



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 112th CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

Vol. 158

WASHINGTON, MONDAY, JANUARY 23, 2012

No. 9

House of Representatives

The House met at noon and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Ms. FOXX).

DESIGNATION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Speaker:

WASHINGTON, DC,
January 23, 2012.

I hereby appoint the Honorable VIRGINIA FOXX to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

JOHN A. BOEHNER,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

MORNING-HOUR DEBATE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of January 17, 2012, the Chair will now recognize Members from lists submitted by the majority and minority leaders for morning-hour debate.

The Chair will alternate recognition between the parties, with each party limited to 1 hour and each Member other than the majority and minority leaders and the minority whip limited to 5 minutes each, but in no event shall debate continue beyond 1:50 p.m.

HONORING TUSKEGEE AIRMEN

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

Mr. COHEN. Madam Speaker, this weekend a movie opened in America that is really unlike any other movie. It is a significant movie because it is about a group of gentleman who won the Congressional Gold Medal, the Tuskegee Airmen. They were the first black airmen in the United States military history.

It's part of black history; but beyond black history, it's American history. Because as I watched the movie yester-

day in Memphis, in a largely African American crowd, I realized this was a story about America's progress and fulfilling its promise and about the problems we've had and have had to overcome.

The Tuskegee Airmen were men that wanted to fight for their country in World War II, but they weren't allowed to because of segregationist policies that we had at the time. The military wasn't integrated, and they didn't think African Americans were capable of serving as pilots and weren't allowed to do so. They had an experimental group set up in Tuskegee, Alabama, the Tuskegee Institute, to train black Army personnel who wanted to be pilots. They succeeded, and they formed the Tuskegee Airmen. They had many obstacles, but they beat the odds and they succeeded. They rose to the challenge. They dispelled myths that African Americans weren't courageous enough, weren't skilled enough, weren't smart enough.

On Friday, at the request of the family, I spoke at the funeral of Lieutenant Colonel Luke Weathers, Jr. Lieutenant Colonel Weathers was from Memphis originally and died in Tucson, Arizona, at age 90. He was one of the first Tuskegee Airmen. He was buried on Friday at Arlington National Cemetery with full military honors, family present, seven horses—six drawing the carriage and the riderless horse—a military flyover, 21-gun salute passed, an American hero being laid to rest in hallowed ground, sacred ground, Arlington National Cemetery.

Lieutenant Colonel Weathers not only had to fight the Germans and fight for his country, he had to fight his country to be accepted and benefit in the basic rights that we all take for granted. To learn about Lieutenant Colonel Weathers and the Tuskegee Airmen is inspiring. And during Black History Month, we will reflect and we celebrate other struggles and accom-

plishments of many African Americans in our history, African Americans who came here in about 1620 as slaves and didn't get freedom from slavery until 1865, and then didn't get real freedom until Jim Crow laws were overturned in the 1960s. The vestiges of slavery and Jim Crow still live with us. Those who overcame those obstacles and broke down barriers were heroes and need to be recognized in the middle of month of February.

At one time, they said African Americans couldn't play baseball, and Jackie Robinson showed them wrong. They said African Americans couldn't be quarterbacks, and Doug Williams and others showed them wrong. They couldn't be coaches. Bill Russell took the Celtics to championships, and Tony Dungy in 2007 won a Super Bowl championship. They couldn't be pitchers and certainly couldn't play tennis. Well, Arthur Ashe showed them wrong. In golf, there is nobody in the world better than Tiger Woods.

And, you know, it's amazing that in this day and time, there are still barriers to be broken. At one time, people thought that an African American couldn't be President of the United States, wouldn't be capable of such. Well, we know that's wrong; but, unfortunately, there are still people in this country who think that the President can't be their President because of his race. Some even refer to him as a "food stamp President." We know that code is wrong. I would ask anybody who thinks that way or has those thoughts to know that they are backwards thinking, just like the people were in the 1940s who said that black people couldn't participate in our military and couldn't fly for our country and that the Red Tails couldn't shoot down the Germans and protect our bombers, as they did. Those days are past.

I would ask everybody to see the movie, remember the Tuskegee Airmen, realize how far our country has

□ This symbol represents the time of day during the House proceedings, e.g., □ 1407 is 2:07 p.m.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.



Printed on recycled paper.

H83

come, and get beyond any bigotry that we have in ourselves. This is a Nation of tolerance and diversity, and we must celebrate it. I encourage everybody to learn about black history and the Tuskegee Airmen, our great vehicle.

FREEDOM AND THE INTERNET, VICTORIOUS

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

Mr. MCCLINTOCK. Madam Speaker, long ago, Jefferson warned: "The natural progress of things is for liberty to yield and government to gain ground." The exceptions to that rule have been few and far between recently; and they ought to be celebrated when they occur, as one did just this past week with the announcement that the supporters of the so-called Stop Online Privacy Act and the Protect Intellectual Property Act have indefinitely postponed their measures after an unprecedented protest across the Internet.

SOPA and PIPA pose a crippling danger to the Internet because they use legitimate concern over copyright infringement as an excuse for government to intrude upon and regulate the very essence of the Internet—the unrestricted and absolutely free association that links site to site, providing infinite pathways for commerce, discourse, and learning. It is not the Internet, per se, that sets the stage for a quantum leap in human knowledge advancement but, rather, the free association that's at the core of the Internet; and this is precisely what SOPA and PIPA directly threaten.

But as dangerous as this concept is to the Internet, it pales in comparison to the danger it poses to our fundamental freedoms as Americans. It is true that rogue Web sites operating from offshore havens are stealing intellectual property and then selling it. We already have very good laws against that, as evidenced by the arrest yesterday of Mr. Kim Schmitz and his associates in New Zealand who stand accused of operating one of the biggest of these rogue sites.

Theft of intellectual property is fundamentally no different than the theft of any other kind of property. It should be taken no less seriously than the thefts perpetrated by the likes of Bernie Madoff or John Dillinger or Willie Sutton. It is no different, and it should be treated no differently. In every such case, it is the individual who commits the theft; and it is the individual who is culpable and the individual who is accountable to the law; and it's the individual who is also accorded the right of due process, including the presumption of innocence while he stands accused. That's what SOPA and PIPA destroy.

Upon mere accusation, these measures would allow the government to shut down Web sites, ruin honest busi-

nesses, impound property, disrupt legitimate speech, and dragoon innocent third parties into enforcing laws that may or may not have been broken.

□ 1210

When property is stolen, we hold accountable the individuals who knowingly commit the act and place the burden of proof on the accuser. The accuser must demonstrate to the satisfaction of the jury that the defendant stole property or that he received property that he knew was stolen.

Yes, it is a ponderous system. Yes, it means you actually have to provide evidence. Yes, it means you have to convince a jury. Yes, it means that we can't catch and successfully prosecute every criminal. But the experience of mankind over centuries has proven that this is the best possible way to protect the innocent and protect our freedom while also punishing the guilty. In part, we punish the guilty to discourage others that we might not be able to punish.

As the arrests yesterday in New Zealand prove, it works. Let Mr. Schmitz and his confederates be extradited, and let them have their day in court. Let evidence be presented. Let a jury be convinced of that evidence. And if convicted of one of the greatest thefts in human history, let us mete out the full measure of punishment provided by the law to stand as a fearsome example to others.

This doesn't and won't stop all theft, and it isn't perfect. But to replace it with one where mere accusation can bring punishment or inflict ruinous costs upon innocent third parties would introduce a despotic and destructive concept that is antithetical to the ancient rights that our government was formed to protect.

The developments of the last few weeks have saved the Internet and saved these fundamental principles, at least for now. But Jefferson was right that the natural order is for government to grow at the expense of liberty. That's why we have our Constitution.

As to the protection of that Constitution, the Internet has now empowered its rightful owners—"we, the people"—to defend it more effectively than ever before, which leads me, Madam Speaker, to conclude that because of the events of the past week, we will see many more victories for freedom in the days and years to come.

CONGRATULATING BRUCE MCMILLAN

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

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Madam Speaker, I rise today to honor the career of an Eagle Scout who is planning for retirement after 37 years of distinguished professional service to the Boy Scouts of America. Bruce "Trip" McMillan will retire as the

Area 4 director for the Northeast Region of the Boy Scouts of America.

Bruce McMillan received his bachelor's degree from Montclair State University. He is a Vigil Honor member of the Order of the Arrow and a Wood Badge recipient. He has staffed jamborees, camp schools, and countless training events.

His career serving America's youth began in 1975 as a district executive in Wayne, New Jersey. Since then, he went on to serve as a Scout executive in Maryland, New York, New Jersey, and Pennsylvania. Trip was then promoted to the Northeast Region Area 4 staff in 2001 and Area 4 director in 2008.

In all capacities, Trip has served with great distinction, earning the respect and admiration of all he has served over a remarkable career. Congratulations to Trip and his devoted wife, Diane.

Madam Speaker, I am honored to recognize a friend and scouting professional who has touched the lives of so many youth in his service to scouting. Well done, Scouter.

KEYSTONE XL PIPELINE

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

Mr. HARPER. Madam Speaker, I am deeply disappointed by President Obama's decision to deny TransCanada's application to build the Keystone XL pipeline. I know that many of my colleagues in the House, Members of the Senate, and citizens across this country share my disappointment and near disbelief. I say "near" disbelief rather than "complete" because while an approval of the application made sense to so many, I had a feeling that the President would continue down a path of making political decisions instead of decisions based on merit and what is best for our country, much like the knee-jerk reaction and decision to shut down drilling in the Gulf of Mexico after the Deepwater Horizon explosion on April 20, 2010.

Instead of shutting down the negligent parties involved in the explosion, the President shut down an entire industry for 6 months, and then it took almost another 6 months before the first permit was issued—almost a 1-year delay that cost thousands of families their jobs. While the President may talk about energy independence, I question whether he understands the role that oil plays in our economy and will continue to play in our Nation's energy portfolio. Even worse would be if he does understand and is just making political decisions.

The application for Keystone XL has been pending for over 3 years; and even though history shows that these types of applications generally take 18 months to approve, the President said that a February 21, 2012, deadline imposed by Congress did not give him enough time to properly review the application. The Keystone XL application

was pending for twice as long as a normal application. The President's argument about not having enough time to make a decision to approve the project is weak, at best. The application was filed more than 3 years ago, and a final decision on whether to let the pipeline go forward was long, long overdue.

Unfortunately, I believe the wrong decision has been made. And if he didn't want to approve it for environmental reasons, I wonder if thought was given to the fact that China wants the oil if the United States does not get it, and that means putting the oil on tankers, which we know would have a much more negative impact on the environment than pipelines.

Mr. Speaker, the United States needs the XL Keystone pipeline. In his first term in office, the President has loosely talked about the need for energy independence. Keystone XL could help provide the United States with the certainty of almost a million barrels of oil a day, and that oil comes from our friend and largest trading partner, Canada, not the Middle East. At a time when the price at the pump continues to fluctuate—in part due to uncertainty in the Middle East—I cannot understand how the President justified denying the transport of friendly Canadian oil to our gulf coast refineries.

When the President took office in January 2009, the average cost of a gallon of gas was \$1.83. On January 23, 2012, AAA reports that the current average is \$3.83 per gallon. The record for the highest annual average price for a gallon of gasoline ever in our Nation's history was set in 2011. A major factor in recent high prices is continued political tension in the Middle East and North Africa. These events have threatened or disrupted huge quantities of oil, causing great fear among investors. It is beyond evident that America needs relief.

The President has struggled with turning the economy around since taking office 3 years ago, and his speeches often center on the subject of jobs. Mr. Speaker, I hope that the President realizes that his denial of the Keystone XL application is costing our country tens of thousands of jobs. An analysis by the Perryman Group, an economic consultant in Texas, has demonstrated the tremendous job-creating potential of this project. It is the reason that six major labor unions have signed project labor agreements to construct the pipeline. These are good-paying American jobs that union members are eager to fill. However, instead of issuing the necessary permits to begin construction of the pipeline and put Americans to work, the administration drags its feet for over 3 years and at the end of that time denied an estimated 120,000 Americans jobs to provide a way to support their families.

Pro-business groups like Americans for Prosperity and the Chamber of Commerce support Keystone XL as a way to give a much-needed boost to the economy. Pro-labor groups support

Keystone XL because they know it will create jobs. Americans across the country asked President Obama to approve this project. They realized its importance but were clearly ignored.

The Keystone XL pipeline is just one example of how House Republicans have been working to promote job creation without the need for "stimulus" money. While the President decided to pander to his extreme environmentalist supporters in a campaign year instead of keeping the best interests of the American people at heart, I do not believe that this battle is over.

Our country needs the pipeline. We need these jobs. We need cheaper gas at the pumps, and I'm committed to working towards alternative ways to get it back.

KEYSTONE XL PIPELINE WILL CREATE JOBS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania). The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from North Carolina (Ms. FOXX) for 5 minutes.

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, unemployment is still at an all-time high; and the high cost of energy is having a significant negative impact on my district's economy as well as on the economy of the entire country.

But when President Obama had the opportunity to help job creation and lower energy costs, he turned his back on hardworking American taxpayers. And as my colleague from Mississippi has just spelled out, we have just seen the highest energy costs ever in this country last year, and the cost of gasoline itself has more than doubled under this President.

President Obama has done all he can to stand in the way of businesses that can help get Americans back to work. The Keystone XL pipeline is a \$7 billion private sector infrastructure project that will create 20,000 jobs with its construction and an estimated 100,000 indirect jobs during the life of its operation.

For the 3 years that President Obama has been in office, he's delayed this project for political benefit in order to placate his liberal base. Liberals who oppose this project say that these jobs are "temporary" and somehow of less value. This is not just misguided, but insulting. All construction jobs, by their essence, are temporary. No construction project is permanent. It's a dangerous precedent these groups are setting by denigrating hardworking Americans for the type of work they perform.

The President is in full campaign mode. He's more interested in protecting his job than allowing the private sector to create jobs.

Mr. Speaker, we cannot continue to import energy from Middle Eastern countries. North American energy will lead to energy security, lower energy costs, and more jobs for Americans.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess until 2 p.m. today.

Accordingly (at 12 o'clock and 20 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess until 2 p.m.

□ 1400

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker at 2 p.m.

PRAYER

The Chaplain, the Reverend Patrick J. Conroy, offered the following prayer: Dear God, we give You thanks for giving us another day.

We ask Your special blessing upon the Members of this people's House. They face difficult decisions in difficult times, with many forces and interests demanding their attention.

In these days, as the second session is poised to be fully engaged, give wisdom to all of the Members, that they might execute their responsibilities to the benefit of all Americans.

Bless them, O God, and be with them and with us all this day and every day to come. May all that is done be for Your greater honor and glory. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER. The Chair has examined the Journal of the last day's proceedings and announces to the House his approval thereof.

Pursuant to clause 1, rule I, the Journal stands approved.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER. Will the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. JOHNSON) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

OBAMA'S ACTIVIST EPA MUST BE STOPPED

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

Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, here is the simple truth: the Obama administration is driven by a far left liberal ideology rather than the facts. This administration says it wants to put America back to work, but through its policies is doing the exact opposite. For example, because of the EPA's new train wreck of regulation, up to 160 direct jobs will be lost with the accelerated closure of Beverly, Ohio's Muskingum coal-fired power plant.

This train wreck of regulation is the most expensive regulation that the EPA has ever mandated. These costs will ultimately be passed on to hard-working families in the form of higher utility rates. This new disastrous regulation will also cost southern Ohio many indirect jobs related to the coal industry. No matter how you look at it, the President has declared war on the coal industry and the jobs that go with it.

It is time for this administration to get serious about creating real jobs, creating an energy policy that puts America first, and ending its war on coal.

RECOGNIZING THE 39TH ANNIVERSARY OF ROE V. WADE AND THE CATHOLIC DIOCESE OF BILOXI IN THE MARCH FOR LIFE

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

Mr. PALAZZO. Madam Speaker, today we pause to mark the 39th anniversary of the Supreme Court ruling of *Roe v. Wade*. No other Supreme Court case has so directly affected the lives of millions of American people, both those who have been touched by abortion and the millions of unborn children whose lives have been taken since 1973.

I and many of my colleagues will continue to speak out on behalf of these unborn children by supporting legislation such as the Life at Conception Act. I am thankful we have hundreds of thousands of friends in the fight that have gathered in the streets of Washington this week in memory of so many lives lost. I am especially grateful to the 150 youths with the Catholic Diocese of Biloxi who have made the trip all the way from my district in south Mississippi.

Today I ask my colleagues to join with me and our friends with the March of Life in marking this sad day and resolving to put an end to this murderous practice of taking unborn life. I pray, as Christ did in Luke 23:34, "Father, forgive them, for they know not what they do."

HONORING CLEON KIMBERLING

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

Mr. GARDNER. Madam Speaker, I rise today to honor Cleon Kimberling. Dr. Kimberling was recently honored by Colorado State University's Department of Animal Science as the livestock leader of the year.

Dr. Kimberling is now 81 years old and has dedicated his life to improving livestock health. He received a degree in veterinary medicine from Colorado State in 1959 and since that time has made significant contributions to the veterinary science field.

One of Dr. Kimberling's achievements includes developing tests that

contributed to the eradication of brucellosis in the dairy industry. He has also successfully advocated for different nutrition standards for sheep, leading to an overall increase in the health of our sheep herds nationwide.

His dedication to animal health started at a very young age when an outbreak of disease occurred on his farm. Since that point, he has dedicated a lifetime to veterinary medicine, stopping disease outbreaks and advocating prevention.

Aside from his medical successes, he is also an avid cyclist. In fact, his business card states that he specializes in both sheep health and bicycling. At 65, Dr. Kimberling completed a bike trip from Oceanside, California, to Bar Harbor, Maine. This trip was over 3,500 miles long.

His support for agriculture has helped many farmers and ranchers prevent disease and improve our livestock industry. These stories highlight an amazing man, and I am proud to honor Dr. Cleon Kimberling from the House floor.

NATIONAL DEBT NOW EQUAL TO ECONOMY

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

Mr. BURGESS. Madam Speaker, Congress is now back into session and reconvening, hitting a dubious milestone. The national debt is now larger than the entire economy of the United States. Earlier this month, USA Today reported on this, and the numbers are daunting. The amount of money the Federal Government owes to its creditors tops \$15.23 trillion. President Obama's own budget from last year shows the debt increasing by \$1 trillion a year over the next 10 years, topping out at \$26 trillion a decade from now.

Put into perspective, other countries have similar situations: Greece, Iceland, Ireland, Italy, Japan—the very countries that are responsible for the European debt crisis. At the same time, the administration, over the last 3 years, has pushed a very aggressive spending agenda which includes a government takeover of health care, government takeover of banks, and \$800 billion in stimulus funding.

House Republicans passed well over 20 jobs bills last year that have yet to come up for a vote in the Senate. I encourage the other body to take up these pieces of legislation. We have got to get our country back to work. We need to grow more taxpayers, not raise taxes.

□ 1410

SENATOR MARK KIRK

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

Mr. DOLD. Madam Speaker, this morning we learned that Senator MARK KIRK suffered a stroke over the weekend. I know all of my colleagues here in the House join me in expressing our thoughts and prayers not only to Senator KIRK but to his family, his friends, and his staff for a quick and speedy recovery.

As many of you know, I succeeded MARK in this body. He served here for 10 years before moving on to the Senate. He has been a friend and a mentor and still is to this day.

One thing that I know about MARK is that MARK is a fighter. MARK fought for 10 years to represent the people of the 10th District of Illinois, battling human rights violations around the globe, battling for a strong U.S.-Israel relationship, battling for the environment, battling for hardworking American taxpayers. As a Senator, he's doing that for the people of Illinois.

As a commander in the United States Navy, he's fought to protect our borders and our way of life. Today he is fighting to make sure that he can come back to the United States Senate to work on the things that he holds dear.

I join with all of my colleagues in hopes that he will be back here shortly, and I welcome the opportunity to walk across the aisle down here across the Capitol and welcome my friend back.

MARCH FOR LIFE

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

Mr. YODER. Madam Speaker, I rise today to welcome the tens of thousands of people traveling to Washington, D.C., to show their support for the cause of life and give a voice to those who do not have one.

Since the ruling of *Roe v. Wade* 39 years ago, tragically, over 50 million abortions have occurred in this country. There are over 3,500 abortions a day, 146 an hour, and, sadly, one pregnancy is aborted every 25 seconds.

Each year, the March for Life gives Americans who are heartbroken by these tragedies a time to come together and pray for these lost souls and the families and women hurt by the abortion epidemic in this country.

As we renew our efforts to support legislation that will restore the sanctity of life, I thank all of these impassioned Americans who today chose to come together in support of life.

RECOGNIZING DONALD SCHNEIDER

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

Mr. SHUSTER. It is my privilege today to celebrate the life and mourn the passing of Donald Schneider, a pioneer who transformed the transportation industry through his ingenuity and entrepreneurial spirit.

Mr. Schneider, who was chairman emeritus and former president of

Schneider National, ran one of the Nation's largest trucking companies with over 12,500 tractors, 35,000 trailers, and thousands and thousands of employees. Some of you may recognize those trucks painted in a distinct shade of orange that travel the highways and byways of America.

Mr. Schneider was a hardworking man who began his career driving a truck and as a mechanic's assistant at age 18 in his family's business. He served in Korea, went to the Wharton School of Business in Philadelphia, and began working in the family business in 1961.

