

Physician's Caucus on the majority side of the aisle has put a lot of work into this issue, together with the Ways and Means Committee and the Energy and Commerce Committee, have come up with a plan, as the gentleman knows, that had bipartisan support.

The problem is how to pay for it, and as I think the gentleman would agree, we can't go and continue to incur costs without finding out ways to pay for it, and that seems to continue to vex—many of the problems around here are trying to discover bipartisan pay-fors.

We made a commitment to continue to work with those Members who are most engaged in this issue and look forward to continue working with the gentleman to try to find those pay-fors, so we can put in place a long-term plan to give some certainty to our providers under Medicare.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for his comments, and I look forward to working with him. I would observe, as he well knows, and I have discussed with the Speaker, the pay-fors that were included in the temporary patch were as elusive as any other pay-for we could find.

We simply accelerated dollars. We didn't have due dollars. We didn't really pay for it. We just simply put the debt off a month or so and collected the money early and pretended that that was going to pay for it.

Whether that is any more real than doing any of the other options that have been suggested, I think, is questionable, but I look forward to working with the gentleman.

Because I mention it every time, but I want to mention it in a slightly different context, I will bring up comprehensive immigration reform again. The majority leader says it is a broken system. We all agree on that, and we ought to move forward.

We are going to be considering the budget. The budget, we don't think is paid for. We will have a discussion about that as we go down. We think it increases the deficits; it is not balanced in 10 years.

But that aside, comprehensive immigration reform, the CBO released its score on our bill H.R. 15, which we think is a bipartisan bill, found it would reduce the deficit by \$900 billion over the next 2 decades, including \$200 billion over the first 10 years.

Therefore, comprehensive immigration reform, in our opinion, is not only the right thing to do, it is economically the smart thing to do. That is in the context of a bill that was brought to the floor this week that increases the deficit by nearly \$74 billion, dealing with the ACA.

It is a bit ironic that, during the time of enormous deficits, that we have been unwilling to bring to the floor a bill that is scored by CBO as close to a trillion dollars positive reduction of our deficit in the coming 20 years. I would hope that we could look at that.

As I say, it is not only the right thing to do, but it is supported across

the board, the bill that the Senate passed by a 68-32 margin, supported by the Chamber of Commerce, supported by the AFL-CIO, supported by growers, farmers, ag interests, as well as farm workers, supported by the faith community across the board, and supported by 70-plus percent of the American people.

You would think, in the context of that broad base of support, that we could bring a bill which has such positive affects for human beings, for individuals, and for our country, as well as a positive economic affect.

I would hope, very sincerely, that once we get past the budget and come back after the Easter break, that we address comprehensive immigration reform.

I yield to my friend if he has any comments.

Mr. CANTOR. I would just say to the gentleman, as he knows, both the Speaker, I, and others have said we reject the comprehensive approach taken by the Senate.

Also, as the gentleman correctly states, we are in favor of trying to fix a very broken, antiquated, legal immigration system, as well as trying to do something to stop illegal immigration. We just have an issue about the President's insistence on, first of all, saying it is his way or the highway.

Secondly, the gentleman and I have talked before about the growing frustration that many Americans have, as well as Members on our side of the aisle, about the seeming disregard for the law by this administration in selectively implementing laws that have passed, specifically as it relates to the Affordable Care Act.

How would one know provisions that will be upheld, implemented, executed in whole or not, given this situation surrounding the ACA? Those are the kinds of challenges we face.

I would also note to the gentleman that the kind of thing that he refers to, comprehensive immigration, we reject that notion that the Senate bill, and we reject comprehensive efforts that have been undertaken over the last several years because they haven't worked so well.

Instead, we should be looking to try and do the things that we agree on. What about border security—border security itself? If we can agree to say that is going to be our position, we are not negotiating on a comprehensive bill, that we have to take care of that.

