTOR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet at 11 a.m. tomorrow; and when the House adjourns on that day, it adjourn to meet on Tuesday, April 1, 2014, when it shall convene at noon for morning-hour debate and 2 p.m. for legislative business.

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

#### --- **HONORING KIM RUBIN**

(Mrs. BACHMANN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. BACHMANN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize an extremely important person. Today marks 25 years that Kim Rubin has worked here on Capitol Hill.

In the 1980s, Kim Rubin accepted an internship with former Congressman Jack Kemp from her home State of New York. She has come a long way since then. She has been with me, I am proud to say, since day one that I served in the United States Congress.

I have never met anyone more loyal, more dependable, or more organized. Not only does Kim coordinate our office's schedule and those of our entire staff, she works diligently as our office manager.

Somehow, she still has the time and energy to be a dedicated wife to her loving husband, Howie, and also to her two beautiful daughters, Lexi and Livi. She is also a volleyball coach, and her nickname is Coach K.

As Kim says, her life is centered on faith, family, and pursuing what makes you happy. I don't know how Kim does it all, but it has been an honor to work with Kim Rubin for these past 8 years.

While we will part ways after we both retire this year, I know I will have a lifelong friend in the indomitable Kim Rubin.

Congratulations and thank you, Kim Rubin.

#### --- **FOREST MANAGEMENT**

(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, the Endangered Species Act was signed into law in 1973, in order to preserve, protect, and recover key domestic species.

The ESA also contains a citizen lawsuit provision, which allows private citizens—and, in many cases, special interest organizations—to sue Federal agencies and private landowners for allegedly failing to comply with ESA. Taxpayers are on the hook, even when the Federal Government prevails.

The Forest Service, which I had the privilege of holding jurisdiction over as chairman of the Agricultural Subcommittee on Conservation, Energy, and Forestry, must comply with ESA before engaging in any kind of forest management activity, which is the agency's most basic and fundamental role.

Protecting species is our goal, but unfortunately, this provision has been used as a tool by those who would like to halt land management activities.

The financial impact of these activities in the Forest Service is significant, posing a threat to the forest health, the economic well-being of local communities, and also the species we are aiming to protect.

We must replace this flawed policy with one that protects taxpayers and species restoration, but also the health of our forests and our local economies.

#### **ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE**

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will recognize Members for Special Orders speeches without prejudice to the possible resumption of legislative business.

#### --- **WEEK IN REVIEW**

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

Mr. GOHMERT. Mr. Speaker, a surprising twist today: Who says there is nothing surprising in Washington? We were told there was potential for a bill to come to the floor today to deal with the issue of the SGR, sustainable growth rate, or the doc fix, as it is sometimes called.

There has been some disagreement in our party what would be the best way to handle it. We had a bill. It was a 1-year extension, 1 year that included some other things that some of the people that are providing the care that haven't been properly treated in reimbursement areas we are not happy about.

So it appeared we didn't have—or our leaders may not have had the votes, and so it is quite a surprise that was voice-voted. No one asked for a recorded vote because normally, see, we trust our leaders that, if there is an important bill, that part of the leadership understand, someone here, part of the bill will request a recorded vote, and we will get a recorded vote, and we will all be able to either vote for or vote against.

Otherwise, we have to keep people here all the time, and it did bring back to mind the time that was not so fond back in 2007, 2008, sometimes 2009 and 2010, when on the first day back in Washington, whether it was a Monday or a Tuesday, the first day, there is suspension bills.

Those are bills that are expected to pass and have two-thirds of the body vote for them, naming courthouses, naming Federal buildings, recognizing some important person or deed, those type of things.

They are generally agreed to, and despite all the negativity in Washington, those are things that we agreed to constantly; and both sides of the aisle worked together getting it accomplished.

We saw very quickly, after Republicans lost the majority in November of 2006, sometimes Republican leadership would agree to allow some suspensions to go when it was extremely important. It should never have been brought to the floor on suspension, which means it doesn't go through subcommittee, it doesn't go through committee.

It just comes to the floor, without having gone through Rules Committee,