Over three decades, Mr. Schneider expanded his fleet substantially, using modern management techniques and acquisition of regional companies to grow his business. Again, his leadership pushed Schneider National to one of the largest trucking companies in America and, of course, one of the most successful, especially after the deregulation which occurred in 1980.

Donald Schneider was a great man who never lost his common touch. He insisted on being called by his first name and, in a 1970 interview, was quoted as saying: My job is important, but not as important as the driver or the people in the service center.

That's how he grew his business—caring about the common man, caring about the customer, and growing his business into one of the great businesses in America.

Mr. Schneider was a man who served with a true servant's heart, and America has been enriched by his service to this country. I invite all Americans to join me in celebrating his life.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess until approximately 4 p.m. today.

Accordingly (at 2 o'clock and 14 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess until approximately 4 p.m. today.

□ 1600

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Ms. FOXX) at 4 p.m.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the Chair will postpone further proceedings today on motions to suspend the rules on which a recorded vote or the yeas and nays are ordered, or on which the vote incurs objection under clause 6 of rule XX.

Record votes on postponed questions will be taken after 6:30 p.m. today.

ROTA CULTURAL AND NATURAL RESOURCES STUDY ACT

Mr. WITTMAN. Madam Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 1141) to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to study the suitability and feasibility of designating prehistoric, historic, and limestone forest sites on Rota, Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands, as a unit of the National Park System.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 1141

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE; FINDINGS.

(a) SHORT TITLE.—This Act may be cited as the "Rota Cultural and Natural Resources Study Act".

(b) FINDINGS.—Congress finds as follows:

(1) The island of Rota was the only major island in the Mariana Islands to be spared the destruction and large scale land use changes brought about by World War II.

(2) The island of Rota has been described by professional archeologists as having the most numerous, most intact, and generally the most unique prehistoric sites of any of the islands of the Mariana Archipelago.

(3) The island of Rota contains remaining examples of what is known as the Latte Phase of the cultural tradition of the indigenous Chamorro people of the Mariana Islands. Latte stone houses are remnants of the ancient Chamorro culture.

(4) Four prehistoric sites are listed on the National Register of Historic Places: Monchon Archeological District (also known locally as Monchon Latte Stone Village), Taga Latte Stone Quarry, the Dugi Archeological Site that contains, latte stone structures, and the Chugai Pictograph Cave that contains examples of ancient Chamorro rock art. Alaguan Bay Ancient Village is another latte stone prehistoric site that is surrounded by tall-canopy limestone forest.

(5) In addition to prehistoric sites, the island of Rota boasts historic sites remaining from the Japanese period (1914–1945). Several of these sites are on the National Register of Historic Places: Nanyo Kohatsu Kabushiki Kaisha Sugar Mill, Japanese Coastal Defense Gun, and the Japanese Hospital.

(6) The island of Rota's natural resources are significant because of the extent and intact condition of its native limestone forest that provides habitat for several federally endangered listed species, the Mariana crow, and the Rota bridled white-eye birds, that are also native to the island of Rota. Three endangered plant species are also found on Rota and two are endemic to the island.

(7) Because of the significant cultural and natural resources listed above, on September 2005, the National Park Service, Pacific West Region, completed a preliminary resource assessment on the island of Rota, Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands, which determined that the "establishment of a unit of the national park system appear[ed] to be the best way to ensure the long term protection of Rota's most important cultural resources and its best examples of its native limestone forest."

SEC. 2. NPS STUDY OF SITES ON THE ISLAND OF ROTA, COMMONWEALTH OF THE NORTHERN MARIANA ISLANDS.

(a) STUDY.—The Secretary of the Interior shall—

(1) carry out a study regarding the suitability and feasibility of designating prehistoric, historic, and limestone forest sites on the island of Rota, Commonwealth of the

Northern Mariana Islands, as a unit of the National Park System; and

(2) consider management alternatives for the island of Rota, Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands.

(b) STUDY PROCESS AND COMPLETION.—Except as provided by subsection (c) of this section, section 8(c) of Public Law 91–383 (16 U.S.C. 1a–5(c)) shall apply to the conduct and completion of the study required by this section.

(c) SUBMISSION OF STUDY RESULTS.—Not later than 3 years after the date that funds are made available for this section, the Secretary shall submit to the Committee on Natural Resources of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources of the Senate a report describing the results of the study.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. WITTMAN) and the gentleman from Northern Mariana Islands (Mr. SABLAN) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Virginia.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. WITTMAN. Madam Speaker, I yield myself as much time as I may consume, and I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous materials on the bill under consideration.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. WITTMAN. Madam Speaker, H.R. 1141 authorizes the Secretary of the Interior to study the suitability and feasibility of designating prehistoric, historic, and limestone forest sites on Rota, Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands, as a unit of the National Park System.

The island of Rota contains cultural and natural resources, including caves with pictographs and several other prehistoric relics as well as sites from the 20th century Japanese occupation. Additionally, Rota has a natural limestone forest that is habitat for endangered species native to the island.

With that, Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SABLAN. I yield myself as much time as I may consume.

(Mr. SABLAN asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SABLAN. Madam Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 1141, the Rota Cultural and Natural Resources Study Act. The bill authorizes the Secretary of the Interior to determine whether it is suitable and feasible to add certain cultural, archeological, historical, and natural resources of the island of Rota in the Northern Marianas to the National Park System.

This same measure was approved by the House in 2010 without dissent, and I hope my colleagues will approve its passage again today.

I want to thank Chairman HASTINGS and Ranking Member MARKEY of the Natural Resources Committee for their support of H.R. 1141. I also want to

thank Chairman BISHOP and Ranking Member GRIJALVA of the Subcommittee on National Parks, Forests and Public Lands for their help in bringing this measure to the floor.

We all understand that resources are limited and that we must not add to the debt our children and grandchildren will be responsible for tomorrow.

At the same time, we owe a debt to our descendants to preserve and protect those resources that we hold in trust for them today. Therefore, when considering adding a unit to the National Park System, we have to balance these two requirements. And we have a well established process for doing so.

The National Park Service began this process on the island of Rota in 2004. A study team assessed the ancient Mochon Latte Stone Village and other sites of the Chamorro people, who first inhabited the Marianas some 3,500 years ago. The team explored the Chugai Cave, containing over 90 pictographs of prehistoric origin. They inventoried the rare species of plants and animals endemic to the limestone forests that still blanket parts of Rota, home to the critically endangered aga, or Marianas crow, and the endangered nosa Luta, or Rota bridled white-eye.

Having completed this field reconnaissance in September of 2005, the Park Service issued a report that concluded there are cultural and natural resources on the island of Rota that are of national significance. The Park Service recommended the next step in designation of a new unit of the Park System: A suitability and feasibility study. And H.R. 1141 authorizes the Secretary of the Interior to take that next step and conduct the necessary study.

I would like to note that the people of Rota look forward to the possibility of having areas of their island added to the National Park System.

It was then-Senator Diego M. Songao of Rota who first encouraged the Park Service to conduct a reconnaissance of the archeological sites on his home island and to determine their importance as part of America's legacy.

Rota Representative Teresita A. Santos testified before the Natural Resources Committee enthusiastically supporting a national park on Rota.

Rota Mayor Melchor A. Mendiola of Rota has added his support to the record, as has Northern Mariana Islands Senate President Paul A. Manglona, who also hails from Rota.

Of course, during the study authorized by H.R. 1141, the people of Rota will continue to have ample opportunity to consider along with the Park Service the suitability and feasibility of including any particular areas of their island in park status.

The people of Rota understand the importance of their culture and of the natural resources and want to pass this on to their children and grandchildren. They also understand that preserving

the remains of ancient Chamorro culture and the plants and animals of the limestone forests of Rota has value today because visitors from elsewhere in the world want to see that which is unique and experience what only Rota has to offer.

Last week, President Obama announced new initiatives to create jobs and spur economic growth in America by improving our visa system and by providing national parks, wildlife refuges, and historic sites to international travelers.

Being the closest part of America to the emerging economies of Asia, the Northern Marianas is eager to see new countries added to our visa waiver program. We want to have the unique cultural and natural resources of our islands added to the national treasures the President intends to promote.

We know that having areas on Rota designated as part of the National Park System will help create jobs in ecotourism, transportation, hotels and restaurants for the people of today. We understand that protecting and preserving these nationally significant resources on Rota will also help ensure jobs for our children and grandchildren in the future.

I urge my colleagues to support passage of H.R. 1141.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. WITTMAN. Madam Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. WITTMAN) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 1141.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds being in the affirmative, the yeas have it.

Mr. WITTMAN. Madam Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, further proceedings on this question will be postponed.

□ 1610

PERMANENT ELECTRONIC DUCK STAMP ACT OF 2011

Mr. WITTMAN. Madam Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 3117) to grant the Secretary of the Interior permanent authority to authorize States to issue electronic duck stamps, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 3117

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Permanent Electronic Duck Stamp Act of 2011".

SEC. 2. DEFINITIONS.

In this Act:

(1) *ACTUAL STAMP.*—The term "actual stamp" means a Federal migratory-bird hunting and

conservation stamp required under the Act of March 16, 1934 (16 U.S.C. 718a et seq.) (popularly known as the "Duck Stamp Act"), that is printed on paper and sold through the means established by the authority of the Secretary immediately before the date of enactment of this Act.

(2) *AUTOMATED LICENSING SYSTEM.*—

(A) *IN GENERAL.*—The term "automated licensing system" means an electronic, computerized licensing system used by a State fish and wildlife agency to issue hunting, fishing, and other associated licenses and products.

(B) *INCLUSION.*—The term "automated licensing system" includes a point-of-sale, Internet, telephonic system, or other electronic applications used for a purpose described in subparagraph (A).

(3) *ELECTRONIC STAMP.*—The term "electronic stamp" means an electronic version of an actual stamp that—

(A) is a unique identifier for the individual to whom it is issued;

(B) can be printed on paper or produced through an electronic application with the same indicators as the State endorsement provides;

(C) is issued through a State automated licensing system that is authorized, under State law and by the Secretary under this Act, to issue electronic stamps;

(D) is compatible with the hunting licensing system of the State that issues the electronic stamp; and

(E) is described in the State application approved by the Secretary under section 4(b).

(4) *SECRETARY.*—The term "Secretary" means the Secretary of the Interior.

SEC. 3. AUTHORITY TO ISSUE ELECTRONIC DUCK STAMPS.

(a) *IN GENERAL.*—The Secretary may authorize any State to issue electronic stamps in accordance with this Act.

(b) *CONSULTATION.*—The Secretary shall implement this section in consultation with State management agencies.

SEC. 4. STATE APPLICATION.

(a) *APPROVAL OF APPLICATION REQUIRED.*—The Secretary may not authorize a State to issue electronic stamps under this Act unless the Secretary has received and approved an application submitted by the State in accordance with this section. The Secretary may determine the number of new States per year to participate in the electronic stamp program.

(b) *CONTENTS OF APPLICATION.*—The Secretary may not approve a State application unless the application contains—

(1) a description of the format of the electronic stamp that the State will issue under this Act, including identifying features of the licensee that will be specified on the stamp;

(2) a description of any fee the State will charge for issuance of an electronic stamp;

(3) a description of the process the State will use to account for and transfer to the Secretary the amounts collected by the State that are required to be transferred to the Secretary under the program;

(4) the manner by which the State will transmit electronic stamp customer data to the Secretary;

(5) the manner by which actual stamps will be delivered;

(6) the policies and procedures under which the State will issue duplicate electronic stamps; and

(7) such other policies, procedures, and information as may be reasonably required by the Secretary.

(c) *PUBLICATION OF DEADLINES, ELIGIBILITY REQUIREMENTS, AND SELECTION CRITERIA.*—Not later than 30 days before the date on which the Secretary begins accepting applications under this section, the Secretary shall publish—

(1) deadlines for submission of applications;

(2) eligibility requirements for submitting applications; and

(3) criteria for approving applications.

SEC. 5. STATE OBLIGATIONS AND AUTHORITIES.

(a) **DELIVERY OF ACTUAL STAMP.**—The Secretary shall require that each individual to whom a State sells an electronic stamp under this Act shall receive an actual stamp—

(1) by not later than the date on which the electronic stamp expires under section 6(c); and

(2) in a manner agreed upon by the State and Secretary.

(b) **COLLECTION AND TRANSFER OF ELECTRONIC STAMP REVENUE AND CUSTOMER INFORMATION.**—

(1) **REQUIREMENT TO TRANSMIT.**—The Secretary shall require each State authorized to issue electronic stamps to collect and submit to the Secretary in accordance with this section—

(A) the first name, last name, and complete mailing address of each individual that purchases an electronic stamp from the State;

(B) the face value amount of each electronic stamp sold by the State; and

(C) the amount of the Federal portion of any fee required by the agreement for each stamp sold.

(2) **TIME OF TRANSMITTAL.**—The Secretary shall require the submission under paragraph (1) to be made with respect to sales of electronic stamps by a State according to the written agreement between the Secretary and the State agency.

(3) **ADDITIONAL FEES NOT AFFECTED.**—This section shall not apply to the State portion of any fee collected by a State under subsection (c).

(c) **ELECTRONIC STAMP ISSUANCE FEE.**—A State authorized to issue electronic stamps may charge a reasonable fee to cover costs incurred by the State and the Department of the Interior in issuing electronic stamps under this Act, including costs of delivery of actual stamps.

(d) **DUPLICATE ELECTRONIC STAMPS.**—A State authorized to issue electronic stamps may issue a duplicate electronic stamp to replace an electronic stamp issued by the State that is lost or damaged.

(e) **LIMITATION ON AUTHORITY TO REQUIRE PURCHASE OF STATE LICENSE.**—A State may not require that an individual purchase a State hunting license as a condition of issuing an electronic stamp under this Act.

SEC. 6. ELECTRONIC STAMP REQUIREMENTS; RECOGNITION OF ELECTRONIC STAMP.

(a) **STAMP REQUIREMENTS.**—The Secretary shall require an electronic stamp issued by a State under this Act—

(1) to have the same format as any other license, validation, or privilege the State issues under the automated licensing system of the State; and

(2) to specify identifying features of the license that are adequate to enable Federal, State, and other law enforcement officers to identify the holder.

(b) **RECOGNITION OF ELECTRONIC STAMP.**—Any electronic stamp issued by a State under this Act shall, during the effective period of the electronic stamp—

(1) bestow upon the licensee the same privileges as are bestowed by an actual stamp;

(2) be recognized nationally as a valid Federal migratory bird hunting and conservation stamp; and

(3) authorize the licensee to hunt migratory waterfowl in any other State, in accordance with the laws of the other State governing that hunting.

(c) **DURATION.**—An electronic stamp issued by a State shall be valid for a period agreed to by the State and the Secretary, which shall not exceed 45 days.

SEC. 7. TERMINATION OF STATE PARTICIPATION.

The authority of a State to issue electronic stamps under this Act may be terminated—

(1) by the Secretary, if the Secretary—

(A) finds that the State has violated any of the terms of the application of the State approved by the Secretary under section 4; and

(B) provides to the State written notice of the termination by not later than the date that is 30 days before the date of termination; or

(2) by the State, by providing written notice to the Secretary by not later than the date that is 30 days before the termination date.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. WITTMAN) and the gentleman from the Northern Mariana Islands (Mr. SABLAN) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Virginia.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. WITTMAN. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous materials on the bill under consideration.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. WITTMAN. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

In 1934, the Congress enacted the Migratory Bird Hunting Stamp Act. This law required hunters to purchase a Federal duck stamp in order to hunt migratory waterfowl. Proceeds from the sale of these stamps have been used to preserve vital wetlands and waterfowl habitats across the country. Every year, hunters, bird watchers, and stamp collectors visit the post office, National Wildlife Refuge, or sporting goods store to purchase their duck stamp.

For the past 4 years, eight States have participated in an electronic duck stamp pilot program. Instead of having to visit a bricks-and-mortar store, hunters and collectors could purchase the duck stamp online. By all accounts, the program has been a tremendous success. Many Americans have enjoyed the convenience of buying a Federal duck stamp over the Internet.

I'm the author of this legislation and would like to see that it continues to allow hunters to electronically purchase the annual Federal duck stamp required to hunt migratory waterfowl. It is time to make this permanent feature a Federal law for a more efficient and faster process. Similar technology is already embraced by States that allow sportsmen to obtain their hunting and fishing licenses online.

And, by the way, many States who require a duck stamp also allow their hunters to purchase the duck stamp online. And as I have spoken with a number of hunters, they also indicate an interest to be able to do this. And especially hunters that may, at the last minute, decide to want to pursue a hunting activity the next day, if they are not in the area where a post office is open, then they are not able to enjoy a day on the water hunting waterfowl.

As a member of the Migratory Bird Conservation Commission and an avid waterfowl hunter, I am proud to spon-

sor this legislation to modernize the distribution of the Federal duck stamp program without burdening the taxpayer.

I want to compliment the lead co-sponsor of this bill, Congressman RON KIND from Wisconsin, for his leadership, his commitment, and his passion on sportsmen's issues and waterfowl conservation. Anybody who knows Representative KIND knows how strongly he feels about this. He has worked on this issue for a number of years, and I thank him for those ongoing efforts.

H.R. 3117 is supported by the Congressional Sportsmen's Foundation and Ducks Unlimited.

I urge support for this bill, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SABLAN. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

(Mr. SABLAN asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SABLAN. Madam Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.R. 3117, which would allow the Secretary of the Interior to continue sale of electronic duck stamps and expands the program to include all 50 States.

The Migratory Bird Hunting and Conservation Stamp, commonly called the "duck stamp," must be purchased and carried by all waterfowl hunters 16 years and older when hunting migratory waterfowl on both public and private land. Ninety-eight cents of every dollar generated by the sales of the duck stamp goes to purchase or lease wetland habitat for the National Wildlife Refuge System, which benefits migratory waterfowl.

In some rural areas, purchasing duck stamps can be difficult, with hunters having to wait a significant amount of time to receive their official duck stamp. Electronic stamps come with a unique identifying number that serves as a proof of purchase and allows hunters to hunt for 45 days until the actual stamp arrives via the postal service.

In October, at the hearing on H.R. 3117, the Fish and Wildlife Service supported the bill's intent to continue the electronic duck stamp program.

I commend my colleagues, Congressman WITTMAN and Congressman RON KIND, for introducing this bill and for their leadership on this issue.

I have no additional speakers, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. WITTMAN. With that, Madam Speaker, we have no further speakers, and I also yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. WITTMAN) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 3117, as amended.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds being in the affirmative, the ayes have it.

Mr. WITTMAN. Madam Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, further proceedings on this question will be postponed.

REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBER
AS COSPONSOR OF H.R. 3261

Mr. LUJÁN. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to remove my name as a cosponsor of H.R. 3261.

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

There was no objection.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess until approximately 6:30 p.m. today.

Accordingly (at 4 o'clock and 16 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess until approximately 6:30 p.m.

□ 1831

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. POE of Texas) at 6 o'clock and 31 minutes p.m.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER
PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, proceedings will resume on motions to suspend the rules previously postponed.

Votes will be taken in the following order:

H.R. 3117 and H.R. 1141, in each case by the yeas and nays.

The first electronic vote will be conducted as a 15-minute vote. The second electronic vote will be conducted as a 5-minute vote.

