

That said, a principle function and what the American people are expecting of us is that we pass these 12 appropriations bills. So if what is referred to as the August recess is brought to this body for a vote, I will vote "no." I'll encourage every Member of this body to vote "no," Democrat and Republican. When an organization is facing profound challenges, you do what you must do to set it on a better course. It may be House tradition to break, but I submit that it's not wise.

Mr. Speaker, I really believe we ought to be in session 6 days a week, starting at 8 a.m.—earlier, if it were up to me—and then end around 7 p.m. Six days a week. I'm convinced that just that pressure alone would help us to find some common ground that I know exists in this place. That's why I call for a change in the calendar.

#### THE FUTURE OF PUBLIC BROADCASTING

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER) for 5 minutes.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, I listened to my friend from Virginia. I respect his opinion; but with all due respect, I think we've got a more fundamental problem than the calendar. The Republican leadership refuses to allow a conference committee on the budget between the House and the Senate to reconcile our differences. We can be here 24 hours a day, 7 days a week; but if the Republican leadership refuses to allow the process to work, we're not going to get anywhere. And that's where we are right now.

My friends on the Appropriations Committee refuse to deal with the budget level that was passed into law 2 years ago that fixed us on a course. They have a level of funding that is literally slashing and burning Federal spending. The latest manifestation of this battle is putting in jeopardy the very existence of public broadcasting.

I would have hoped that we were past that when the last Congress targeted NPR and tried to defund the Corporation for Public Broadcasting. Luckily, the 170 million Americans who don't just listen or watch public broadcasting, but depend on it, unleashed an unprecedented show of support. As a result, the Republican leadership walked it back.

One good thing about that budget battle 2 years ago was that it called for a study to look for alternatives for the 14 percent of Federal money that supports public broadcasting. The study is in and it clearly shows there's no viable alternative to those 14 cents on the dollar.

Many of the proposals that have been suggested would actually result in less money, overall, for public broadcasting in the long term. Yet the House appropriations bill, we're told, is going to eliminate Corporation for Public Broadcasting funding.

Last summer, I had a fascinating conversation with my friend Ken Burns, who pointed out that his six projects in the pipeline would never have been made, let alone be seen, without funding for the Corporation for Public Broadcasting. So I hope you enjoyed his show last fall about the Dust Bowl, because if the Republicans have their way, you will never see his programs about the Roosevelts, Jackie Robinson, Vietnam, or Hemingway.

Remember how well it worked for Governor Romney when he singled out broadcasting as one of the five projects that he would defund? The Republicans, sadly, pander to a tiny fraction of the American public that is even a minority in their own party. Polls show two-thirds of Republicans surveyed would either keep funding for public broadcasting where it is or increase it. What resonates with some Republican primary voters is not what America wants, needs, or believes.

The unprecedented threat comes at exactly the time when America needs public broadcasting the most. "NPR News," the object of the greatest Republican scorn, is the most trusted brand in American news media. PBS shows like "Sesame Street" have helped three generations of parents raise their children with effective, commercial-free educational program.

Locally owned news is becoming only a memory for most America, as large corporations buy up local stations and newspapers. There's no money to be made by commercial stations that cater to the special needs of rural and small-town America. Luckily, public broadcasting is there because their mission is to inform and serve, not just make money.

We must stop the attack on this critical service, especially for rural and small-town America. It's time for the 170 million Americans who depend on public broadcasting every month to again fight back and for Congress to finally listen. The radical proposal to slash public broadcasting, defund NPR, to terminate public broadcasting as we know it is a powerful signal of how far out of step the Republican leadership is from the country they're supposed to represent.

There's no reason to make public broadcasting, which Republicans including Barry Goldwater, helped launch, into a partisan issue. Public broadcasting has broad support from Republicans, independents, and Democrats alike. That's why PBS and its member stations were named number one in public trust and an excellent use of tax dollars for 10 years in a row.

It's time for the people who believe in public broadcasting to stand up to this extremism and settle the question once and for all about the future of public broadcasting. Unless we fight now, there may be nothing left to defend.

#### RULE OF LAW

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. GOSAR) for 5 minutes.

Mr. GOSAR. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to shed light on Attorney General Eric Holder's blatant disregard for the rule of law. Mr. Holder's violations of the law are egregious, and he should not be immune from prosecution or given license to act without restraint.

An ordinary citizen would go to jail for selling guns to Mexican drug cartels. An ordinary citizen would go to jail for secretly obtaining phone records and emails. An ordinary citizen would go to jail for lying to Congress about an investigation. What would happen to an ordinary citizen for lying to a judge? This is just a small part of what Attorney General Eric Holder is responsible for.

As Supreme Court Justice Brandeis said:

In a government of laws, the existence of the government will be imperiled if it fails to observe the law scrupulously. If government becomes a lawbreaker, it breeds contempt for law. It invites every man to become a law unto himself. It invites anarchy.

I ask you, has Attorney General Eric Holder invited anarchy?

I will continue to make this case here in the people's House at the people's pulpit. Folks, I will be back.

#### COAL ASH AND ENERGY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. QUIGLEY) for 5 minutes.

Mr. QUIGLEY. Mr. Speaker, we can do better. When it comes to legislatively establishing a national energy policy to address climate change, we can and must do better. But we're not. As Members of this body, we're not doing anything. Why?

We are hamstrung by our inability to work together to do great, important, vital things here in this Chamber: things like addressing our national debt, tackling comprehensive immigration reform, and to ever, in the history of this Nation, establish a national energy plan. The only way forward is to establish a national energy plan to address climate change, something this great Nation has always lacked, and to work with public and private entities alike to get this done.

For the climate doubters out there who still question climate change, I remind them that over 200 peer-reviewed scientific studies have said that climate change is real and that man contributes significantly to it. And zero scientific peer-reviewed studies have said the opposite.

So we must craft a plan that focuses on working with the business community hand-in-hand to be competitive internationally. We must go toe-to-toe with India and China. We must craft a plan that focuses on public transportation and green infrastructure. We must pass a multiyear transportation bill. We must focus on conservation, as