What about the kids? The gentleman knows I am very focused on trying to do something that we can agree on, but without saying that that has to be a precursor to something that the President insists, or otherwise, we can't even have the discussion.

So, again, we have got a lot of issues with regards to immigration. I would say to the gentleman I understand his frustration. I think that we have plenty of people who are also frustrated, given how things have gone with this White House.

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

I want to say on border security, H.R. 15, we refer to as a comprehensive bill, as you know, included the border security provision passed out of the Homeland Security Committee, chaired by your Republican chairman, passed out on a voice vote, essentially unanimously, is included in our bill.

So, on the border security issue, we apparently have a very broad-based agreement on that issue. The gentleman says you want to do it individually. The gentleman knows that the Judiciary Committee has passed out individual, discrete bills dealing with discrete parts of the immigration issue, what you say is a broken system.

Bring out discretely those bills. The bill that the Homeland Security reported out unanimously has not been brought to the floor. The four bills that have been reported out of the Judiciary Committee have not been brought up to the floor. They were passed months and months and months ago.

So that if you don't want to do a comprehensive—if that is the view of the majority leader, Mr. Speaker, then I would suggest to the majority leader that he bring out discrete bills, individual bills, not comprehensive, and see if we can deal with those.

I will tell you our disappointment also is that it was not only the Senate bill that was rejected, but the Speaker put out some principles with respect to comprehensive—or immigration reform, I won't call it comprehensive, put out some principles.

We received those positively. We thought that was a positive step. Unfortunately, those—the Speaker's proposal were rejected apparently by a very large number of your party in and outside of this institution. As a result, 6 days after he issued the principles, he said that they were not going to be pursued.

Yes, we were frustrated and disappointed with that because we thought the Speaker had taken a positive step forward. I don't know whether the majority leader was. Mr. Speaker, part of those principles, but in any event, we accepted them as good-faith efforts to come to an agreement, and we were prepared to pursue discussions on those principles. Unfortunately, as I say, the Speaker withdrew them.

Mr. Speaker, I am prepared to yield back the balance of my time, unless the majority leader wants me to yield to him.

I yield back the balance of my time.

ADJOURNMENT TO MONDAY,
APRIL 7, 2014

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.

WATERS OF THE UNITED STATES

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

Mr. LAMALFA. Mr. Speaker, the Environmental Protection Agency and the Army Corps of Engineers has proposed under waterways of the United States rules that the EPA claims jurisdiction not just over nearly every navigable waterway, but virtually every body of water in the Nation, no matter how large or how small.

Using a creative interpretation of a 40-year-old law, the EPA argues that it holds jurisdiction over any activities that could conceivably impact not just navigable waters, but any waterway that eventually flows into a river, even a waterway or wetland, which is simply near a navigable waterway.

Furthermore, the EPA doesn't stop at claiming control over water. It also claims control over any activity that could impact those waters in any way. This rule drastically limits private property rights by inserting the Federal Government into local land use decisions.

The rule would also expand EPA's authority from rivers, bays, and wetlands into manmade waterways like storm drains, drain ditches, farm ponds—unconnected in any way to a waterway—and even puddles. That's right, puddles.

EPA's first draft of that rule specifically exempted puddles. Tellingly, the final draft does not exempt them anymore.

Mr. Speaker, enough is enough. It is time to put an end to the government overreach and defund these efforts in the appropriations process and ensure that only America's elected representative make the laws that govern the Nation.

VERA HOUSE'S WHITE RIBBON CAMPAIGN

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

Mr. MAFFEI. Mr. Speaker, I rise today, with what is left of my voice, to support Vera House's 20th annual White Ribbon campaign. For more than 35 years, Vera House has played a crucial role in combating domestic and sexual violence.

Located in the Syracuse area in my district, Vera House provides a safe shelter, counseling services, and other services for rape and sexual abuse victims and helps survivors rebuild their lives. It also provides life-saving prevention and education throughout central New York.