PERMANENT ELECTRONIC DUCK
STAMP ACT OF 2011

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 3117) to grant the Secretary of the Interior permanent authority to authorize States to issue electronic duck stamps, and for other purposes, as amended, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. WITTMAN) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, as amended.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 373, nays 1, not voting 59, as follows:

[Roll No. 5]

YEAS—373

Ackerman	Duncan (SC)	Lankford
Adams	Duncan (TN)	Larsen (WA)
Aderholt	Edwards	Larson (CT)
Akin	Ellison	Latham
Altmire	Ellmers	Latta
Amash	Emerson	Lee (CA)
Amodei	Engel	Levin
Andrews	Eshoo	Lewis (CA)
Baca	Farenthold	Lewis (GA)
Bachmann	Fattah	Lipinski
Bachus	Fincher	LoBiondo
Barletta	Fitzpatrick	Loeback
Barrow	Fleischmann	Loftgren, Zoe
Bartlett	Fleming	Long
Barton (TX)	Flores	Lowey
Bass (CA)	Forbes	Lucas
Bass (NH)	Fortenberry	Luetkemeyer
Becerra	Fox	Luján
Benishak	Frank (MA)	Lummis
Berg	Franks (AZ)	Lungren, Daniel
Biggart	Frelinghuysen	E.
Bilbray	Fudge	Lynch
Bilirakis	Garamendi	Manzullo
Bishop (GA)	Gardner	Marino
Bishop (NY)	Garrett	Matheson
Bishop (UT)	Gerlach	Matsui
Black	Gibbs	McCarthy (CA)
Blackburn	Gibson	McCarthy (NY)
Blumenauer	Gohmert	McCaul
Boren	Gonzalez	McClintock
Boswell	Goodlatte	McCollum
Boustany	Govdy	McCotter
Braley (IA)	Granger	McDermott
Brooks	Graves (GA)	McGovern
Broun (GA)	Graves (MO)	McHenry
Brown (FL)	Green, Al	McIntyre
Buchanan	Green, Gene	McKinley
Bucshon	Griffin (AR)	McMorris
Buerkle	Griffith (VA)	Rodgers
Burgess	Grimm	McNerney
Burton (IN)	Guthrie	Meehan
Calvert	Hahn	Meeks
Camp	Hall	Mica
Campbell	Hanabusa	Michaud
Canseco	Hanna	Miller (FL)
Cantor	Harper	Miller (MI)
Capito	Harris	Miller (NC)
Capps	Hartzler	Miller, Gary
Capuano	Hastings (FL)	Moore
Cardoza	Hastings (WA)	Mulvaney
Carnahan	Hayworth	Murphy (CT)
Carney	Heck	Murphy (PA)
Carson (IN)	Heinrich	Myrick
Cassidy	Hensarling	Nadler
Castor (FL)	Hergert	Napolitano
Chabot	Herrera Beutler	Neal
Chaffetz	Higgins	Neugebauer
Chandler	Himes	Nugent
Chu	Hinojosa	Nunes
Ciilline	Hirono	Nunnelee
Clarke (MI)	Hochul	Olson
Clarke (NY)	Holden	Olver
Clay	Holt	Owens
Cleaver	Honda	Palazzo
Coble	Hoyer	Pallone
Coffman (CO)	Huelskamp	Pastor (AZ)
Cohen	Huizenga (MI)	Paulsen
Cole	Hultgren	Payne
Conaway	Hunter	Pearce
Connolly (VA)	Hurt	Pelosi
Conyers	Israel	Perlmutter
Cooper	Issa	Peters
Costello	Jackson (IL)	Peterson
Courtney	Jackson Lee	Petri
Crawaack	(TX)	Pingree (ME)
Crawford	Jenkins	Pitts
Crenshaw	Johnson (GA)	Poe (TX)
Critz	Johnson (OH)	Polis
Crowley	Johnson, E. B.	Pompeo
Cuellar	Johnson, Sam	Posey
Cummings	Jones	Price (GA)
Davis (CA)	Jordan	Price (NC)
Davis (KY)	Keating	Quayle
DeGette	Kelly	Quigley
DeLauro	Kildee	Rahall
Dent	King (IA)	Rangel
DesJarlais	King (NY)	Reed
Deutch	Kingston	Rehberg
Diaz-Balart	Kinzinger (IL)	Reichert
Dicks	Kissell	Renacci
Dingell	Kline	Reyes
Doggett	Labrador	Ribble
Donnelly (IN)	Lamborn	Richardson
Doyle	Lance	Richmond
Dreier	Landry	Rigell
Duffy	Langevin	Rivera

Roe (TN)	Scott (SC)	Tsongas
Rogers (AL)	Scott (VA)	Turner (OH)
Rogers (KY)	Scott, Austin	Upton
Rogers (MI)	Scott, David	Van Hollen
Rohrabacher	Serrano	Velázquez
Rokita	Sessions	Visclosky
Rooney	Sewell	Walberg
Ros-Lehtinen	Shimkus	Walden
Roskam	Shuster	Walsh (IL)
Ross (AR)	Simpson	Walz (MN)
Ross (FL)	Sires	Wasserman
Rothman (NJ)	Smith (NE)	Schultz
Roybal-Allard	Smith (NJ)	Waters
Royce	Smith (TX)	Waxman
Runyan	Southerland	Welch
Ruppersberger	Stark	West
Ryan (OH)	Stearns	Westmoreland
Ryan (WI)	Stivers	Wilson (FL)
Sanchez, Loretta	Stutzman	Wilson (SC)
Sarbanes	Sullivan	Wittman
Scalise	Sutton	Wolf
Schakowsky	Terry	Womack
Schiff	Thompson (CA)	Woodall
Schilling	Thompson (MS)	Woodley
Schmidt	Thompson (PA)	Yarmuth
Schock	Thornberry	Yoder
Schrader	Tierney	Young (AK)
Schwartz	Tipton	Young (FL)
Schweikert	Tonko	Young (IN)

NAYS—1

Sensenbrenner

NOT VOTING—59

Alexander	Flake	Miller, George
Austria	Gallegly	Moran
Baldwin	Giffords	Noem
Berkley	Gingrey (GA)	Pascarell
Berman	Gosar	Paul
Bonner	Grijalva	Pence
Bono Mack	Guinta	Platts
Brady (PA)	Gutierrez	Rush
Brady (TX)	Hinchee	Sánchez, Linda
Butterfield	Inslee	T.
Carter	Johnson (IL)	Sherman
Clyburn	Kaptur	Shuler
Costa	Kind	Slaughter
Culberson	Kucinich	Smith (WA)
Davis (IL)	LaTourette	Speier
DeFazio	Mack	Towns
Denham	Maloney	Turner (NY)
Dold	Marchant	Watt
Farr	Markey	Webster
Filner	McKeon	Whitfield

□ 1855

Messrs. DENT and MULVANEY 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. FILNER. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 5, I was away from the Capitol due to prior commitments to my constituents. Had I been present, I would have voted “yea.”

Mr. DOLD. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 5, I was unavoidably, detained. Had I been present, I would have voted “yea.”

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER

The SPEAKER. The Chair wishes to make a brief announcement concerning floor practice.

Members should periodically rededicate themselves to the core principles of proper parliamentary practice that are so essential to maintaining order and deliberacy in the House. The Chair believes that a few of these principles bear emphasis today.

Members should refrain from trafficking the well when another (including the presiding officer) is addressing the House.

Members should wear appropriate business attire during all sittings of the House, however brief their presence on the floor might be.

Members who wish to speak on the floor should respectfully seek and obtain recognition from the presiding officer, taking the time to do so in proper forms (such as “I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute”).

Members should take care to yield and reclaim time in an orderly fashion, bearing in mind that the official reporters of debate cannot properly transcribe two Members simultaneously.

Members should address their remarks in debate to the presiding officer and not to others in the second person or to some perceived viewing audience.

Members should not embellish the offering of a motion, the entry of a request, the making of a point of order, or the entry of an appeal with any statement of motive or other commentary, and should be aware that such utterances could render the motion, request, point of order, or appeal untimely.

Following these basic standards of practice will foster an atmosphere of mutual and institutional respect. It will insure against personal confrontation among individual Members or between Members and the presiding officer. It will facilitate Members’ comprehension of, and participation in, the business of the House. It will enable accurate transcriptions of proceedings. In sum, it will ensure the comity that elevates spirited deliberations above mere argument.

The Chair appreciates the attention of the Members to these matters.

ROTA CULTURAL AND NATURAL RESOURCES STUDY ACT

The SPEAKER. Without objection, 5-minute voting will continue.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 1141) to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to study the suitability and feasibility of designating prehistoric, historic, and limestone forest sites on Rota, Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands, as a unit of the National Park System, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. WITTMAN) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill.

This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 278, nays 100, not voting 55, as follows:

[Roll No. 6]

YEAS—278

Ackerman
Altmire
Amodei
Andrews
Baca
Bachus
Barietta
Barrow
Bartlett
Barton (TX)
Bass (CA)
Bass (NH)
Becerra
Berg
Biggert
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Bishop (UT)
Blumenauer
Boren
Boswell
Boustany
Braley (IA)
Brooks
Brown (FL)
Buchanan
Burton (IN)
Calvert
Camp
Canseco
Cantor
Capito
Capps
Capuano
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carney
Carson (IN)
Castor (FL)
Chaffetz
Chandler
Chu
Cicilline
Clarke (MI)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Cohen
Cole
Connolly (VA)
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Costello
Courtney
Cravaack
Crawford
Crenshaw
Critz
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis (KY)
DeGette
DeLauro
Dent
Deutch
Diaz-Balart
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Dold
Donnelly (IN)
Doyle
Dreier
Duffy
Edwards
Ellison
Elmiers
Emerson
Engel
Eshoo
Fattah
Fincher
Fleming
Fortenberry
Frank (MA)
Frelinghuysen
Fudge
Garamendi
Gerlach

Gonzalez
Graves (MO)
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Griffith (VA)
Grimm
Guinta
Guthrie
Hahn
Hanabusa
Hanna
Harper
Harris
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Heck
Heinrich
Hensarling
Herger
Herrera Beutler
Higgins
Himes
Hinojosa
Hirono
Hochul
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hoyer
Hunter
Hurt
Israel
Issa
Jackson (IL)
Jackson Lee
(TX)
Jenkins
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Jones
Keating
Kelly
Kildee
King (NY)
Kissell
Labrador
Lamborn
Landry
Langevin
Lankford
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
Loeb sack
Lofgren, Zoe
Long
Lowe y
Lucas
Luján
Lungren, Daniel
E.
Lynch
Marino
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (CA)
McCarthy (NY)
McCaul
McClintock
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McHenry
McIntyre
McKinley
McMorris
Rodgers
McNerney
Meeks
Michaud
Miller (NC)
Miller, Gary
Moore
Moran
Murphy (CT)
Murphy (PA)
Myrick
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal

Nunes
Olver
Owens
Pallone
Pastor (AZ)
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters
Peterson
Petri
Pingree (ME)
Polis
Price (GA)
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rahall
Rangel
Rehberg
Reichert
Reyes
Ribble
Richardson
Richmond
Rigell
Rivera
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Ross (AR)
Rothman (NJ)
Roybal-Allard
Runyan
Ruppersberger
Ryan (OH)
Ryan (WI)
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schock
Schrader
Schwartz
Schweikert
Scott (VA)
Scott, Austin
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell
Shimkus
Simpson
Sires
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Speier
Stark
Sullivan
Sutton
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Tonko
Tsongas
Turner (OH)
Upton
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walden
Walz (MN)
Wasserman
Schultz
Waters
Waxman
Welch
West
Wilson (FL)
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Woodall
Woolsey
Yarmuth
Yoder
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

NAYS—100

Adams
Aderholt
Akin
Amash
Bachmann
Benishek
Black
Blackburn
Broun (GA)
Bucshon
Buerkle
Burgess
Campbell
Cassidy
Chabot
Coble
Coffman (CO)
Conaway
DesJarlais
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Farenthold
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Flores
Forbes
Foxy
Franks (AZ)
Gardner
Garrett
Gibbs
Gibson
Gohmert
Goodlatte

NOT VOTING—55

Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Griffin (AR)
Hall
Hartzler
Hayworth
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jordan
King (IA)
Kingston
Kinzinger (IL)
Kline
Lance
Latham
Latta
LoBiondo
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
Manzullo
McCotter
Meehan
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Mulvaney
Neugebauer
Nugent
Nunnelee
Olson

Alexander
Austria
Baldwin
Berkley
Berman
Bonner
Bono Mack
Brady (PA)
Brady (TX)
Butterfield
Carter
Clyburn
Culberson
Davis (IL)
DeFazio
Denham
Farr
Filner
Flake

□ 1908

Mr. YOUNG of Indiana changed his vote from “yea” to “nay.”

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

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated for:

Mr. FILNER. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 6, I was away from the Capitol due to prior commitments to my constituents. Had I been present, I would have voted “yea.”

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. PASCARELL. Mr. Speaker, I want to state for the RECORD that on January 23, 2012, I missed the two rollcall votes of the day.

Had I been present I would have voted “yea” on rollcall vote No. 5, on H.R. 3117—Permanent Electronic Duck Stamp Act of 2011. Additionally, had I been present, I would have voted “yea” on rollcall vote No. 6, on H.R. 1141—Rota Cultural and Natural Resources Study Act.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. GUTIERREZ. Mr. Speaker, I was unavoidably absent for votes in the House Chamber today. Had I been present, I would have voted “yea” on rollcall votes 5 and 6.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. JOHNSON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I had a previously scheduled meeting with constituents in Champaign County Illinois and was unable to attend votes this evening. Had I been present, I would have voted "yea" and "yea" on H.R. 1141, the Rota Cultural and Natural Resources Study Act and H.R. 3117, the Permanent Electronic Duck Stamp Act of 2011.

REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBER
AS COSPONSOR OF H.R. 3261

Mr. ROSS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to remove my name as a cosponsor of H.R. 3261.

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

There was no objection.

NOTICE OF INTENTION TO OFFER
MOTION TO INSTRUCT CON-
FEREES ON H.R. 3630, TEM-
PORARY PAYROLL TAX CUT
CONTINUATION ACT OF 2011

Mrs. CAPPS. Mr. Speaker, under rule XXII, clause 7(c), I hereby announce my intention to offer a motion to instruct on H.R. 3630, the conference report to extend payroll tax, unemployment insurance, and sustainable growth rate payments for doctors.

The form of the motion is as follows:

Mrs. Capps moves that the managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the Senate amendment to the bill H.R. 3630 be instructed to file a conference report not later than February 17, 2012.

□ 1910

REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBER
AS COSPONSOR OF H.R. 3261

Mr. SCALISE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to remove my name as a cosponsor of H.R. 3261.

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

There was no objection.

REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBER
AS COSPONSOR OF H.R. 3261

Mr. GRIFFIN of Arkansas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my name be removed as a cosponsor of H.R. 3261.

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

There was no objection.

REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBER
AS COSPONSOR OF H.R. 3609

Mr. LANKFORD. Mr. Speaker, due to a clerical error, I ask that the name of the gentleman from Michigan, JUSTIN AMASH, be removed as a cosponsor from H.R. 3609.

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

There was no objection.

MARCH FOR LIFE

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

Mr. FLEISCHMANN. Mr. Speaker, I was honored to speak at the March for Life today at the rally on the National Mall earlier today. Thousands of Americans came together in our cause to protect the sanctity of all human life and voice our continued opposition to the decision made in Roe v. Wade.

I am reminded each and every day now how precious life is and why we should stand up for its intrinsic value. It is our belief that life is sacred from the moment of conception until the grave.

That separates us from so many others in the world. Every abortion is a tragedy, but being pro-life isn't just about conception to birth, it's about the entire existence of a person. It encompasses more than just their physical well-being. A soul cannot flourish, a person cannot prosper if they aren't first allowed to live. Being pro-life is also promoting faith, education, jobs and the overall quality of life.

I will continue to fight against the culture of abortion and fight for the right of life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness.

CENTER AISLE CAUCUS

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

Mr. MURPHY of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, I'm so grateful that as we prepare to receive the President tomorrow night for his State of the Union Address that we're going to be joined by our colleague, Congresswoman GABBY GIFFORDS. The courage that she has shone in her long recovery has been an inspiration to all of us, and I'm proud to call her a friend.

Last year, in the aftermath of that terrible and tragic shooting, we came together as a Congress for the State of the Union. We put aside our partisan differences, and we convened as a united body. Republicans sat with Democrats, conservative Members sat with liberal Members. It was a small but symbolic gesture that this place can rise above partnership for the greater good of this Nation.

As cochair of the House's Center Aisle Caucus, I, along with my fellow cochairs are calling on this House to do it again. Tomorrow night, let's sit together, let's show the Nation again that with GABBY in our midst we can be one rather than be divided. Now our small but growing caucus brings together Members who believe that we can discuss issues in a civil and respectful manner. I hope that all of you, all of my colleagues, will join us in an effort to build on the success of last year and start a new bipartisanship tradition in this House.

HONORING FORMER ILLINOIS REP-
RESENTATIVE EDWARD
DERWINSKI

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

Mrs. BIGGERT. Mr. Speaker, I rise today with great sadness to report the passing of former Illinois Representative Edward Derwinski.

Congressman Derwinski dedicated his life to public service, including 24 years here in the House serving Illinois' Fourth District from 1959 to 1983. He passed away on January 15 at the age of 85. Perhaps best known for his colorful and engaging personality, he went on to serve as the Undersecretary of State for National Security Affairs, and in 1989 he led efforts to renew our country's commitment to its veterans as first ever Secretary for Veterans Affairs.

President George H.W. Bush once said of Ed, a former infantryman in World War II, that he had the skill of a seasoned legislator, the patience of a practiced administrator, the finesse of a diplomat, and the heart of a man who knows what it means to start his government career as a private in the United States Army.

Today I join my colleagues in the Illinois delegation in honoring his service to our State and Nation. My thoughts and prayers are with all those who knew him best, especially his wife, Bonnie; son, Michael; daughter, Maureen; stepdaughter, Maggie; stepson, Kevin; sister, Bernadette; and his seven grandchildren.

TRIBUTE TO ARMY MASTER
SERGEANT JOHN F. BAKER, JR.

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

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, last Friday retired Army Master Sergeant John F. Baker, Jr., a recipient of the Medal of Honor, died at the age of 66.

Master Sergeant Baker was a native of Davenport, Iowa, before relocating to South Carolina. My thoughts and prayers are with his wife, Donnell, and the Baker family. Master Sergeant Baker served in Vietnam and received the Medal of Honor after braving intense Communist fire to save the lives of eight American soldiers on November 5, 1966.

Master Sergeant Baker was one of 239 servicemembers to receive our Nation's highest honor for conspicuous gallantry and courage during their service in the Vietnam War. He was also the last Army soldier to be awarded the Medal of Honor and have residency in South Carolina.

Our country is very grateful for the service of Master Sergeant John Baker. He went well beyond the call of duty, sacrificing so much for this great Nation, and will be remembered as a true

American hero, along with the late Colonel Chuck Murray of Columbia.

In conclusion, God bless our troops, and we will never forget September the 11th in the global war on terrorism.

TIME TO STAND UP FOR LIFE

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

Mr. FLEMING. Mr. Speaker, as a family physician for more than 30 years, I've had the privilege of delivering hundreds of babies. I have witnessed the miracle of life itself firsthand, and I believe that every human life at any stage is unique and fully deserving of my protection as a physician. The authority of our government should stand behind the protection of human life.

I am proud to be from Louisiana, a State recently ranked number one on life issues by Americans United for Life. Louisiana has implemented some commonsense protections, including a requirement that any woman seeking an abortion must understand how that unborn child is developing, the pain her child will experience during the abortion, and the facts about risks and the alternatives to abortion.

Louisiana has banned partial birth abortion and prohibits abortion providers from getting taxpayer dollars to pay for abortion services. We are making progress.

But abortion still happens. In the last 39 years, there have been more than 54 million babies terminated. This is a heart-breaking number, and it is past time to end this scourge and protect human life from conception to natural death.

KEYSTONE XL PIPELINE

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

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I was listening to Rush Limbaugh today, as I quite frequently do, and they had a Democrat truck driver, African American Democrat truck driver, come on and he talked for about 4 or 5 minutes, which is unusual, when you listen to Rush, for him to let somebody talk that long.

But this fellow was very intelligent, and his remarks were something I wish everybody, including the President, could hear. And he said, you know, I was a big supporter of President Obama, and I voted for him. He said, but when he stopped that pipeline, which would bring thousands of jobs to America, and also maybe help us lower the price of gasoline and diesel fuel—and I presume he used a lot of diesel fuel—he said that really, really bothered me.

And he said, when they started talking about inflation, whether or not we had it, he said, I'm telling you, there is inflation. I can't hardly afford to buy

groceries or to live anymore. And he said because of that, I'm not going to vote for President Obama this time, I'm going to vote for whoever is running against him.

Now, I hope, since the President is working on his State of the Union speech, he'll take what that African American, intelligent young man said today and take it to heart. It's extremely important that we get that pipeline and start worrying about American jobs.

□ 1920

KEYSTONE XL PIPELINE

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

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, today there are thousands of Americans who are forced to pay \$3.50 a gallon just to fill up their car to get to work. And there are more than 14 million other Americans who can't get to work because they don't have jobs.

Meanwhile, the little fellow from the desert, Ahmadinejad of Iran, threatens to block the Strait of Hormuz and thus control oil shipments and the international price of oil.

The Keystone XL pipeline would bring 700,000 barrels of oil per day from our stable, friendly ally, Canada. And it would bring it down to my district in southeast Texas. It would create at least 20,000 jobs and over 100,000 related jobs. But the administration arbitrarily just said "no" to jobs, "no" to energy, and "no" to national security. This pipeline is in the national interest. Build the pipeline. Make unstable Middle Eastern countries irrelevant. Put Americans back to work, lower the cost of energy.

While the administration continues to say "no" to Americans, Congress has the obligation and legal ability to say "yes" to America.

And that's just the way it is.

LIFE BEGINS AT CONCEPTION

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

Mr. BARTON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, in the spring of 1981, I was applying for the White House Fellow's Program, which is a program where you work for the President of the United States for 1 year in one of the executive agencies like the Department of Energy or the Department of State. Our regional seminar was in Austin, Texas, at the LBJ School of Government. We had a lunch, and I sat at lunch with Hillary Rodham Clinton and a lady name Sarah Weddington, who was the lead attorney in the Roe v. Wade Supreme Court case. Little did I know then, back in 1981, that that case would still be the law of the land.

Today, thousands of people from all over the United States came to protest

that court case and asked the Congress to help overturn it.

I'm a lifetime 95 percent pro-life voting Member, and I pledged to the crowd on the Mall that I would do everything I could in Congress to help overturn that decision. Life is precious. Life begins at conception, and we need to recognize that in the Congress of the United States.

JOB GROWTH

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

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, fostering job growth for the American people continues to be the number one job for House Republicans. We certainly don't know what the number one job is for President Obama, but it doesn't seem to be creating jobs. He talks a good game, but when it comes to delivering, he does nothing. He has refused to approve the Keystone pipeline, which would immediately create 20,000 jobs, bring down the price of gasoline for hardworking Americans, and ultimately create hundreds of thousands of jobs.

You would think with unemployment above 8 percent for the past 35 months and the Obama economy continuing to produce the Nation's worst jobless record since the Great Depression that we would see different actions out of the President.

Last year, following the House Republican plan for America's job creators, the House passed more than 30 bipartisan bills on behalf of the American people. We outline them on this card. Each bill is aimed at unleashing the power of our private sector to freely and confidently build, invest, innovate, and expand again and put millions of Americans back to work. The Keystone pipeline is one of those projects that should be done.

Unfortunately, 27 of these bipartisan House-passed jobs bills are being ignored or blocked in the Democrat-controlled Senate. The American people are tired of waiting. It's time for the Democrats in the Senate and the White House to put politics aside and pass these jobs bills.

PREGNANCY CARE CENTERS

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

Mr. MANZULLO. Mr. Speaker, today we recognize the Roe v. Wade decision and its aftermath. In 1982, my wife and I had the opportunity to work to start what became the seventh crisis pregnancy center in the country. Now they are known as pregnancy care centers. The work that we did in Rockford, Illinois, spilled into Freeport, Illinois, and DeKalb, Illinois. We set up these centers so we could be there to minister to the women who had very difficult decisions to make.

The pregnancy care centers throughout the country offer all kinds of service, from ultrasound to social services

to working with the women and with the fathers involved in a very difficult situation.

We commemorate that today we honor those who worked so hard for these crisis pregnancy centers. My wife and I are proud to have been two people who helped start the one in Rockford, Illinois.

SANCTITY OF HUMAN LIFE ACT

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

Mr. BROUN of Georgia. The greatest moral issue that this Nation faces today is the killing of 4,000 babies every single day through abortion. God cannot and will not continue to bless this land while this atrocious practice continues.

The first bill I introduced in this Congress when I was elected in 2007, and in every single Congress since then, has been my Sanctity of Human Life Act that scientifically describes the beginning of life when a spermatozoon, or the sperm cell, enters the cell wall of the ovum, the egg, to create a one-cell human being, the zygote.

Mr. Speaker, it's absolutely critical, if we want to continue to expect God to bless America, that we stop murdering these unborn babies, and I will continue to fight to do so. And I hope my colleagues will see the reality that these are human beings. It's not a glob of tissue; it's a human being created by God, and we have to protect their lives.

LIVES LOST TO ABORTION

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

Mr. LAMBORN. Mr. Speaker, I rise this evening in recognition of the over 55 million American lives lost to abortion since the passage of Roe v. Wade 39 years ago.

In President Obama's statement celebrating the anniversary of Roe v. Wade, he emphasized the principle that government should not intrude on private family matters. Ironically, on Friday, the Obama administration made an unprecedented decision to require all U.S. employers to cover the cost of contraception, including emergency contraceptive drugs, despite the protest from faith-based institutions such as Catholic hospitals and universities. This is a violation of citizens' religious convictions. It will force the organizations to either violate their deeply held views or pay a heavy fine and terminate health insurance plans.

Every human life has inherent value because he or she is made in the image of God. I will continue to fight for the right to life for America's youngest pre-born citizens and for freeing taxpayers from being forced to pay for abortions.

WORDS MATTER

(Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, a gentleman by the name of Andrew Adler located in Atlanta, Georgia, and writing for an Atlanta, Georgia, newspaper offered instructions to the prime minister of Israel on how to protect that great nation. He suggested an attack on Hezbollah and Hamas and an attack on Iran. And then he gave number three: Give the go ahead for U.S.-based Mossad agents to take out a President deemed unfriendly to the nation of Israel. That President, I need not say, happens to be the President of the United States now. Words matter.

Mr. Adler has been called upon to apologize, and he did. But he has brought shame to Jewish Americans, to Americans and Israel. And, frankly, the latitude in which he thought he could talk about assassinating the President of the United States without in any way a suggestion of, if you will, challenge, is an outrage and disgrace.

I believe in the First Amendment, but words do matter. We should come together and be unified as a Nation, find ways to disagree with each other without raising words that are hostile and devastating. I beg for this Nation's leaders to stop calling names and talk about policies and how to build this Nation up.

I'm outraged, Mr. Adler. An apology is not enough.

□ 1930

CONGRESSIONAL BLACK CAUCUS HOUR: VOTING RIGHTS ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SCHWEIKERT). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 5, 2011, the gentlewoman from the Virgin Islands (Mrs. CHRISTENSEN) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mrs. CHRISTENSEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks on the subject matter of this special order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from the Virgin Islands?

There was no objection.

Mrs. CHRISTENSEN. Mr. Speaker, tonight we are here on the floor of the House of Representatives on the eve of the State of the Union by President Barack Obama, the first African American President of the United States and some 46 years after the passage of the Voting Rights Act which made his election and ours possible. And I'm pleased to be joined by members of the Congressional Black Caucus this evening for this Special Order.

I'd like to yield such time as he might consume to the gentleman from New York, who I believe is the most senior member of the Ways and Means

Committee, a former chair of the Congressional Black Caucus and a founding member of the Congressional Black Caucus, Mr. CHARLIE RANGEL.

Mr. RANGEL. Let me thank the gentlewoman from the Virgin Islands for having the foresight to try to protect our Constitution and the voting rights that all Americans are entitled to. Before I get into the subject matter, I would like to really first thank the Speaker for pointing out the guidelines that we would have as relates to the decorum of Members in the House of Representatives. I think it's well heeded and we can walk away with some pride. I just assume that included in that was not to make derogatory remarks about the President of the United States. But recognizing that the whole body and the whole world has already spoken about this issue, then I don't think there is any need for me to elaborate.

Because of the reputation of the United States of America, no matter what we find in our fiscal system or whatever problems we have day-to-day and year-to-year, we still remain the source of hope and inspiration for people all over the world. People teach their kids that if they can only get to America this is the place where you can come from the depth of poverty, and with hard work and education there's no limit to how far you can go.

And while we have fought over the years in order to get equality for those that came as immigrants to this country or slaves, we do recognize that in this country, this country offers all of us the best opportunity in the world to be able to provide a better life for ourselves, our kids and for society generally.

Madam Chairlady, when the early sixties was there, and I marched from Selma to Birmingham, Alabama, it was 54 miles. But, quite honestly, I don't know whether I've admitted this publicly or not, I had no idea that I was going to march 54 miles. I thought I could go down, have my picture taken and come back and say I was with Andy Young, JOHN LEWIS, Ralph Bunche, and Dr. King. But, somehow, I got caught up in it, and I was cussing every step of the way wondering how did I get caught up walking through all of these dark streets and being insulted.

But much later, when I heard Lyndon Johnson say those words, that theme that had directed us emotionally and patriotically that "we shall overcome," I felt so proud, notwithstanding my lack of knowledge of the importance of the issue, that I did march. Then I found out that the Civil Rights Act and the Voting Rights Act weren't just something that made minorities feel good, it made Americans feel good. And the ripple effect of this throughout the world was that we were able to say, see, we told you that in the United States, it's not what we want, but in the United States of America we are working toward full equality.

Now, even today when we give assistance to a country that aspires to have a democracy, more often than not they come here to see how we were able to do it, and we send people to watch what they are doing. And they listen to Americans teaching them what equality is and how to avoid fraud and how everybody should have an opportunity to participate. And notwithstanding what happens in America, we used to have a sense of pride that even though we have our problems we're still respected throughout the world. And what is happening today in certain States that have had a long history of discrimination, it seems as though now they want to take this backward step to cause it to be difficult for people to vote.

Why in the world would this great country want people not to vote? What could it be to have more and more people express themselves? You go to countries that have 80 and 90 percent of the population participating in this great democracy, and when you vote you care more about the direction in which your country is going. God knows that in America today with the performance of the Congress, if the people were more involved we'd do a better job and do it in a hurry. But having said that, these States are now changing their laws to make it difficult for people to vote.

Even though I have my own suspicions as to why, if you lay out the facts and see what is happening, which States are they and what prohibitions are they putting? They're asking for ID. Well, do we have cases of people misusing ID? The Attorney General doesn't know of any. And then they're going after those who allow participation on Sundays, then they're going after communities with a high number of poor people, then they go into minority communities, and then they ask older people who have no reason for ID that they have to do it. And people who fought so hard for these rights that were given to them now find themselves, in this late stage, being denied the right to vote.

It is so embarrassing. Not only is it not the right thing to do as Americans, but how can we continue to send people to foreign and developing countries as being the major spokespeople for democracy, when right in this country we are prohibiting—not prohibiting—but discouraging people from participating in the right to vote?

I don't know whether the color of the President or the fact that this President has received record-breaking participation by the very same people that they're making it difficult to vote, but I tell you for you taking the opportunity to bring the attention of this to the Congress, and therefore to the Nation, for you to be able, with the Congressional Black Caucus, to say that we're not protecting our rights, we're protecting our Constitution, we're protecting our country, and there is no question in my mind that we felt bet-

ter as a people when we were able to overcome the obstacles that were placed.

□ 1940

So let me thank you and my fellow colleagues in the Congressional Black Caucus for saying we can vote. They can't hurt us. But it's a better country with everybody, regardless of their color, their age, where they live or how much money they have in the bank, to be able to say, in our country, at this time, we have to move forward, and we cannot find ourselves where we were 60 and 70 years ago.

So thank you so much for this opportunity, and for all of the Members who have taken time this evening to say that we shall indeed overcome for the length of the Constitution of this great Nation.

Mrs. CHRISTENSEN. Thank you, Mr. RANGEL. And thank you again, as a founding member of the Congressional Black Caucus, for reminding the American people why we're called the conscience of the Congress. Thank you for those words.

I'd like now to yield such time as she might consume to the gentlelady from Ohio, who for the last Congress chaired these Special Orders and who is a leader on so many, many issues and whose district I believe the CBC will again be traveling to to help protect the rights of voters in Ohio, Congresswoman MARCIA FUDGE.

Mrs. FUDGE. Let me thank my colleague who comes down to this floor every week. I know what it's like. I thank you for being the anchor for the CBC hour.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to address the covert voter suppression effort under way in the United States of America. This effort might have begun as a stealth operation, but my colleagues, organizations across the Nation, and I will ensure that Americans are informed and protected, such that voters are well prepared for the gimmicks under way to keep them from casting their ballots in 2012.

During 2011, 34 States introduced legislation that would require voters to show a photo ID to cast a ballot. Approximately 13 States introduced bills to end Election Day and same-day voter registration. As many as nine States introduced bills to reduce early voting, and four States proposed draconian reductions in absentee voting opportunities. Two States took steps backward by reversing prior executive actions that make it easier for citizens with past felony convictions to restore their voting rights.

For many years, America has been described as a beacon of light for the world; the model of democracy and the home of fair elections. As a Nation, we have always rejected voter intimidation at polling places in foreign nations. We frown upon nations that limit the right of its citizens to vote. Yet we now face the same issues that fall disproportionately on the same

class of voters that these very laws were designed to protect—the elderly, the disabled, students, and minorities.

I will not stand by, Mr. Speaker, and watch silently as State legislatures attempt to compromise the right of citizens to vote. And as a caucus, we will not be silent. We will not stand by idly as decades of struggle for equal voting rights are trampled upon. We will not turn our backs on voters who now face the erosion of the very premise upon which our Nation is built, and that is the right to vote and to representation.

I am proud to report, however, that 2012 is looking much better than 2011. Connecticut's Secretary of State and Governor introduced a package to streamline voter registration and increase access to absentee voting. In Florida, a bill was proposed to repeal legislation that shortened early voting periods and restricted voter registration drives. A bill introduced in Nebraska that would require a photo ID to vote was removed from the legislature's agenda. In Washington, a bipartisan bill was introduced that would allow 16-year-olds to preregister to vote. The Department of Justice rejected South Carolina's photo ID law, and just last week a circuit court in Wisconsin heard a case against Wisconsin's voter ID law. It looks like 2012 will be a very good year for the protection of voting rights.

These attempts to restrict voting are especially hard on young folks. More than 1 million students attend colleges, universities, and technical schools in the State of Texas alone, but because of the State's new voter ID law, none will be allowed to use their student ID cards to cast a ballot. Texans, however, can show a gun permit and be allowed to vote, but a college student attempting to use their school-issued ID will be denied.

Earlier this month, Bill O'Reilly vehemently defended laws like the one in Texas. He said if students don't know they can vote absentee, they're too stupid to vote. You're in college, but you're too stupid to vote? What an insult.

During the Jim Crow era, people said African Americans were too stupid to vote. If you were black and you couldn't count the number of jelly beans in a jar or tell the person at the ballot box how many bubbles were in a bar of soap, you were too stupid to vote.

We refuse to return to those days. Stand with us. Protect the franchise. Protect the right to vote.

Mrs. CHRISTENSEN. Thank you, Congresswoman FUDGE, for those very strong words, and thank you for the ray of hope by pointing out some of the States that are reversing some of those laws that are making it easier for their voters to vote.

I would now like to yield to the former chair of the Congressional Black Caucus, a leader not only in California but in the country, a person who has always been the conscience of

the CBC as we are the conscience of the Congress, Congresswoman BARBARA LEE.

Ms. LEE of California. Thank you very much. I thank the gentlelady for her kind remarks, and I also thank Congresswoman CHRISTENSEN for her leadership. She serves as the first vice chair of the Congressional Black Caucus and has led on so many issues in this House on behalf of our country and on behalf of her constituents. Thank you very much.

Let me also take a moment to thank Congresswoman FUDGE and Congresswoman JACKSON LEE, Congressman BOBBY SCOTT and Chairman RANGEL for their leadership in defending the most basic element of our democracy—the right to vote. I'd also like to thank our Congressional Black Caucus chair, EMANUEL CLEAVER, for his focus on this very critical issue. His leadership is making such a difference on so many important issues in our country.

The right to vote is our most fundamental right that guarantees and preserves all other legal rights. When Americans lose their right to vote, that endangers their ability to defend further attacks on their rights.

The assault on voter rights continues in 2012. In this election year, a coordinated campaign designed to block access to the polls to tens of millions of Americans threatens to undermine our democracy and change election outcomes. And sadly, Mr. Speaker, it's no secret which communities these laws are designed to disenfranchise—communities of color, students, elderly Americans, impoverished families, and the disabled.

Let me say that the Republican legislators and Governors who are pushing these antivoter laws know exactly what they are doing. They saw the election results of 2008, with the surge of voter participation from Americans who had never voted before. They see the rising tide of Americans who seek to change their country by doing their basic civic duty on Election Day. Instead of embracing change, they are desperately trying to avoid change by undermining our voting process.

These Republican legislators are proposing partisan laws that require voters to show a government-approved photo ID before voting. Those who are truly concerned about voter fraud have plenty of actual, documented problems to take on. Why aren't they going after those who spread false information meant to trick voters or public officials who improperly purge eligible voters or political operatives who tamper with election equipment and forms? Instead, they all are pushing laws designed to change election outcomes by reducing voting, repressing turnout, and turning the clock back.

Now, I have an aunt who is 100 years old, who was born at a time when records were not kept like they are today. How in the world would my aunt know where to start to find her birth certificate to be eligible to qualify for

a government ID? How can I ask her to pay to do the research so she can figure out where her birth certificate may be and then pay to get a government ID to vote? Outrageous.

One hundred years ago, my aunt did not have the right to vote. Thanks to the hard work of those who came before us, my aunt witnessed the expansion of voting rights to women with the 19th Amendment and the protection of African American and other minority voters with the Voting Rights Act. These regressive laws seek to turn my aunt back to where she was a century ago when she could not vote and her fundamental right to fully participate in our democratic society was cut off, mind you, just cut off by unjust laws.

These partisan laws are shameful and a disgrace to our country. These anti-democratic efforts have no place in a modern democracy, and we must unmask these shameful attempts to disenfranchise voters.

□ 1950

We encourage democracy and voting rights all around the world. I was an observer in the first election in South Africa where President Nelson Mandela was elected. I was an observer in the nineties in Nigeria. I witnessed long lines of people waiting patiently to vote. People believed and said to me that in America voting was encouraged rather than discouraged, so we need to stop these partisan efforts that strike at the core of our democracy. It really is, Congresswoman CHRISTENSEN, fundamentally anti-American.

We have to win this war against voters. We should be about dismantling and reducing barriers so we can reignite their hope for the American Dream.

I want to, again, thank you for your leadership, and Congresswomen FUDGE and JACKSON LEE, and BOBBY SCOTT and Mr. RANGEL and the entire Congressional Black Caucus for their calls and their hard work to protect the right to vote for all citizens across this Nation.

We must protect voters from these attempts to deny access to the heart of our democratic process. We need to move forward and encourage more voter participation. People need to know that they have a stake in this system and in this democracy. These laws were designed to stop that.

Mrs. CHRISTENSEN. Thank you, Congresswoman LEE. And just to underscore what you have shared with us this evening, I don't usually quote from Politico, but let me read the last sentence of one of their articles. It says, the framers bequeathed us a Constitution intended to create a more perfect union. Every time an eligible voter is denied the right to vote we are left that much further from achieving that goal.

Thank you again for joining us this evening.

And now I want to yield such time as he might consume to one of our out-

standing constitutional experts and attorneys in the CBC, Congressman BOBBY SCOTT from Virginia.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlelady from the Virgin Islands for the opportunity to speak. And today I rise in opposition to an unfortunate trend that seems to be creeping up all over the country, laws that add unnecessary complications to the process of voter registration and the process of voting.

Now, some of these initiatives include photo ID laws, reduction in time to vote or to register to vote, laws complicating the rules for running voter registration drives.

Now, none of these little schemes prevent individuals from voting, but the unnecessary complications guarantee that many will not get their paperwork in on time and, as a consequence, many will not be able to vote. In some States, those few votes can make the difference in a presidential election.

Now, we need to protect the right to vote, not add unnecessary complications that will result in fewer people voting. But we see all over the country efforts to reduce the Election Day registration. In those States that have allowed it for decades, those who could have registered on Election Day will find that they cannot vote.

In States that allow early voting, we're seeing efforts to reduce the number of days of early voting, meaning that some people may not be able to get their votes in as they could have with the longer period.

In some States the rules for voter registration drives are becoming more onerous, so much so that groups that have traditionally conducted voter registration drives, such as the League of Women Voters, are having second thoughts about conducting those drives under the new rules, and that will mean fewer people will be registered to vote.

And many States are imposing for the first time a requirement that voters display a specific voter ID. This scheme that is so slanted that, as has been previously stated, some government-issued IDs are acceptable and some are not. Texas proposed to accept the concealed weapons permit as acceptable government-issued ID, but not student IDs from a State college.

Now, Mr. Speaker, these voter ID requirements are a solution in search of a problem. There is no credible evidence that in-person voter fraud, which is the only kind of fraud that the photo ID would prevent, is any problem around the country. In fact, multiple studies have found that virtually no cases of in-person voter fraud can be found.

And the requirement of voter ID in subjecting people to that time and expense will guarantee that many will not get their paperwork in on time. There are complications that can occur when you're trying to get that paperwork done. Some of the elderly have

never gotten a photo ID and wouldn't know where to start. Many who are adopted may not know where to find a birth certificate. Many counties—for the elderly people, some counties have lost their records and the records aren't available.

And it produces bizarre results, such as the nuns who were prohibited from voting because they didn't have photo ID, even though the election officials knew them personally.

In Virginia, we have an exception to the photo ID. You have to present a photo ID, but if you don't have one, you can sign an affidavit under pains of a felony and go ahead and vote right now. But unfortunately, even in Virginia they're trying to eliminate that exception and require people to go through the time and expense of getting photo ID if they don't have one.

Now, if we're going to look for problems in the voting process maybe we ought to look at Iowa that just certified, had announced that one person had won the Republican Caucuses one day and a couple of days later certified results that another one had won. And there are public reports that suggest that really nobody knows who won. I mean, if you want to look for some voter irregularities, maybe we ought to look at that.

Or maybe we ought to look at the candidate who tried to become a candidate on the Virginia Republican Presidential Primary this year. He has publicly stated that petition signatures submitted on behalf of his campaign, of those signatures, hundreds were, in fact, bogus. And if they had not been caught, he would have qualified for the ballot. But fortunately, it has been ascertained that so many were bogus signatures that he, in fact, did not qualify for the Virginia ballot.

But as we see all over the country, efforts to reduce Election Day registration and other forms of ease in voting are making it possible for many people to lose those rights. While the situations like Iowa and in Virginia, where it's clear that those situations need scrutiny, there is no evidence that in-person voter fraud is a problem anywhere in the United States.

Voting is not an arbitrary, inconsequential act. The cumulative effect of individuals voting elects our government officials who directly create our laws and policies. It is important that we ensure that every eligible voter is given the opportunity to vote, free from unnecessary barriers and schemes. Those schemes that erect barriers to the right to vote are unfair in our democracy.

And I thank the gentlelady from the Virgin Islands for giving us the opportunity to make these statements.

Mrs. CHRISTENSEN. I thank you for joining us and for pointing out some of that data and helping to explain to the American public the injustice that's being done by these voter restrictions on voting and restrictions on registration.

We're also joined by another fighter for justice and equality, a strong voice in the Congressional Black Caucus, the gentlelady from Texas, Congresswoman SHEILA JACKSON LEE.

Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas. I'd like to thank Dr. CHRISTENSEN, which I enjoy calling her that because she has been of such value and service to this Congress and to this body, the Congressional Black Caucus, and thank her for her leadership in convening this very important discussion on voter protection.

I'm very delighted to be joined, and I thank him very much, by Congressman BOBBY SCOTT, who has served and we are serving on the Judiciary Committee. And I know that he remembers that in about 2006, 2007, after years of rumors of the Voting Rights Act ending, we clarified it by coming together in a bipartisan manner and over months of hearings, convinced a then, I believe, Republican and moving into a Democratic Congress, but a bipartisan Congress, that the Voting Rights Act was needed, and it needed to be reauthorized in certain sections.