It is critically important that we continue to support Vera House's ongoing mission to end domestic abuse and sexual violence and to empower the victims to promote equality and respect in relationships.

The White Ribbon campaign encourages all members of the community to join those efforts and to demonstrate such support by wearing a white ribbon.

I urge my colleagues to support Vera House's White Ribbon Campaign to raise awareness of sexual and domestic violence.

□ 1415

COMMENDING CHICAGO ON INITIATING NEW POLICIES

(Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I rise to commend the mayor of the city of Chicago for initiation of a new set of policies designed to help facilitate the reentry of individuals with criminal records back into normal and productive life.

These policies include apprenticeship and job opportunities with the Chicago Transit Authority, city departments, and other municipal agencies, and—on a limited basis—the ability to access public housing as a place to live.

These are important initiatives for the reentry into community and for the citizens of Chicago. I commend Mayor Rahm Emanuel.

EXTENDING UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2013, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. LEVIN) for 60 minutes as the minority leader.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Speaker, several of us come together to talk about unemployment insurance.

The majority leader said to accept the Senate bill is to accept the status quo. That is simply not correct. No, it is not accepting the status quo; it is whether we will penalize over 2 million long-term unemployed looking for work who have lost their unemployment insurance because of the overall economic situation in this country that is getting better, but for them, not nearly good enough. So don't raise the issue of the status quo as a reason to penalize over 2 million Americans.

Mr. Speaker, 2 months ago, a number of us invited a number of unemployed workers to be our guests at the President's State of the Union Address. We wanted to give a voice to the over 2 million Americans who have had their unemployment benefits cut off.

When these jobseekers told their stories one by one, I thought to myself: This is America, these are folks who come from every walk of life, who have worked hard, very hard, and who have played by the rules in pursuit of the American dream; now, they have lost their jobs, through no fault of their own, and they are desperately seeking new employment.

You can understand their complete bewilderment when uninformed people call them lazy, and you can feel their utter disbelief that their government apparently has abandoned them.

My guest for the State of the Union Address was Josie Maisano from St. Clair Shores, Michigan. Josie proudly told us she had worked since she was a teenager, but now, at age 60, she could not find a job.

Her unemployment benefits were helping her to keep her head above water as she searched for work, but when her benefits were cut off, she fell behind on her mortgage payments, struggled to keep the power on, and worried about becoming homeless, worried about that every day.

Josie and over 2 million Americans just like her are desperately waiting to see if this Congress will finally act to help those seeking jobs, not saying we are ratifying the status quo, but as I said to the majority leader, not letting the status quo—which is changing a bit but not enough—let that status quo penalize her.

Indeed, the good news is that the Senate is expected to take that critical step on Monday by passing bipartisan legislation—bipartisan legislation—to retroactively extend the unemployment insurance program through May.

So the question is this: Whether this House will also act or will it leave town and leave America's jobseekers in the lurch?

If every Member of this Chamber will simply take a few minutes to talk with unemployed workers in their district, to people like Josie, I have no doubt we will do the right thing and act; but up to this point, action has been scant, while the excuses have been plentiful.

We have heard that an extension of unemployment benefits must be paid for, even though these emergency benefits have traditionally not been offset, but the Senate unemployment extension is fully paid for with bipartisan offsets, so end of excuse.

We have heard that any legislation extending unemployment benefits must also create jobs, but the CBO has estimated that continuing emergency unemployment benefits would create 200,000 jobs by raising consumer demand, so, again, end of excuse.

We have heard that extended unemployment benefits aren't needed any more because the economy has recovered. The economy certainly has improved from the depths of the Great Recession, but we continue to have near-record rates of long-term unemployment.

Indeed, the percentage of those long-term unemployed in this country are the largest in our records, and we have never cut off these benefits in the past with anything close to this level of long-term unemployment, so end of that excuse.

Again, we have heard that it is too late to help the unemployed because the Federal UI program has been expired for too long, but as the whip said,