And so our stand today is to reinforce that issue. And so I would like to thank, again, Congressman RANGEL, who so movingly told of his long journey and walk to support the Voting Rights Act, Congresswoman FUDGE, who has been a champion in her State in Ohio, Congresswoman LEE, and then Congressman SCOTT, who all bring to the table a personal story about voter protection.

□ 2000

But I must make mention of our friend Congressman JOHN LEWIS, who is the epitome of the civil rights movement around the idea of voter protection and enhancement. Many of us are not aware of Mr. FILNER, who was one of the Freedom Riders and celebrated the Freedom Riders in the last year, their 50 years. My colleague Congressman AL GREEN, who led the NAACP in Houston during times when we were under siege as it relates to voting opportunities.

And I remember working for the Southern Christian Leadership Conference in the South in the aftermath in the 1970s of the Voting Rights Act actually going to many States, from North Carolina to South Carolina to Georgia and Alabama, where African Americans were still not registered, had still not had the full impact. I remember walking miles with Prairie View University students to allow the students to vote.

So this is a cause for which we have been on a long journey, and it saddens me that we are here again today fighting for voter protection in the year 2012 as we look to our Presidential elections.

I might offer to my colleagues the words of Barbara Jordan, who could not have come to Congress if it had not been for the passage of the 1965 Voting Rights Act. Sitting in the Judiciary

Committee she offered these words: "I believe hyperbole would not be fictional and would not overstate the solemnness I feel right now. My faith in the Constitution is whole, it is complete, it is total."

She said that of course during the impeachment hearings of Richard Nixon, but really the point was that she felt that the Constitution breathed life, if you will, into the rights of Americans, and the Constitution spoke to the voting rights of African Americans and others through the 14th and 15th Amendments.

But over the years, we had not been protected. And so the Congress, through the leadership and sacrifice of Dr. Martin Luther King, whose monument is magnificent, they passed the Voting Rights Act. The constitutionality was challenged in 1966. It barely got passed. And the Supreme Court said this: Congress has found that case-by-case litigation was inadequate to combat widespread and persistent discrimination in voting.

This is what they found over the years in the Deep South; that it was constant, it was ongoing because of the inordinate amount of time and energy required to overcome the obstructionist tactics invariably encountered in these lawsuits. After enduring nearly a century of systemic or systematic resistance to the 15th Amendment, Congress might well decide to shift the advantage of time and inertia from the perpetrators of evil to its victims. That was a landmark case in 1966, *South Carolina v. Katzenbach*, the Attorney General of the United States, to reaffirm the Voting Rights Act of 1966.

Here we are now almost 50 years plus where we are fighting this case again, and I might add, in not too friendly a climate. First of all, fraud is offered, and I notice that my colleague mentioned the unfortunate facts or the circumstances in Iowa where one Republican presidential candidate was declared a winner and then now another. And I did not hear voices being raised about whether there was fraud. Maybe it was a miscount, a mistake. But you didn't hear the outrage that we have heard over the seeming increase, or the effort to increase, the votes of poor people and minorities, and in particular Latinos and African Americans.

Might I just say with a sense of pride, the Honorable Barbara Jordan added Texas to the Voting Rights Act coverage by adding language minorities in I believe about 1978.

But the thought that fraud is bad and should be prosecuted, but a photo ID does not prevent voter impersonation, that it doesn't work—requiring a photo ID amounts to discrimination. Eleven percent of the entire voting-eligible population, 2.1 million, do not have a government-issued photo ID. You're discriminating against them. Twenty-five percent of eligible African American voters do not have a qualified voter ID. A 2006 nationwide study of voting-age citizens by the Brennan

Center for Justice of the New York University School of Law found that African Americans are more than three times as likely as Caucasians to lack a government-issued ID.

You talk to many of our seniors and they were born with midwives. My mother, God rest her soul, we could not, as long as we looked for her birth certificate, could not find it, but she did have a voter registration card. Nationwide, 18 percent of eligible voters over 65 lack an ID. Voter ID laws are costly and add to the deficit. Missouri estimates that the ID law would cost the State over \$20 million to implement, and it goes on to say North Carolina, \$14 million.

This is a shame on us. This is a pox on our House. And it is a pox on our House because fraud cannot be documented. As my colleague indicated how ironic it is that a student ID, students at State colleges, private colleges, historically black colleges, Hispanic-leaning colleges can't use a credible ID that colleges take great pride or great efforts to secure. Photo ID. Young people who we want to see cherish the democracy of this country can not in fact use their ID. But yet a gun ID can be used.

Just a few weeks ago in the Judiciary Committee—somewhat related—we were trying to pass legislation that says if you have a gun ID in Georgia, you can use your gun permit in another State. We're willing to give all of these rights to those carrying a gun ID, which may in fact jeopardize our law enforcement officers in all of the different States by not knowing who's in there carrying a gun permit.

But yet the sacred and simple act of being able to vote for a person of your choosing causes the ire of so many State legislatures who, after the 2010 election and the misrepresentation that there was fraud in the 2008 election, maybe because we elected the first African American President, or some crisis generated this response, we have this kind of map that shows practically 40 States, it looks like, all but 11, that require photo ID, that photo ID is requested, that photo ID legislation is proposed.

Congresswoman, I ask on what basis have we now taken the Constitution, the Voting Rights Act, and the constitutionality of the Voting Rights Act to do it?

Let me just share these points as I come to a close and ask that we continue the efforts.

I look forward to a voter protection meeting by the Congressional Black Caucus in Houston. The State of Texas has the voter ID law that is now being pre-cleared. I understand that all of my colleagues are in the middle of redistricting, but let me just say this is not in any way promoting Texas, but I believe that we may be the singular case that is going to ascertain the integrity of the Voting Rights Act and voter protection.

Right now Texas is in three courts: the Supreme Court, the District Court

of Appeals here in the District of Columbia, and the San Antonio Federal Court. We are fighting on three different levels.

I might say this without any punitive comments intended. We had an interim plan, and this is under the Voting Rights Act, that one person, one vote. And Congresswoman, I think it is important to note that the Voting Rights Act protects all Americans. Its premise is one vote, one person. Its premise is not fraud but opportunity.

So when we have the redistricting and some sections of the Voting Rights Act protect the idea of one person, one vote, we take these cases not for personal promotion, meaning Members of Congress and State legislators, but to ensure the integrity of the vote.

So when the court ruled in San Antonio just briefly that the plan did not work, that the State of Texas wrote and gave us a new plan, the State of Texas went to the Supreme Court—not the individuals trying to protect the right of voters—went to the Supreme Court to stay that plan.

Well, the Supreme Court did render a decision. We're still in the midst of our confusion. But I just have to put this on the record. The Supreme Court assessed us, the ones who did not appeal, \$18,000 to pay for printing. For those of us who are lawyers, we are simply questioning in wonderment how you can charge individuals who did not take the case up to the Supreme Court, who were being guided by the Federal Court, who had a plan and assessed us \$18,000.

I simply say here is another way that you can not protect voting, because inevitably, those who are on the side of the Voting Rights Act are not rich. We inevitably in many instances are not the State.

□ 2010

It's the State coming against those who are trying to say, "One vote, one person." I bring this up just as I close.

Let me just say that, in the course of the hearings that we had in reauthorizing the Voting Rights Act, we discovered that there were problems with voting across the country. In 2004, nearly 4,500 people reported problems with ballots that were coming to them; 1,000 people reported voting intimidation; 7,000 reported registration problems.

Also, as you well know, the status of voting laws now, meaning the voting ID or voter identification, limits the kind of voter ID you can use. It excludes the most common forms of identification—student IDs, Social Security cards—and they offer no alternatives. There are changes requiring proof of citizenship as a condition for voter registration, limitations or the outright elimination of early voting opportunities, and barriers to first-time voters by suggesting that there is no same-day registration.

So I would simply argue that this is an important Special Order that you

have tonight. What I feel in my heart is that we have to educate the public. They have to raise their level of, not anxiety, but of cause, in that they have a cause. They've got to get their marching shoes on again. They've got to get their shoes of being the carriers of justice as those civil rights legends and heroes did. They've got to get like the movie "The Help" when those domestics, those people who work for others, walked in the Montgomery Bus Boycott because they were trying to do for others. So I want to thank you for allowing me to share with you this evening.

I also want to indicate that this very fine letter that was sent by Members of Congress to the Attorney General on July 25, 2011, should be upheld; that of these voter ID laws that may suppress the vote, we want to have voter protection by having a vigorous review of all of these laws, and one of them happens to be the voter ID requirement in the State of Texas.

Thank you for allowing me to participate in an opportunity to share and in an opportunity to tell a message to our colleagues that the justice of voting is justice for everyone and that the protection of voting is the protection of voting for everyone.

Mrs. CHRISTENSEN. I thank the gentlelady for those strong words.

Again, I'm going to go back to the article in Politico because everyone has made reference to the charges of fraud. In this article, it reads, "official and academic studies have consistently shown that the chances of being hit by lightning are greater than the likely incidence of such fraud."

So today, as we prepare for the elections in November of this year, we have seen an unprecedented—at least unprecedented since August of 1965—attack on the rights of Americans to vote. As you've heard, these attacks have taken many forms: expanding bans that prevent felons from voting; cutting election administration budgets in States; curtailing early voting, something that was used very effectively in previous elections; eliminating same-day registration; intimidating voter registration by some groups, which extends in some places to intimidation on Election Day; imposing strict ID requirements; creating barriers to getting the required ID; and creating barriers to voting by students in schools outside of their States.

Again, the voter fraud claims are bogus, and as our chairman, EMANUEL CLEAVER, said in testimony before the Senate Committee on the Judiciary late last year, "The laws are solutions in search of problems, especially when it comes to voter ID, because there is basically no evidence of fraud." Many studies, as I've said, have supported that statement.

With an estimated 11 percent of Americans not having IDs that would meet the requirement, it is projected that these new attacks on the rights of American citizens to vote will prevent

many millions of people—mostly Democrats, mostly minorities and the elderly—from voting and could affect as many as 171 electoral votes. It is clear to me, whether racially based or not, that this is a direct attempt not only to undermine the election process but is a specific attempt to derail what surely would be and ought to be the reelection of Barack Obama.

The CBC is speaking out as is the NAACP, but I'm still waiting for the cries of many of the good people of this country. This is an egregious injustice and a threat to democracy and to the stability of our Nation, and it must not be allowed to continue. The Congressional Black Caucus has met with officials of the Justice Department; and as Congresswoman JACKSON LEE has stated, the CBC has sent a letter to Attorney General Eric Holder, which has over 100 signatures from other Members, registering our grave concern over these laws and proposed laws, urging that the Department of Justice examine them and ensure that the rights of voters are protected.

In March, we will take up the torch of those who marched across the Edmund Pettus Bridge to continue to fight for equal rights and, together with the NAACP and other partners, to begin a voter protection tour to key cities in order to call attention to the injustice; to mobilize efforts to help individuals get the required ID or vote where there still remains some early voting; and to continue to press the Justice Department to do all that is in its authority to protect this right that so many fought, sacrificed, and died for.

As Congresswoman JACKSON LEE showed, this is the map. It's called the "Map of Shame." Only 11 States are without voter ID laws or are requesting one or have legislation proposed. How will we ever be able to lead and speak for the rights of the disenfranchised in other parts of the world? That was something raised by Congressman RANGEL as we began the Special Order. Where will we get the moral authority if this travesty is allowed to exist and if we undermine this very fundamental right, the right to vote?

Already the undue influence of big money from undisclosed donors is influencing elections. Already the ugly specter of racism has been raised to divide our country and to misinform and inflame some segments of our country. This is not the country that we want to be. The Voting Rights Act was passed in August of 1965, and at that time, it ended over a century of denial of the right to vote to African Americans in the South and to Latinos in the Southwest as well. In voting rights, as with health care reform, as someone said earlier, we are not going back.

I would like to just take a few minutes of the time we have left to call attention to a crisis in my district, in the U.S. Virgin Islands. Last Wednesday, January 18, we suffered an economic earthquake with the announcement

that the HOVENSA oil refinery—it's either the second or the third largest oil refinery in the Western Hemisphere—is going to close in the middle of February. Now, we're a small community—110,000 throughout the entire Virgin Islands—and we're maybe about 55,000 on the Island of St. Croix, so a hit of over 2,000 jobs is a big hit to our economy. Those are the direct jobs. Of the people who work either for HOVENSA or their subcontractors on the site, there will continue to be about 100 employees for oil storage facilities, but the impact will reverberate throughout that entire community. Businesses that rely on HOVENSA from some of their suppliers—hotels and restaurants and even some of our private schools—are wondering how they are going to survive and keep their doors open when HOVENSA closes.

We are looking at a number of issues, and we still have a lot of questions that we need to ask, but I wanted to bring this to the attention of my colleagues because this is a severe crisis. As all of our States have been, we were already having layoffs and having to cut salaries and impose austerity measures on our population. The closing of this refinery is a major hit, and it has left my community reeling. So I ask for your prayers, and at the appropriate time I will probably come and ask for your assistance on behalf of the people of the Virgin Islands.

I want to take this opportunity to thank my colleagues Congressman RANGEL, Congresswoman FUDGE, Congressman SCOTT, Congresswoman LEE, and Congresswoman JACKSON LEE for joining me in this Special Order to speak to the issue of voter protection for the people of this country—the protection of a fundamental right that must not be abridged.

I would be happy to yield to my colleague from Texas if she would like to have some more time.

□ 2020

Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas. First, I want to speak to the gentlelady's last comment and say that you have been a champion for the Virgin Islands. I have had the privilege of having several meetings there. They are generous people, they are our neighbors, and so I personally want to say, experiencing and understanding the impact of the loss of a major entity is something many of us have gone through.

In this instance I wanted to say, yes, we will stand with you and be of help. I'm introducing legislation that deals with trying to look at the energy industry in a way to help it grow in a fair way, to be environmentally safe, and I know that you are certainly someone who is a champion of the environment but have found that that business is served economically, and I want to make sure that we have these kinds of industries, and they are not mutually exclusive. I don't have the facts of what has generated this action, but we need to be helpful.

My legislation talks about using the energy industry to also support improving the environment, and I think that creates jobs as well. So I just want to say that I look forward to working with you and thank you for bringing that issue to our attention, because voter protection gives people the opportunity for expressing their views. We know that the opportunity for work and for jobs is crucial as well.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to speak about the need to protect democracy, to protect the voice of the American people, and to ensure the right to vote continues to be treated as a right under the Constitution rather than being treated as though it is privilege.

I am joined by my colleagues here today to call on all Americans to reject and denounce tactics and measures that have absolutely no place in our democracy. I call on African-Americans, Hispanic and Latino Americans, as well as Asian-American voters to band together to fight for their right to vote and to work together to understand their voting rights which are granted to citizens of our nation by our laws and our Constitution.

I call on these citizens to stand against harassment and intimidation, to vote in the face of such adversity. The most effective way to curb tactics of intimidation and harassment is to vote. Is to stand together to fight against any measures that would have the effect of preventing every eligible citizen from being able to vote. Voting ensures active participation in democracy.

As a Member of this body, I firmly believe that we must protect the rights of all eligible citizens to vote. Over the past few decades, minorities in this country have witnessed a pattern of efforts to intimidate and harass minority voters through so-called "Voter ID" requirements. I am sad to report that as we head into the 21st century, these efforts continue.

Never in the history of our nation, has the effect of one person, one vote, been more important. A great Spanish Philosopher, George Santayana once said "Those who cannot learn from history are doomed to repeat it." Our history has taught us that denying the right to vote based on race, gender or class is a stain on the democratic principles that we all value. The Voting Rights Act was a reaction to the actions of our passed and a way to pave the road to a new future.

The Voting Rights Act (VRA) was adopted in 1965 and was extended in 1970, 1975, 1982, and 2007. This legislation is considered the most successful piece of civil rights legislation ever adopted by the United States Congress. Contrary to the prevailing rumor that the Act is due to expire, leaving minorities with no rights, the Act is actually due for reauthorization in the 2nd session of the 108th Congress—there is no doubt about whether it will continue to protect our rights in the future.

The VRA codifies and effectuates the 15th Amendment's permanent guarantee that, throughout the nation, no person shall be denied the right to vote on account of race or color. Adopted at a time when African Americans were substantially disenfranchised in many Southern states, the Act employed measures to restore the right to vote to citizens of all U.S. states.

By 1965, proponents of disenfranchisement made violent attempts to thwart the efforts of

civil rights activists. The murder of voting-rights activists in Philadelphia and Mississippi gained national attention, along with numerous other acts of violence and terrorism.

Finally, the unprovoked attack on March 7, 1965, by state troopers on peaceful marchers crossing the Edmund Pettus Bridge in Selma, Alabama, en route to the state capitol in Montgomery, persuaded the President and Congress to overcome Southern legislators' resistance to effective voting rights legislation. President Johnson issued a call for a strong voting rights law and hearings began soon thereafter on the bill that would become the Voting Rights Act.

Congress adopted this far-reaching statute in response to a rash of instances of interference with attempts by African American citizens to exercise their right to vote—a rash that appears to be manifesting itself again in this nation. Perhaps a legislative measure is needed to respond in a way that the VRA did.

The Supreme Court upheld the constitutionality of the VRA in 1966 in a landmark decision—*South Carolina v. Katzenbach*, 383 U.S. 301, 327–28:

Congress had found that case-by-case litigation was inadequate to combat widespread and persistent discrimination in voting, because of the inordinate amount of time and energy required to overcome the obstructionist tactics invariably encountered in these lawsuits. After enduring nearly a century of systematic resistance to the Fifteenth Amendment, Congress might well decide to shift the advantage of time and inertia from the perpetrators of the evil to its victims.

It seems that the “obstructionist tactics” that threatened the aggrieved parties in *Katzenbach* have returned. The advantages of “time and inertia” that were shifted from bigoted bureaucrats to minority victims are slowly shifting back against their favor when educators, government leaders, and agencies are allowed to contravene the policy and legal conclusions given by the highest court in the country.

Several factors influenced the initiation of this civil rights legislation. The first was a large shift in the number of African Americans away from the Republican Party. Second, many Democrats felt that it was a mistake of its Southern members to oppose civil rights legislation because they could lose more of the African American and liberal votes.

No right is more fundamental than the right to vote. It is protected by more constitutional amendments—the 1st, 14th, 15th, 19th, 24th and 26th—than any other right we enjoy as Americans. Broad political participation ensures the preservation of all our other rights and freedoms. 3 State laws that impose new restrictions on voting, however, undermine our strong democracy by impeding access to the polls and reducing the number of Americans who vote and whose votes are counted.

VOTER IDENTIFICATION

There have been several restrictive voting bills considered and approved by states in the past several years. The most commonly advanced initiatives are laws that require voters to present photo identification when voting in person. Additionally, states have proposed or passed laws to require proof of citizenship when registering to vote; to eliminate the right to register to vote and to submit a change of address within the same state on Election Day; to shorten the time allowed for early voting; to make it more difficult for third-party or-

ganizations to conduct voter registration; and even to eliminate a mandate on poll workers to direct voters who go to the wrong precinct.

These recent changes are on top of the disfranchisement laws in 48 states that deprive an estimated 5.3 million people with criminal convictions—disproportionately African Americans and Latinos—of their political voice.

Voter ID laws are becoming increasingly common across the country. Today, 31 states have laws requiring voters to present some form of identification to vote in federal, state and local elections, although some laws or initiatives passed in 2011 have not yet gone into effect. Some must also be pre-cleared under the Voting Rights Act prior to implementation. In 16 of those 31 States, voters must (or will soon be required to) present a photo ID—that in many states must be government-issued—in order to cast a ballot.

Voter ID laws deny the right to vote to thousands of registered voters who do not have, and, in many instances, cannot obtain the limited identification states accept for voting. Many of these Americans cannot afford to pay for the required documents needed to secure a government issued photo ID. As such, these laws impede access to the polls and are at odds with the fundamental right to vote.

In total, more than 21 million Americans of voting age lack documentation that would satisfy photo ID laws, and a disproportionate number of these Americans are low-income, racial and ethnic minorities, and elderly. As many as 25% of African Americans of voting age lack government-issued photo ID, compared to only 8% of their white counterparts. Eighteen percent of Americans over the age of 65 do not have government-issued photo ID.

Laws requiring photo identification to vote are a “solution” in search of a problem. There is no credible evidence that in-person impersonation voter fraud—the only type of fraud that photo IDs could prevent—is even a minor problem. Multiple studies have found that almost all cases of alleged in-person impersonation voter “fraud” are actually the result of a voter making an inadvertent mistake about their eligibility to vote, and that even these mistakes are extremely infrequent.

It is important, instead, to focus on both expanding the franchise and ending practices which actually threaten the integrity of the elections, such as improper purges of voters, voter harassment, and distribution of false information about when and where to vote. None of these issues, however, are addressed or can be resolved with a photo ID requirement.

Furthermore, requiring voters to pay for an ID, as well as the background documents necessary to obtain an ID in order to vote, is tantamount to a poll tax. Although some states issue IDs for free, the birth certificates, passports, or other documents required to secure a government-issued ID cost money, and many Americans simply cannot afford to pay for them. In addition, obtaining a government-issued photo ID is not an easy task for all members of the electorate. Low-income individuals who lack the funds to pay for documentation, people with disabilities with limited access to transportation, and elderly Americans who never had a birth certificate and cannot obtain alternate proof of their birth in the U.S., are among those who face significant or insurmountable obstacles to getting

the photo ID needed to exercise their right to vote. For example, because of Texas' recently passed voter ID law, an estimated 36,000 people in West Texas's District 19 are 137 miles from the nearest full service Department of Public Safety office, where those without IDs must travel to preserve their right to vote under the state's new law.

In addition, women who have changed their names due to marriage or divorce often experience difficulties with identity documentation, as did Andrea, who recently moved from Massachusetts to South Carolina and who, in the span of a month, spent more than 17 hours online and in person trying without success to get a South Carolina driver's license.

Voter ID laws send not-so-subtle messages about who is and is not encouraged to vote. As states approve laws requiring photo ID to vote, each formulates its own list of acceptable forms of documentation. Another common thread emerging from disparate state approaches is a bias against robust student electoral participation.

Henceforth, students at Wisconsin colleges and universities will not be able to vote using their student ID cards, unless those cards have issuance dates, expiration dates, and signatures.

Currently, only a handful of Wisconsin colleges and universities are issuing compliant IDs. Nor will South Carolina, Texas, or Tennessee accept student identification at the polls.

Policies that limit students' electoral participation are particularly suspect, appearing on the heels of unprecedented youth turnout in the 2008 election.

Four states with new voter identification mandates, including my home state of Texas, South Carolina, Mississippi, and Alabama, are required under the Voting Rights Act to have these voting changes pre-cleared by either the Department of Justice (DOJ) or a panel of federal judges. Before they may be implemented, DOJ must certify that these laws do not have the purpose or effect of restricting voting by racial or language minority groups.

Thus far, South Carolina and Texas both have submitted applications to DOJ that have been formally opposed in written submissions. DOJ has requested further information from both states, and the applications are on hold. Alabama's ID requirements do not take effect until 2014, so the state has not yet applied to DOJ for preclearance. Mississippi's voter ID requirement was approved by voters on November 8, 2011, so a preclearance request has not yet been submitted.

In countries scattered across this earth, citizens are denied the right to speak their hearts and minds. In this country, only a few decades ago, the right to vote was limited by race, sex, or the financial ability to own land. When a vote is not cast, it is a referendum on all those who fought so hard and tirelessly for our rights. When a vote is cast, it is cast not only for you and the future but also for all those who never had the chance to pull a lever.

We are still working to make Martin Luther King's dream a reality, a reality in which our government's decisions are made out in the open not behind cigar filled closed doors.

The time to take back the country is at hand, and we are the ones with the power to do just that. To do so we must allow all citizens who are eligible to vote, with the right to excise this decision without tricks or tactics to dilute their right to vote.

Instances of voter intimidation are not long ago and far away. Just last year I sent a letter to U.S. Attorney General Eric Holder to draw his attention to several disturbing instances of voter intimidation that had taken place in Houston. In a single week there were at least 15 reports of abuse of voter rights throughout the city of Houston.

As a Senior Member of the House Judiciary Committee, I called for an immediate investigation of these instances. Many of these incidents of voter intimidation were occurring in predominately minority neighborhoods and have been directed at African-Americans and Latinos. It is unconscionable to think that anyone would deliberately employ the use of such forceful and intimidating tactics to undermine the fundamental, Constitutional right to vote. However, such conduct has regrettably occurred in Houston, and I urge you to take appropriate action to ensure that it does not recur.

I am here today in the name of freedom, patriotism, and democracy. I am here to demand that the long hard fought right to vote continues to be protected.

A long, bitter, and bloody struggle was fought for the Voting Rights Act of 1965 so that all Americans could enjoy the right to vote, regardless of race, ethnicity, or national origin. Americans died in that fight so that others could achieve what they had been forcefully deprived of for centuries—the ability to walk freely and without fear into the polling place and cast a voting ballot.

Efforts to keep minorities from fully exercising that franchise, however, continue. Indeed, in the past thirty years, we have witnessed a pattern of efforts to intimidate and harass minority voters including efforts that were deemed “Ballot Security” programs that include the mailing of threatening notices to African-American voters, the carrying of video cameras to monitor polls, the systematic challenging of minority voters at the polls on unlawful grounds, and the hiring of guards and off-duty police officers to intimidate and frighten voters at the polls.

My colleagues on the other side of the aisle have a particularly poor track record when it comes to documented acts of voter intimidation. In 1982, a Federal Court in New Jersey provided a consent order that forbids the Republican National Committee from undertaking any ballot security activities in a polling place or election district where race or ethnic composition is a factor in the decision to conduct such activities and where a purpose or significant effect is to deter qualified voters from voting. These reprehensible practices continue to plague our Nation’s minority voters.

VOTING RIGHTS ACT HISTORY

August 6, 2011, marked the 46th anniversary of the Voting Rights Act.

Most Americans take the right to vote for granted. We assume that we can register and vote if we are over 18 and are citizens. Most of us learned in school that discrimination based on race, creed or national origin has been barred by the Constitution since the end of the Civil War.

Before the 1965 Voting Rights Act, however, the right to vote did not exist in practice for most African Americans. And, until 1975, most American citizens who were not proficient in English faced significant obstacles to voting, because they could not understand the ballot.

Even though the Indian Citizenship Act gave Native Americans the right to vote in 1924,

state law determined who could actually vote, which effectively excluded many Native Americans from political participation for decades.

Asian Americans and Asian immigrants also have suffered systematic exclusion from the political process and it has taken a series of reforms, including repeal of the Chinese Exclusion Act in 1943, and passage of amendments strengthening the Voting Rights Act three decades later, to fully extend the franchise to Asian Americans. It was with this history in mind that the Voting Rights Act of 1965 was designed to make the right to vote a reality for all Americans.

And the Voting Rights Act has made giant strides toward that goal. Without exaggeration, it has been one of the most effective civil rights laws passed by Congress.

In 1964, there were only approximately 300 African-Americans in public office, including just three in Congress. Few, if any, black elected officials were elected anywhere in the South. Today there are more than 9,100 black elected officials, including 43 members of Congress, the largest number ever. The act has opened the political process for many of the approximately 6,000 Latino public officials that have been elected and appointed nationwide, including 263 at the state or federal level, 27 of whom serve in Congress. And Native Americans, Asians and others who have historically encountered harsh barriers to full political participation also have benefited greatly.

We must not forget the importance of protecting this hard earned right.

VOTER ID

An election with integrity is one that is open to every eligible voter. Restrictive voter ID requirements degrade the integrity of our elections by systematically excluding large numbers of eligible Americans.

I do not argue with the notion that we must prevent individuals from voting who are not allowed to vote. Yet a hidden argument in this bill is that immigrants may “infiltrate” our voting system. Legal immigrants who have successfully navigated the citizenship maze are unlikely to draw the attention of the authorities by attempting to register incorrectly. Similarly, undocumented immigrants are even less likely to risk deportation just to influence an election.

If for no other reason than after a major disaster be it earthquakes, fires, floods or hurricanes, we must all understand how vulnerable our system is. Families fleeing the hurricanes and fires suffered loss of property that included lost documents. Compounding this was the devastation of the region, which virtually shut down civil services in the area. For example, New Orleans residents after Hurricane Katrina were scattered across 44 states. These uprooted citizens had difficulty registering and voting both with absentee ballots and at satellite voting stations. As a result, those elections took place fully 8 months after the disaster, and it required the efforts of nonprofits, such as the NAACP, to ensure that voters had the access they are constitutionally guaranteed.

We need to address the election fraud that we know occurring, such as voting machine integrity and poll volunteer training and competence. After every election that occurs in this country, we have solid documented evidence of voting inconsistencies and errors. In 2004, in New Mexico, malfunctioning machines mysteriously failed to properly register

a presidential vote on more than 20,000 ballots. 1 million ballots nationwide were flawed by faulty voting equipment—roughly one for every 100 cast.

Those who face the most significant barriers are not only the poor, minorities, and rural populations. 1.5 million college students, whose addresses change often, and the elderly, will also have difficulty providing documentation.

In fact, newly married individuals face significant barriers to completing a change in surname. For instance, it can take 6–8 weeks to receive the marriage certificate in the mail, another two weeks (and a full day waiting in line) to get the new Social Security card, and finally three–four weeks to get the new driver’s license. There is a significant possibility that this bill will also prohibit newlyweds from voting if they are married within three months of Election Day.

The right to vote is a critical and sacred constitutionally protected civil right. To challenge this is to erode our democracy, challenge justice, and mock our moral standing. I urge my colleagues to join me in dismissing this crippling legislation, and pursue effective solutions to the real problems of election fraud and error. We cannot let the rhetoric of an election year destroy a fundamental right upon which we have established liberty and freedom.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,

WASHINGTON, DC,

July 25, 2011.

Hon. ERIC HOLDER,

U.S. Attorney General, United States Department of Justice, Robert F. Kennedy Building, 950 Pennsylvania Ave., N.W., Washington, DC.

DEAR ATTORNEY GENERAL HOLDER: We are concerned about the restrictive voter photo identification legislation pending or already signed into law in a number of states. Many of these bills only have one true purpose, the disenfranchisement of eligible voters—especially the elderly, young voters, students, minorities, and low-income voters. Approximately 11 percent of voting-age citizens in the country—or more than 20 million individuals—lack government-issued photo identification. We urge you to protect the voting rights of Americans by using the full power of the Department of Justice to review these voter identification bills and scrutinize their implementation.

The Voting Rights Act vests significant authority in the Department to ensure laws are not implemented in a discriminatory manner. Section 5 of the Voting Rights Act requires preclearance by the Department when there is an attempt to change any voting qualification or prerequisite to voting, or standard, practice, or procedure with respect to voting in covered jurisdictions. In Section 5 jurisdictions, whenever photo identification legislation is considered, the Department should closely monitor the legislative process to track any unlawful intent evinced by the proceedings. In jurisdictions not covered by Section 5, the Department should exercise vigilance in overseeing whether these laws are implemented in a way that discriminates against protected classes in violation of Section 2 of the Voting Rights Act.

Restrictive voter photo identification legislation has the potential to block millions of eligible American voters, and thus suppress the right to vote. We urge you to exercise your authority to examine these laws so that voting rights are not jeopardized. We also request that you brief us on the efforts the Department is undertaking to ensure

these new laws are implemented in accordance with the Voting Rights Act.

Sincerely,

Marcia L. Fudge; Nancy Pelosi; Steny H. Hoyer; James E. Clyburn; John B. Larson; George Miller; Tim Ryan; Janice D. Schakowsky; Keith Ellison; Grace F. Napolitano; Emanuel Cleaver; André Carson; Raúl M. Grijalva; Maxine Waters; Laura Richardson; Lucille Roybal-Allard; Silvestre Reyes; Sheila Jackson Lee; Yvette D. Clarke; Bob Filner.

Barbara Lee; Donna M. Christensen; José E. Serrano; Judy Chu; Alcee L. Hastings; Charles B. Rangel; Karen Bass; Frederica S. Wilson; Melvin L. Watt; Eleanor Holmes Norton; Bennie G. Thompson; G. K. Butterfield; William Lacy Clay; Danny K. Davis; John Lewis; Gwen Moore; Tammy Baldwin; Jesse L. Jackson, Jr.; Robert C. "Bobby" Scott; Donald M. Payne.

Michael M. Honda; Betty McCollum; Henry C. "Hank" Johnson, Jr.; Robert A. Brady; Dennis J. Kucinich; Edolphus Towns; Anna G. Eshoo; Steve Cohen; Corrine Brown; Luis V. Guterrez; Elijah E. Cummings; Rubén Hinojosa; Joe Baca; Chellie Pingree; Betty Sutton; Terri A. Sewell; Charles A. Gonzalez; Fortney Pete Stark; Peter Welch; Brad Miller.

Ben Ray Lujan; Loretta Sanchez; Carolyn B. Maloney; Donna F. Edwards; Dale E. Kildee; Henry A. Waxman; Doris O. Matsui; James P. McGovern; Eni F.H. Faleomavaega; Eliot L. Engel; Earl Blumenauer; Hansen Clarke; Gary L. Ackerman; John Garamendi; Russ Carnahan; Jerry McNerney; Rush D. Holt; Bill Pascrell, Jr.; Robert E. Andrews; Peter A. DeFazio.

Zoe Lofgren; Paul Tonko; Howard L. Berman; Lynn C. Woolsey; Michael H. Michaud; Lois Capps; Xavier Becerra; Rosa L. DeLauro; Steve Israel; Louise McIntosh Slaughter; Chris Van Hollen; Al Green; Cedric L. Richmond; Albio Sires; Sam Farr; Jim McDermott; Jim Cooper; Gregory W. Meeks; Nydia Velázquez; Marcy Kaptur.

Eddie Bernice-Johnson; Theodore E. Deutch; Lloyd Doggett; Linda T. Sánchez; John P. Sarbanes; John W. Olver; Jerrold Nadler; John C. Carney; John D. Dingell; John F. Tierney; James A. Himes; Chaka Fattah; David E. Price; Ed Pastor; Chris Murphy.

Mrs. CHRISTENSEN. I thank you for your support, and I know that I have the support of the Congressional Black Caucus. It just raises the issue that we have been coming to the floor for the entire year to speak on before this evening, and that's jobs and job creation.

Mine, like other communities across the country, will definitely need to enact legislation, like the American Jobs Act and some of the countless pieces of legislation that the Congressional Black Caucus has introduced in this Congress to create jobs for the people, for people in this country.

I just wanted to add that in addition to the impact on the U.S. Virgin Islands and St. Croix in particular, this closing will have a major impact, especially on the east coast, as Hovensa has been a major supplier of gasoline to the east coast. So, again, I ask for your prayers and your support.

With that, I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to speak in strong opposition to voter suppression efforts in Texas and in several other states throughout the country.

In the United States, we use voting as a means for the people to select their elected representatives at all levels of government. This is a basic tenet of American democracy that some have sought to manipulate and curtail.

Through a series of regressive voting laws, a number of state legislatures have already taken extraordinary measures to exclude the elderly, our youth, minorities, and the poor from access to the polls and casting their ballots.

Whether in the form of voter ID mandates, obstructions to voter registration, or even outright intimidation, these measures to keep eligible voters from exercising their right to vote are contrary to our founding principles as a Nation.

In Texas, strict voter ID laws were passed in the State Legislature last year. This law requires each voter to present a valid government-issued ID, regardless of whether they possess a voter registration card and are listed among the voting rolls. These efforts are specifically tailored to exclude specific voting groups.

The only mechanism keeping these discriminatory policies from becoming effective in Texas is preclearance, required under the Voting Rights Act in states that have a history of racial discrimination.

We need only to look to history to know that these kinds of devious tactics have been used before. In essence, these laws mimic the literacy tests and poll taxes that defined the days of Jim Crow. Except today, these laws target not only minorities but also seniors, students, the disabled, and the poor.

Yet here we find ourselves again battling the same problem with a different disguise. I refuse to accept that these laws seek to address existing weaknesses in our electoral system. In fact, these laws do nothing to address the kinds of fraud that were exposed during previous elections, such as the purging of entire voter rolls or intentionally long wait times during early voting.

Mr. Speaker, it is absolutely critical that we work toward strengthening the integrity of our elections and avoid tactics meant to sway their outcome in favor of a select few. It is undemocratic and I will continue to oppose any efforts to suppress our electorate.

RIGHT TO LIFE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. GARDNER). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 5, 2011, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SMITH) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, the right-to-life movement is the greatest human rights movement on Earth, a remarkable decades-long struggle embraced by millions of selfless women and men of all ages, races, colors and creed and made up in recent years, I'm happy to say, disproportionately of young people.

We defend and seek to protect all the weak and vulnerable persons from the

violence of abortion, infanticide and euthanasia. We believe in the politics and policies of inclusion, regardless of race, age, sex, disability or condition of dependence.

Yesterday, January 22, marked the 39th year since the infamous holdings of Roe v. Wade and Doe v. Bolton, the pair of Supreme Court decisions that nullified fundamental pro-life protections throughout the United States. The catastrophic loss of children's lives since Roe v. Wade and Doe v. Bolton has been absolutely numbing. Over 54 million children have been killed by dismemberment, chemical poisoning, lethal pills, suction and starvation.

Let's not forget that RU-486 is a chemical compound. It's two chemicals, and one of the effects of one of those chemicals is to literally starve the baby in the womb to death. The second chemical brings on delivery of a dead baby. Women have been harmed by abortion as well. Over 100 studies showed significant psychological harm, major depression and elevated suicide risk in women who abort.

The Times of London wrote, senior psychiatrists say that new evidence has uncovered a clear link between abortion and mental illness in women with no previous history of psychological problems. They found that women who had abortions had twice the level of psychological problems and three times the level of depression as women who give birth or who have never been pregnant.

Younger women are also harmed by abortion psychologically. A comprehensive New Zealand study found that almost 80 percent of 15- to 18-year-olds who had abortions displayed symptoms of major depression as compared to 31 percent of their peers.

Abortion also has a deleterious effect on subsequent children born to women who have aborted. At least 113 studies showed significant association between abortion and subsequent premature births. One study by Shah and Zoe showed a 36 percent increased risk for preterm birth after one abortion and a staggering 93 percent increased risk after two.

What does this mean for subsequent children born to women who have had abortions? Preterm birth is the leading cause of infant mortality in the industrialized world after congenital abnormalities or anomalies. Preterm infants have a greater risk of suffering from common lung disease, sensory deficit, cerebral palsy and cognitive impairment and behavioral problems.

Low birth weight, which is also one of the consequences, is associated with neo-natal mortality and motility.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, at the March for Life today, there were large, large numbers of people, tens of thousands of people. As cochair of the Pro-Life Caucus, I was proud to stay with so many of our lawmakers here, many of whom are on the floor tonight, and also with our leadership, Speaker JOHN BOEHNER, Majority Leader CANTOR, KEVIN

MCCARTHY and JEB HENSARLING, among the most profoundly important speeches made about the sanctity and the dignity of human life.

And they have produced the No Taxpayer Funding for Abortion Act, H.R. 3, which not only would be a government-wide prohibition on government funding for abortion, it also had a robust, very significant conscience clause as part of that legislation.

The Protect Life Act and, of course, the defunding of Planned Parenthood, a group that aborts in its clinics some 330,000 abortions, 330,000 dead babies in its clinics each and every year. It was a great march and we had women from Silent No More campaign, post-abortive women who eloquently speak to all women not to have abortions because they are the ones who have been victimized by it, but also as a pathway to healing and reconciliation for those who have. This movement is all about forgiveness and all about reconciliation and reaching out to those who are on the other side, especially post-abortive women.

I would like to now yield to the distinguished gentlelady from Tennessee, MARSHA BLACKBURN.

Mrs. BLACKBURN. I thank the gentleman from New Jersey for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, he said something that is so important. This is a special day, it's a somber day and solemn in many ways, but yet it is a day when you think about hope and encouragement and reconciliation. We all have had constituents who have come in today to express their opinion and to mark this 39 years to be here to protest, 39 long, painful years of government-sanctioned abortion on demand.

My constituents and many Tennesseans that came here today and that gathered in churches and at the State Capitol in Nashville have done it for two reasons. One is to protest abortion. The other is to show respect for life. They have spoken with one voice.

Life is a beautiful gift from God and no government should be able to take that life away. We know in our hearts what is true. Life is a natural right, and the Declaration of Independence calls for us to protect the smallest and the weakest among us. After all, there is no independence without our most basic, fundamental right, the right to life.

There are a couple of things that have concerned many of us lately. One is abortion being smuggled into our health care system through ObamaCare. It is something that I think is morally indefensible, it is fiscally irresponsible, it is an issue that we're going to hear more about each and every day as we go through the year.

□ 2030

As a woman, I believe that America and our citizens deserve better than abortion. And I believe, and this is the second thing that has really caught a lot of attention lately and is an area

where we are going to place some additional attention this year, and that is on Planned Parenthood. America deserves better than Planned Parenthood. And it's important that everyone realize, Mr. Speaker, that Planned Parenthood continues to profit from the destruction of human life with taxpayer money. This year, we are going to delve into that issue a little bit more and find out more about what has happened with these funds and the organization of Planned Parenthood.

Today, as our constituents have come into the city, we have been encouraged, and we have encouraged others. It's nice to be able to encourage one another. We all have prayed for the millions of women and children who are hurt by abortion, and we have also prayed that God will provide the courage and the steadfastness that is needed for us to put an end to this national tragedy.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I want to thank my friend, Mrs. BLACKBURN, for her very eloquent comments, and thank her for her leadership.

I would now like to yield to the gentlelady from Ohio (Mrs. SCHMIDT), who has led both in Ohio when she was there in the legislature as well as here in Washington.

Mrs. SCHMIDT. I thank my good friend from New Jersey (Mr. SMITH). Your courage on this issue will not go unnoticed.

I really, Mr. Speaker, wanted to talk to you tonight about a little girl, a little girl with a 2-inch foot and the lasting impression that that little 2-inch foot has made.

I come from southern Ohio, and my parish is St. Elizabeth Ann Seton, led by Father Michael Cordier. Father Cordier has a brother, Andy, and his sister-in-law, Ann. And just recently they buried their 5-month-old daughter.

Sophia Grace Cordier was born with a chromosomal condition, one that was diagnosed long before she was born. The doctors made the suggestion that perhaps they should abort the child because the risks were so great that she wouldn't even be born alive. Given the statistics, even if she was born alive, it was likely she would not make her first birthday, so why bother. But Ann and Andy understand the meaning of life at all levels. They know that life is precious, and they knew that her life was worthy of respect.

The amazing thing is not just the hundreds of people who came to the funeral, but what happened on December 23. See, the Cincinnati Enquirer had a front-page story on the miracle baby. They showed the risks, but they also talked about life and pro-life positions, our Cincinnati Enquirer.

At the funeral, there were many pictures of Sophia Grace. But the one that left the imprint on my mind were her little 2-inch footprints. And her mother had, and I wished I could remember the exact words, but typed up something that said to the point that no matter

how small the footprint, every footprint can make a lasting impression. Had Sophia not been born, the Enquirer wouldn't have run the story and it wouldn't have provoked the discussion for life, and who knows what other child wouldn't have been saved.

Ann told me at the funeral that the value of life each person has, no matter their shortcomings or faults, should be loved and cherished and protected. Ann has it right. I believe many people in this Congress have it right. And I know that Americans at heart have it right.

So today, while hundreds of thousands marched on the lawn of the Capitol in the rain to protest a really bad decision that was made 39 years ago, I saw Sophia's little footprints in my mind. As I saw those footprints on the lawn, I thought those big footprints are making as lasting an impression as little Sophia because no matter how great or how small, we all have life's value because we are children of God.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I thank my good friend for her excellent statement.

I now yield to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. WALBERG).

Mr. WALBERG. I thank the gentleman for his courage in standing on this issue of life. It's an important issue. And tonight, we will have the privilege of hearing from lawyers and doctors and business people who all hold the same position, the position held with the framers and founders of this great country when they began in writing the greatest document man has ever written, I believe, the Declaration of Independence, that said many things, but this tonight comes in very important to us when they said:

We hold these truths to be self-evident that all men are created equal and endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable rights, among them, the right to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness.

They understood in their wise minds as they deliberated together and as they contemplated doing something that had not been done in this world before, they sought their Creator for wisdom, and they understood truths that were unique and special and truths that were blessed ultimately by their Creator.

And so tonight, I don't want to speak to you from a medical perspective or from a legal perspective, but I want to speak from a perspective that really we give credence to when we look above the Speaker's rostrum and we see our motto for this great Nation: In God we trust. What does he think about what went on today? What does he think of what went on 39 years ago?

Well, the Psalmist said in the word of God that was left for us to understand and our framers and founders read, meditated upon, deliberated over, and came up with something great for this life and this country, they read words such as this. The Psalmist in Psalm 127 said:

Behold, children are a gift of the LORD, the fruit of the womb is a reward.

The prophet Jeremiah heard from God himself who said to Jeremiah:

Before I formed you in the womb, I knew you, before you were born I set you apart.

Unique. Not a product of conception, a product of God's planning and gift.

And then in that beautiful Psalm, Psalm 139:

For You formed my inward parts; you wove me in my mother's womb. I will give thanks to You, for I am fearfully and wonderfully made; Wonderful are Your works, And my soul knows it very well. My frame was not hidden from You, When I was made in secret, And skillfully wrought in the depths of the earth; Your eyes have seen my unformed substance; And in Your book were all written The days that were ordained for me, when as yet there was not one of them.

In God we trust. He designed us. He designed a purpose for all life, Mr. Speaker. We as humans run amuck of His plan, His wisdom, if we decide what is good, what is right, what is acceptable as opposed to saying: God, thank You for the gift.

I'm a father of three gifts; I'm a grandfather of four, one in heaven that I look forward to seeing again some day after he fought and lived for 8 days on this Earth. I'm a grandfather of two others who are on the ground who I enjoy to the fullest, and a grandfather of one who is in the womb at this very time growing into what God intends him to be. And in a little over a month, I look forward to meeting and greeting that new creation, gift of God, formed uniquely in the womb.

We can think of medical practices and terms, and those are good. We can have arguments from law and Constitution, and those are good and decent. But I take the words of God, the Creator himself, and find great sustenance in my belief that life is the greatest gift that God has given. And the Savior that He gave who was born of a woman in a womb, not aborted, said:

I am come that you might have life, and life abundantly.

We would do well in this great country to say "Amen" to that issue and to support life in all its forms.

□ 2040

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. WALBERG, thank you very much for that very eloquent and God-centered testimony on behalf of life. I would point out that throughout the Capitol and throughout the country there were religious services on behalf of the unborn seeking reconciliation and wisdom from above and healing. One of those was the National Memorial for the Preborn and Their Mothers and Fathers right here in the Capitol. Clergy from various denominations gathered together to pray and to hear readings from the Gospels, Old and New Testaments, and to hear the preaching of Father Frank Pavone, director of Priests for Life and president of the National Pro-Life Religious Council, and so many others of all denominations and faiths pleading before the Lord for reconciliation and, frankly, for forgive-

ness for this terrible tragedy of abortion on demand.

I would like to now yield to the gentlelady from New York, ANN MARIE BUERKLE. Mr. WALBERG talked about the lawyers. Well, she is a lawyer and a nurse and brings a unique perspective to this fight, the struggle for the human rights of the unborn and for their mothers.

Ms. BUERKLE. And I thank the gentleman from New Jersey for his leadership in this issue.

Mr. Speaker, I stand before you this evening as we commemorate the 39th anniversary of the infamous Supreme Court decision Roe v. Wade. And as we stand here and we reflect as a Nation the loss of millions and millions of unborn lives and the destruction and the damage that is done to the woman—there are two victims in an abortion, both the mother and the unborn—I think there is reason for us to be hopeful. This day we witnessed hundreds of thousands of Americans marching on the Capitol in support of life; and of those hundreds of thousands, so many of them were young people, high school students and college students standing up for life, doing the right thing. So I am hopeful we are changing the hearts and minds of the American people. The youth of today are willing to stand up for what's right, and they understand the words of the Declaration of Independence, that we are endowed by our Creator with unalienable Rights, among them, life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness, and the most basic right is the right to life.

So we celebrate those youth who have the courage to stand up on behalf of life, and we pray for the change of the hearts and minds of the American people to understand that every life, regardless of how that life was conceived, is valuable; it has intrinsic value, and we must protect that life.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Thank you, Ms. BUERKLE.

I would like to now yield to the gentleman from Tennessee, Dr. ROE. We have, in this Congress, a number of medical doctors, most of whom are profoundly pro-life. And in the case of Dr. ROE, I believe he has delivered at least 5,000 babies.

Mr. ROE of Tennessee. I thank the gentleman for yielding. And I want to first start out by thanking my friend and colleague, Congressman SMITH, for being one of the most steadfast leaders in this Nation, not tonight, not for this 1 hour of Special Order tonight, but for decades, CHRIS, for standing up for life and what's right, and I am proud to associate with you.

Today, as we went out on The Mall here, for those of you all who didn't see it on television, it was a cold, rainy day—and it was very cold last year and clear—but it didn't dampen the spirits of literally thousands and thousands of people who came from all over the Nation, and as Congresswoman BUERKLE just said, the scores of young people who are here to celebrate life.

Life, as has been mentioned, is a precious gift from God. And not only is abortion wrong both morally and ethically, it's a really bad idea. And I know from my practice of medicine, I'm an OB/GYN doctor, as Congressman SMITH mentioned, and in the group that I belong to and in the years that I was there, we delivered over 25,000 babies, myself almost 5,000 babies.

What I got to see during that time, it's been an amazing transition. When Roe v. Wade was passed, we didn't have access to ultrasound; and as ultrasound came along from just a little gray blur that you were able to see to now in 3-D and 4-D ultrasound that you're able to visualize the fingers, the hands and the movement, to see this little person very early on. We can identify a heart-beat at 28 days post-conception. And I will defy anyone to tell me that that is not a living, breathing, in utero human being. It's a person that's there that just hasn't been there quite long enough yet.

And I remember in my practice when I first began in 1977, at 32 weeks, half of the children died of prematurity at that point. Now, those children live the same as a term birth. And we're seeing that number pushed further and further and further back with children younger and younger.

We tend to think of this in our own time. Think about 50 or 100 years from now. Who knows what the technology will provide? Because it is a precious gift from God that we're protecting.

I sadly stand here and tell you that 19,500 women in Tennessee in 2008 had an abortion. That's just in one State. The rate is going down, and across the Nation it's going down, but it's far, far too many. And we've just heard a number, 54 million, that boggles my mind about how many people that is. And I can tell you, having had the opportunity to live in the community I have for 35 years and to watch young babies that I have delivered grow up to be teachers, coaches, doctors, and friends of mine—many of them are close, personal friends that I have delivered. I've watched them now take their children to soccer matches and to school plays and learn to play musical instruments and to add to this Nation and to add to the culture of this Nation. I can't imagine what this world would be like without them here.

And one of the great privileges that I've had in my life was a person that I know very well at home came to me and he said, Dr. ROE, do you remember that boy you delivered of mine 20 years ago? I said, Yeah, I do. He said, You also had the privilege of nominating him to the military academy to Annapolis. And I stand here with great pride, and I'm probably one of the few people that's been able to do that. And what if his mother had made a different decision? This young leader in this country, these are the future leaders of our Nation.

I want to finish by saying I think, to me, personally, one of the most heinous procedures that could ever be performed on a human being is a third-trimester abortion. There is absolutely no medical reason—I stand here tonight and will challenge anybody in this Nation of over 300 million people to debate me on this issue. There is no medical indication other than termination of the child's life. There is no reason to do that for any other.

I have made this challenge before, and I will make it again here tonight. I have yet to be taken up on that. I don't see any difference in that and why wait until a baby is born and do something. It's called murder then.

I want to thank CHRIS again, Congressman SMITH, for being so steadfast in his 30-plus years. You are changing hearts and changing minds. And it is a true privilege to stand here tonight with my colleagues and to be for life. I can't imagine being otherwise.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Dr. ROE, thank you so very much for your kind remarks, and you have been a leader, as have the Members that have been speaking. There's no single leader, except for maybe Henry Hyde when he was the leader here in the House. But this is a group leadership of men and women who are just passionately in favor of life.

I mentioned doctors who are strongly members of this Pro-Life Caucus. Well, one of those is Dr. FLEMING from Louisiana, and I would like to yield to him.

And I just point out that the Obama administration has declared war on conscious protections. He has done it in a repeated fashion, most recently in ordering all health insurers, including faith-based institutions, to pay for all means of preventing pregnancy, including subsidizing abortifacients like Ella and Plan B. Everyone must comply regardless of moral objection or religious tenets simply because Obama says so.

The United States Catholic Conference of Bishops recently had a grant to assist human trafficking victims under a law I wrote called the Trafficking Victims Protection Act. They did a great job. The reviewers said so and gave it very high marks. But that wasn't enough for the Obama administration. This past fall, the USCCB was blatantly discriminated against and thrown out of the program simply because they would not refer for abortions.

And Mr. LANKFORD, who will speak shortly as well, did a wonderful job in a hearing in bringing out, as did Chairman ISSA, how discriminatory this really is.

Leading the effort on conscience protection, prime sponsor of the Abortion Nondiscrimination Act, is Dr. FLEMING.

Mr. FLEMING. I thank the gentleman, Mr. SMITH, not just for the introduction, but for the fine work you've done for so many years, sir, as well as JOE PITTS, our good friend and colleague.

Mr. Speaker, I speak to you this evening as a physician of over 30 years,

a father, and a grandfather. And I have delivered, myself, many hundred babies and have found that that is one of the most important and intimate times in a person's life is taking part of and in some way delivering a baby.

□ 2050

Nonetheless, we have today a problem since *Roe v. Wade* that we are in great grievance about.

You heard Mr. WALBERG so eloquently talk about the passages from the Bible that describe about knitting me in the womb and knowing me even before being born. But do you realize that the DNA of every conceived life is unique in history? There will never be another like it. In my opinion, that is God's opinion, that that is a separate and distinct human being and a person upon itself.

Let me share some facts with you. Do you realize that the heart begins beating at 23 days after conception, that the fetus begins to feel pain as early as 20 weeks and maybe even earlier? We are still waiting for some studies on that. Certainly any abortion that is committed in the middle or third trimester is obviously extreme agony for any type of fetus.

Some other important facts. While there were approximately 744,000 abortions in 1973, the time of *Roe v. Wade*, that actually peaked in 1990 at 1.6 million. It has come down. It has come down today to 1.2 million. Not nearly low enough. Do you realize also that over \$487 million of taxpayer money is used each year to go to Planned Parenthood, which is the number one provider of abortions in this country, committing over 320,000 innocent lives to death each year?

There are things we are doing that are effective. You heard me say that we are down from a peak of 1.6 million down to 1.2 million. What are some of the things that we can do and have done? My home State, Louisiana, which was chosen by AUL to be number one in abortion law, has done the following: A mother-to-be must wait at least 24 hours after notification to actually have an abortion; she must be provided with information so she can read about this and have a cooling-off period before making that final decision; she must receive information about fetal pain, what I mentioned just a moment ago; and that she must be allowed, if she chooses, to view a sonogram to see what that fetus actually looks like, her potential baby. And Louisiana has declared that the unborn child is a human being and is therefore a person.

Mr. Speaker, there is a lot that we have done. There is a lot more we can do. Although I want to see *Roe v. Wade* overturned, there are still many good laws that we can produce that I think—certainly defunding of organizations that provide these abortions that can sharply lower these numbers. There is much more we can do.

We shouldn't just hold out for overturning *Roe v. Wade*. We should act today.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I would like to now yield to the gentlewoman from Alabama, Congresswoman MARTHA ROBY.

One of the blessings of this Congress is that we have so many articulate and brave women who speak out in defense of life. I have been here for 32 years and I think we have now more pro-life women than ever.

Mrs. ROBY. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I also rise today to recognize the 39th anniversary of the monumental court decision of *Roe v. Wade*.

Since the legalizing of abortion in 1973, approximately 50 million abortions have been performed in the United States of America alone. Just today, 4,000 babies have been aborted. Over the course of 2012, as you heard the doctor just say, 1.2 million children in the United States will not be granted life.

I am unapologetically pro-life and it is a tremendous honor to be a part of this pro-life caucus. I believe that the miracle of human life begins at the moment of conception. I also believe that every human life has the inherent right to life and that this must be protected by law. As a woman, a wife and a mother of two precious young children of my own, I will continue to fight for the unborn as a Representative of Alabama's Second Congressional District.

I applaud my own home State of Alabama in its admirable fight to protect human life. Alabama recently became the fifth State to pass a measure banning physicians from performing abortions after 20 weeks, which according to the research you just heard is the point where an unborn child can experience pain. I applaud the Alabama legislature for taking such a strong stance on abortion and protecting the unborn.

I believe that I have an obligation to do everything in my power to fight for the unborn, prevent taxpayer money from funding abortions and to protect our system from the encroachment of the all-powerful judiciary.

Today is the time to celebrate the gift of life and to mourn those lives that were unjustly ended before birth. Let us use the 39th anniversary of *Roe v. Wade* as an occasion to reaffirm our belief and to vow to fight for the life of every child.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I thank the gentlewoman.

I would like to now yield to my good friend and colleague from Indiana, MARLIN STUTZMAN, who before coming to the House, fought for life in the legislature. And he did a wonderful job.

Mr. STUTZMAN. I thank the gentleman for yielding. I want to thank him for his service and his fight on this particular issue. And it is a privilege to stand here today with so many other colleagues on this important matter.

Mr. Speaker, I stand here before you today as a father of two young boys that I'm very proud of, Payton and Preston.

In this day of technology, it is amazing what we can now see in the womb.

Today I brought with me a picture of my niece that my brother sent to me and it is on my BlackBerry. If you could see the picture, it is a picture of a little girl with a pudgy nose, pudgy cheeks and a lot of hair. The doctor tells my brother and my sister-in-law that she talks a lot and it doesn't surprise me for a Stutzman.

It is amazing to see a color picture like this of a little baby girl 27 months old in the womb and to see this picture and to realize the life that is inside the womb is truly amazing and remarkable. I believe that is what is going to be a big part in leading the battle in overturning *Roe v. Wade* or reversing this tragic decision that has led to so many lost lives here in America.

As I served in the Indiana legislature for so many years, we fought this issue year after year. And I applaud the Indiana legislature, especially last year, in passing legislation and preventing the subsidization of abortions with State and Federal tax dollars. At the same time, I want to bring to the floor the important matter that we have to continue to push back on the Federal Government because the Federal Government has threatened to withhold other health care dollars from the State of Indiana for this decision.

Indiana has actually been most recently named the most improved over 2011 by Americans United for Life and now ranks as the number 10 State in the Nation for defense of the unborn. Planned Parenthood received over \$487.4 million in government funding. That is an astounding \$1.34 million per day. By their own count, they performed 329,445 abortions in that same time. That is over 900 abortions a day.

Mr. Speaker, today is the day that we stop a tragedy that is going to be a blight on this country. I believe that the young people across America that marched today here in Washington, D.C., are going to be the generation that puts an end to this tragedy.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Thank you very much and thank you for reminding all of us that Planned Parenthood really is Child Abuse, Incorporated, 329,000, 332,000 the year before that of innocent children decimated, killed in their clinics.

I would like to now yield to the gentleman from New Mexico, Mr. STEVAN PEARCE, who is back to us having served in the House. He came back after a different run.

He is a stalwart for life and a great friend of the unborn.

□ 2100

Mr. PEARCE. Thanks to the gentleman from New Jersey for leading this issue. The value of a Nation is measured in its willingness to speak for the most fragile among us.

In the United States, it is punishable by 5 years in jail and a \$250,000 fine to destroy an eagle egg, an embryo. If you destroy a human embryo, it is not only fully legal, but it is federally sanctioned. The Nation needs to pause and

ask itself about these convoluted values.

It does not pass without note that *Roe vs. Wade*, 39 years ago, was passed in 1973. It was the same year that the Endangered Species Act was passed protecting the eagle eggs. So at the point that this Nation was fully sanctioning the destruction of human embryos, it was fully protecting embryos of other species.

I'm fully confident today that this tragedy is going to be reversed because I hear young men and young women across this Nation who are looking at the scientific evidence to understand that it is more than a blob of tissue, but this is human life that we're ending.

We see the decline in the value of the human in our culture because of decisions that this Nation's policy leaders have made, and I see young people across this land beginning to stand up and let their voices be heard. And when we speak with one voice, Washington listens. And in this case of protecting the human life, it is time for Washington to listen.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Thank you so much for that very, very eloquent statement.

I would like to now yield to VICKY HARTZLER from Missouri, a new Member of Congress who has already made a serious impact, particularly on the life issue. So glad to have you here.

Mrs. HARTZLER. Thank you so much, Congressman. It is an honor to be here tonight on the anniversary of the 39th year of the *Roe v. Wade* court decision. And today it was so encouraging to see the hundreds of thousands of people from all across this country come here to march and to commemorate this deadline, this decision, and to celebrate life and to pray for the day when all life is valued in this country.

It was cold, about 36 degrees here, and it was rainy, but people stood for hours out in the rain, not minding, because they believe in life. And people may say, well, why are the people doing this? And why are you pro-life?

And I'd just like to summarize it, Mr. Speaker, in that, basically because it's a child, not a choice. We see those bumper stickers around and we don't think about them very much. But those words and that reality certainly has meaning for me because words matter.

I was in sixth grade when the *Roe vs. Wade* decision came down, and I remember hearing a little bit about it, but not thinking too much about it. I was just busy being a 12-year old kid. But I remember one day in the hallway at school when a girl stopped me and said something about well, what do you think about abortion? What do you think? And I said, well, I don't know. And she said, well, do you think a woman should have a right to do with her body whatever she wants, and the government shouldn't tell her what to do? And I said, well, yeah. And she said well, you're pro-choice. And I said oh,

well, okay. And I didn't feel quite right about it, but I didn't have much information, I didn't have much facts, I didn't know. So I remember in the future somebody asked me whether I was pro-choice, and I said yeah.

But then something happened. I got some facts, I got some information. It was in high school, in a child development class. And all of a sudden I got to see, for the first time, pictures of a developing baby. And let me show one to you now. This is one of the pictures that I saw, and this is of a 2-month old baby.

And I looked at all of these pictures, and I heard the information, and I realized that abortion is taking this life, and it's alive. It is a child. It is not a choice.

Here's some facts that I learned: That at day 22, that's just over 3 weeks, when most girls don't even know they're pregnant yet, the heart begins to beat. By the end of the third week the child's backbone, spinal column, and nervous system are forming.

By week six, brain waves are detectable, fingernails are forming. Week seven, eyelids and toes form. The nose is distinct and the baby is kicking and swimming.

By the end of the second month, which is how old this baby is here, every organ is in place. Bones begin to replace cartilage. Fingerprints begin to form, and the baby begins to hear.

By week 9 and 10, the baby can turn his head and frown, and the baby can hiccup. By weeks 10 and 11, the baby can breathe amniotic fluid and it can grasp objects in its hand. Perhaps you've seen that famous picture of that surgery on that unborn baby and how that hand came out and grasped the doctor's finger.

Week 12, end of the third month, the baby has all the parts necessary to experience pain. Like my colleague talked about, its vocal cords are complete, and the baby can suck its thumb.

Some facts that I also learned are, for instance, in 2008 there were 1.21 million abortions done and of those, 92 percent of those abortions were done during the first 3 months of life. So what that means is that there are abortions, and it would average out to about 138 an hour, I figured up, two for the minute that I'm talking here, where abortions are taking place on babies that can hear, that have a beating heart, that have brain waves going, and that have vocal cords.

It is about a child. This is not about a choice. And I commend all the people who came here today to Washington to speak out on behalf of life. And with them, I celebrate, and look forward to the day when all Americans are granted the right to life, whether they're born or unborn.

So thank you, Mr. Speaker, for having us today.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Thank you.

I would like to yield to the gentleman from Nebraska, JEFF FORTENBERRY, who is the prime sponsor of the

Respect for Rights of Conscience Act and has combated abortions both at home as well as in foreign nations.

Mr. FORTENBERRY. I thank the gentleman, my good friend from New Jersey, for the time and for his courageous leadership on this, a central American issue of justice.

Mr. Speaker, let me say this first. What a day this has been. I spent the morning with a group of young Nebraskans who had traveled all this way to participate in the March for Life. And they came here to express one similar purpose, one truth: that all life is worthy of protection. All life should be loved and nurtured.

These young people are saying that we should be big enough, caring enough, loving enough as a Nation to see to it that all mothers and their unborn children are provided for. And these young people are saying that we should make the great woundedness of the Roe vs. Wade decision a thing of the past.

Now, Mr. Speaker, it's important to note that in the same year when Roe vs. Wade was errantly decided by the Supreme Court, stripping unborn children of their dignity and right to life, that Congress came together and enacted a very important law called the Endangered Species Act. This was a very significant piece of legislation to ensure that the majesty and wonder of nature's creations were rightly protected.

I believe the responsible stewardship of our environment is an essential cause, but there is a certain irony here. The life of a child should be of no less value than any other creature on earth. And in 2010, with my support, we passed a bill prohibiting the interstate commerce of videos that were depicting the torture of vulnerable animals. Yet, in that same year, we could not move a bill forward that prohibited interstate abortions of vulnerable children and minors without parental protection. There is a grave inconsistency in these walls.

But, Mr. Speaker, I don't know if you had a chance to look out on the National Mall today. But the hundreds of thousands of young people out there braving both the bite of cold and wind, who understand the principle for which they marched, were saying this. These young people know that abortion hurts women. These young people are saying women deserve better. And they know that abortion is so often the result of a tragic circumstance of abandonment, an unsupportive family or, worse yet, a coercive boyfriend or unscrupulous doctor, and they are saying that we can do better as a country.

□ 2110

Mr. Speaker, I recently received a newsletter in my mailbox at home, and it described some people who were standing in front of an abortion clinic legally, peacefully providing witness to alternatives to abortion.

A car pulled up in the driveway. The car hesitated. The man driving was

very anxious and nervous. And these people who were witnessing there walked up and asked if they could be of assistance. The woman who was with him who was going in for an abortion had three children. She was unsure that she could care for a fourth child. In fact, she didn't know where her next meal was coming from.

They talked a bit. The couple decided to seek these nice people's help, who had provided a little bit of assistance, comfort, and care for them. And now 9 months later because of that act of compassion, there is a baby named David.

We should be big enough and loving enough as a country to help people get through no matter how tough the circumstances.

It is that courageous woman who made the decision to keep her child that gives me strength to stand on this floor to defend our shared convictions and fight to see the day when the scales are lifted from our Nation's eyes and we declare the unborn worthy of protection under the 14th Amendment.

Before I conclude and yield back to my good friend from New Jersey, I'd also like to say a word of thanks, Mr. Speaker, to all of the women who are saying they will be silent no more, providing the most powerful example of women who have been wounded by abortion but now who are speaking out against the abortion industry in saying we can do better as a Nation.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Thank you so much for your powerful statement.

I'd like to now yield to G.T. Thompson, a good friend and colleague from Pennsylvania who has spoken out so eloquently time and again on behalf of the sanctity of life.

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. I thank my good friend from New Jersey for yielding and for hosting this Special Order about moral truth, that the right to life is a fundamental right, and frankly a Nation that kills its next generation is not a moral Nation.

It's been 39 years since the infamous Roe v. Wade decision, and for the 39th time, the American people have marched in Washington, D.C., in the March for Life to show Congress that they remain opposed to this decision. This year, the cold and driving rain couldn't dampen the resolve of the hundreds of thousands that turned out again. Their message was simple: stop abortion.

The act of murdering an unborn child has no place in this country. For a judicial system that is taking great lengths to try and ensure justice and fairness in the court of law, where is the justice here? Mr. Speaker, I'll ask you again, where is the justice for the unborn? The answer is simple. There is none.

But still Roe v. Wade and the subsequent left-wing pro-choice groups have pushed the envelope so that now this legalized murder of the unborn is prevalent across the country, accessible,

and sometimes even partially financed by your tax dollars.

Let us look no further than last year in my home State of Pennsylvania, in a neighborhood outside west Philadelphia, an abortion mill that was in operation for over four decades, 40 years, was illegally delivering and killing newborns in a so-called abortion procedure. For years, the procedures he performed on women who came into the clinic was responsible for several deaths and severely injuring scores more.

For political reasons, even outlined in the grand jury report, the Pennsylvania Department of Health refused to inspect the abortion facilities. These abortion mills ran rampant and unchecked.

So for those who argue that this legalized murder is for the woman's health, I ask you where is the justice for those women? Where is the justice for the unborn at that facility? There is no justice in abortion for anyone.

Yet you look to the White House, and we have a President who states, "As we remember this historic anniversary, we must also continue our efforts to ensure that our daughters have the same rights, freedoms, and opportunities as our sons to fulfill their dreams."

Mr. Speaker, surely the President recognized he's wrong. Abortion is not the way to allow our daughters to fulfill their dreams. In America, everyone, regardless of color or gender, has the same rights and freedoms and opportunities to fulfill their dreams. Everyone except the unborn.

Mr. Speaker, surely the President knows that we will never know the dreams of the countless unborn daughters that are not with us today because of the pro-abortion policies this administration enforces.

Mr. Speaker, I stand with my colleagues tonight to say that enough is enough. How many more Roe v. Wade anniversaries must we endure until justice is done and this decision is overturned?

I thank my good friend from New Jersey.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I thank my good friend. Again, a very, very powerful statement.

I'd like to yield to ALAN NUNNELEE from Mississippi. I thank him for being here this evening.

Mr. NUNNELEE. I want to thank the gentleman from New Jersey for your leadership. Thank you for yielding.

Our Nation's Founders expressed in our Declaration of Independence that all individuals are endowed by their creator with certain unalienable rights, and that among these are the right to life. Yet, since January 22, 1973, over 50 million Americans have been denied that very basic right to life. Their unborn voices call from silent graves, asking America to change our ways.

There's another group who suffers in silence: our mothers, our wives, our daughters, and our sisters. Those who

have been exploited as victims of a multibillion dollar industry that profits on their grief.

On this, the 39th anniversary of that decision, we rededicate our decision to stand for life. The measure of a society is how it treats its most vulnerable of its citizens. For far too many unborn children, our Nation has abandoned that protection.

Now, there are those who say that since the Supreme Court has declared it, it must be right. This is the same Supreme Court that looked at Mr. Dred Scott and said, "Mr. Scott, in the eyes of the law, you're not a man, but chattel." The legal equivalent of a cow. The Supreme Court was wrong in 1857, and it was wrong in 1973.

We will answer to a higher law, a law higher than we debate in this hallowed Chamber, a law higher than is discussed across the street in the Supreme Court. And that law says:

For You formed my inward parts; You wove me in my mother's womb. I will give thanks to You, for I am fearfully and wonderfully made. My frame was not hidden from You, when I was made in secret, and skillfully wrought in the depths of the Earth; Your eyes have seen my unformed substance; and in Your book were all written the days that were ordained for me when as yet there was not one of them.

Mr. Speaker, I echo the prophet of old:

This day I call on heaven and earth as witnesses against you, that I have set before you life and death, blessings and curses. Now choose life, so that you and your children might live.

This night we choose life.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I thank the gentleman from Mississippi.

I yield to the gentleman from Kansas (Mr. POMPEO).

Mr. POMPEO. Mr. Speaker, we often come to the podium to talk about a bill or piece of legislation. Today I have the great privilege to stand in support of protecting every human life.

In Kansas is a place that has marked a great piece in the history of the pro-life movement. In the early 1990s, the Summer of Mercy was held in Kansas. A huge step forward in people speaking out about the tragedy that is abortion.

I, personally, a couple years later had the privilege of working doing some research for a woman named Mary Ann Glendon, who became the ambassador of the Vatican, who taught me about how this movement can work, and how we can begin to eradicate this plague that sits on top of America after still 39 years.

For me, too, it's personal. I have a nephew and a niece that, but for a pregnancy crisis center in Wichita, Kansas, would not be my niece of 6, Emily, and my nephew of 10, James. Two brave women who made the right decision.

Today was an incredible privilege. I got to stand at the Mall and look out at hundreds of thousands of folks, including enormous groups of young people who came from Kansas on buses of 25-hour rides from Clearwater and from

Norwich and from Garden Plain, and from our high schools and colleges in Kansas who came today to stand for life and to say that this movement will continue, that we are winning, that after 39 years we can now say that America understands that this is not about choice but about protecting those lives.

To see those young faces and those young smiles was a glorious thing. I want to thank them for coming to Washington, D.C., to be part of this today, and with them and with our continued effort we can do the right thing and protect every human life.

□ 2120

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma, Mr. JAMES LANKFORD.

Mr. LANKFORD. Mr. Speaker, I recently read about a couple who found out there was a problem in their pregnancy, that their child had not developed all four sections of its heart. So, at 23 weeks, they did a surgery where they reached in with a needle into the womb. They used a balloon technique to be able to open up the fourth chamber of the heart of that child. At 23 weeks, the family could gather around and see the video and celebrate this incredible scientific act of medical bravery, and then the family celebrated something wonderful that had happened. They had protected the life of a child. They reached into a beating heart, still in the womb at 23 weeks, and saved that child.

The frightening part is, across town, a different mother at 23 weeks of pregnancy, which is before viability in many States, could go to a different doctor, who could reach into that womb and pull that child apart limb by limb. The family wouldn't stand and celebrate nor would we look at the video and say that's beautiful, like we did with the other surgery.

Yet, in the cognitive dissidence of our Nation, we celebrate one mother, and we protect the other one simultaneously. It is unmistakable to look in that womb and see a life for both of them. Understand, this is a child in both instances, and they must stand to be protected.

It is a difficult thing for the President to say today that we must reduce the need for abortion. There is only one need to reduce the need for abortion: that is if the President understands the same thing that we do, that it's a life. He would not stand and say we need to reduce the need for some skin tissue or some mole on your arm. If it were only tissue, there is no need to try to reduce the need, but he understands we do need to reduce the need. As the President stated today, this is not protecting the dreams of our daughters; this is protecting the daughters that will never be and the nightmare guilt that is on so many women who have gone through an abortion.

We must stand for life. I look forward to the day. I look forward to the day

that generations ahead of us will look back at this time and say, I am so glad that the Nation finally chose life.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HULTGREN).

Mr. HULTGREN. Henry Hyde was a personal friend and mentor of mine. He first helped restrict abortion funding just 3 years after Roe v. Wade. Today, Planned Parenthood receives over 363 million tax dollars a year. We're giving 1 million tax dollars a day to an organization in desperate need of oversight. If he were here today, I think Henry Hyde would be shocked and appalled at the abhorring conditions of fraud, over-billing, and the general lack of transparency found at Planned Parenthood and at other abortion clinics across the country.

We must win this fight for life. It's the only way that we can literally win our future.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I now yield to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. HUIZENGA).

Mr. HUIZENGA of Michigan. I, too, want to rise today in recognition of this 39th year since this decision has come down from the Supreme Court, and it is something that has affected my family, my life. I think we have all known somebody who has had an abortion, whether she felt forced into it or whether she made that choice. Every single one of them, I know, has regretted that.

This issue of life became very personal for my wife and me as we had to move forward through troubled pregnancies and after losing quite a few pregnancies, struggling with that whole notion of "what is life?" and of "what does that mean to have that life growing in you?" We firmly came down on the side of this being a gift from God, that creation that happens. That's something that we want to protect.

I can tell you that the hardworking taxpayers don't expect their dollars to go towards procedures such as this and that it's something that this House has continued to fight for. I hold this issue very dear, and my wife, who now serves on the board of a crisis pregnancy center back in west Michigan, also holds that very near and dear. I will continue to fight for that sanctity of life and for that dignity of life at the beginning as well as at the end as long as we're here in Congress.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. In conclusion, tomorrow night, the President will call for a return to American values in his State of the Union message.

Mr. President, the violent destruction of the child in the womb, of the killing of babies and of the wounding of their moms is not an American value.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

THE MARCELLUS SHALE CAUCUS: THE POTENTIAL OF NATURAL GAS DEVELOPMENT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 5, 2011, the gentleman from New

York (Mr. REED) is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. REED. Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker.

I rise today with a few of my colleagues to talk about an issue that, I think, could be a game-changer for the United States of America, which is the natural gas development potential that we find in the shale formations throughout the United States.

I have been privileged to cofound the Marcellus Shale Caucus here in the U.S. House of Representatives with my colleague from Pennsylvania, MARK CRITZ, who will be joining us shortly. The purpose of the caucus is to come at this issue from an objective, scientific, database point of view in order to talk about the pros and cons of natural gas development in America and, in particular, of the Marcellus shale formation, which is located in my district of western New York, throughout Pennsylvania, and in other areas of the Northeast.

One of the things we wanted to highlight today is the indirect benefits that natural gas development will have on our country and probably most importantly from an economic point of view at this time when we face in our Nation's history some of the most enduring and high levels of unemployment we have ever seen.

What we are fundamentally talking about are jobs, not only the jobs related to extracting the natural gas, itself, and laying the pipeline to transport that natural gas to its markets, but the jobs that come as a result of the indirect benefits of that natural gas production. What I and my colleagues are, hopefully, going to talk about tonight are things like the benefits to the public local municipalities with regard to the tax base, road construction and the improvements of the road structures that are located within the areas upon which natural gas development is occurring as a result of the shale formations.

Through these conversations, I think that we will be able to establish that the benefits of extracting natural gas in America will be that game-changing event when it comes to domestic supplies of energy that come from American sources—an event we have never seen before in our lifetimes or potentially in the lifetimes of our children. So I would like to preface this entire conversation by laying some preliminary remarks based upon some concerns that have been raised as to natural gas development in America.

I travel my district. I go to many town hall meetings and get out in front of the people. At times, this issue can become sensitive in the sense of the environmental concerns that are raised. I have always taken the position that this issue should only be dealt with when we can establish that natural gas exploration and development in America can be done in a safe, clean, responsible manner. That's why, tonight, I am going to read some quotes to you,

Mr. Speaker, and to those who may be tuning in and watching this conversation, because there has been a lot of discussion about the potential threat to our aquifers and to our water supplies as a result of hydrofracking and natural gas development out of the shale and tight sand formations. For the record, I would just like to quote some of our leading environmental government officials in America:

"When it comes to natural gas development, the key is to make sure that we say, 'Engineers, make sure we do it safely, without harming water supplies,' and I think we're well on the way. On chemicals, we don't have data that shows those chemicals showing up in someone's well. Over time, that may not be a true statement. Unless there's a problem with well construction, hydrofracking chemicals shouldn't end up in aquifers," Lisa Jackson, head of the EPA for the United States of America, October 14, 2011.

"I'm not aware of any proven case where the fracking process, itself, has affected water, although there are investigations ongoing," Lisa Jackson, Director of the Environmental Protection Agency for the United States of America, May 24, 2011.

□ 2130

You know, these are comments coming from our EPA Director, but then there's comments like, "With respect to hydraulic (fracturing), because it occurs so far underground, we don't know any examples of (contamination) on public lands. But it demonstrates the importance of ensuring we have wellbore integrity up and down the entire wellbore." That's our Interior Secretary, Kenneth Salazar, testifying to the House Natural Resources Committee on November 16, 2011.

I read these quotes to tell the American people and to tell you, Mr. Speaker, that the concern about the environmental impacts to our aquifers, though legitimate, I think have been fully vetted and have had a long, serious, scientific review and approach in determining that risk is not what many people in America are making it out to be. And again I reiterate my position on this matter, that we need to look at this resource through the economic opportunity that it represents to us in our districts, in our homes, but to us as a Nation.

And we have to look at this economic opportunity and this natural resource potential based on making sure that it is done in a safe and reliable way, but we also have to look at it from a third point of view, and that is the national security implications of tapping this domestic supply of energy. Natural gas and oils are now being found all throughout America. They are also being found right here in the United States of America in the shale formation such as the Marcellus shale, the Utica shale formation, and also the tight sands formations that exist here in our Nation.

I don't think I have to speak long or hard to the American people or to you, Mr. Speaker, to explain what impact that would have on our national security. If we can establish an energy supply such that is estimated to be under our own ground in natural gas and oil, we will not be sending millions of billions, if not trillions of dollars, to people in the Middle East who have publicly declared that we are enemy number one. I think this is good public policy to promote.

On the indirect benefits, I just want to highlight three examples of people that are benefiting from this from my district.

Now in New York in the 29th Congressional District, we have not had any development in the Marcellus shale on a recent basis because of the moratorium in the Department of Environmental Conservation on the State level coming up with the regulations to ensure that this is done safely and responsibly. But I have the privilege of representing a district that's just adjacent to the northern tier of Pennsylvania, adjacent to my good friend, GT THOMPSON of Pennsylvania, who will speak shortly, where we have had a spillover effect of economic opportunity to the district.

I could talk to you about Dalrymple Holdings, it's a long, family-held company right outside of my hometown of Corning, New York, that has been involved in highway infrastructure construction in Chemung County for years and counties surrounding it. But now they've expanded beyond. The business has seen a tangible impact from the development across the border.

Mr. Dalrymple has reported to me that he has undertaken contracts for total construction of 65 miles of rural roads, a value over \$22 million of road construction being fully funded by private investment. Let me stress that again, Mr. Speaker, \$22 million of private dollars going into road construction upon which Mr. Dalrymple and his company have benefited.

Now, it's not just Mr. Dalrymple. I know this man, he's a good man, and in that \$22 million worth of additional investment in his company and in the projects that it represents, he has been able to create and hire over 60 new men and women averaging \$40 per hour to his business to fulfill those contracts. Those are 60 families that now benefit directly as a result of this development occurring in the northern tier of Pennsylvania.

Mr. Speaker, Mr. Dalrymple and I share a common background in the sense of he's a small business owner, I was a small business owner before I came here to Congress. And I could tell you there is nothing, nothing like looking at a man or a woman when you hire them and bring them into your business, and you put them to work.

When you have sat in that position, you know when you look at that person you're not just benefiting that person, that person becomes part of your family as a small business owner, and

you're taking care of him or her, but you're also taking care of his family, his children by putting food on their table, by providing extra dollars for their children and their education. That is the American ideal. That's the American Dream, just to give someone the opportunity to go to work to take care of their families.

And I also will bring to the record tonight a story of our local dry cleaning company. I could not believe it, Mr. Speaker. I went over to pick up the family dry cleaning, and I was talking to Rick over in Painted Post, New York, just adjacent to my hometown of Corning. And he said, TOM, come back here, I want to show you something.

And we went into his back room and he showed me piles of uniforms that were used by industrial workers, by the workers on the fields in the northern tier of Pennsylvania. He related to me that he was adding an additional \$5,000-plus revenue to his business coffers every month. He talked about how he was able to give bonuses to his employees because of that new opportunity. He was another small business owner that knew what it was to take care of not only his employees, but their families and to have them share in the rewards of the hard work that they put together in that dry cleaning operation.

Mr. Speaker, I would be remiss if we don't talk a little bit about the public benefits that have been brought to my attention. You know, I look to our county executive in Chemung County, adjacent to my home county of Steuben County, and I see that his county, a small geographical county, mind you, is leading New York State in sales tax growth. He's leading New York State in hotel tax revenue increases—a small county leading the great Empire State of New York by what is going on in the northern tier of Pennsylvania.

And I would be remiss if I didn't tell you the story when I spent the day down in the northern tier of Pennsylvania and met with the commissioners of Bradford County and they told me about the history of their tax sales. You know these sales, Mr. Speaker, these are the sales of people who cannot pay their real property tax bill, lose their property at an auction.

I've been to those auctions. I've looked at families that have lost their property because they couldn't pay the tax bill. Well, in Bradford County, I believe in my friend's district, Mr. THOMPSON, they used to have sales of 100, 150 parcels is my understanding. I know we have had them in Steuben County and Chemung County in New York—and guess how many parcels went up for tax sale in the last year or two? Essentially zero, maybe one or two over those 2-year periods. That is a fundamental shift in what is going on in our part of the country, and hopefully it could be shared across America.

And as that one commissioner told me as we talked about some of the concerns and issues that have to be dealt

with, and traffic is always a concern that is raised, he said I'd much rather see traffic lines in my home county than unemployment lines. And I, when I heard that line, I said, Doug, that is exactly what we're talking about. As a commissioner of Bradford County, you nailed it right on the head, and that we are talking about creating traffic lines of economic opportunity and development for generations of Americans rather than compounding and growing unemployment lines.

□ 2140

And so we will come at this issue of making sure that it is a clean and safe resource that is developed, but let us focus and join hands in bringing this opportunity for America forward.

My colleague from Pennsylvania has joined us. Mr. THOMPSON, if you would like to comment, I yield to you.

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Thank you for leading this Special Order on natural gas and its benefits. And thanks for your leadership on the Marcellus Shale Caucus. With natural gas, everybody wins. I am very proud to be a member of the Marcellus Shale Natural Gas Caucus. And I appreciate Mr. REED, my good friend from just north of me in New York, acknowledging that good stewardship and good science is important. And we have both when it comes to natural gas. This is not 50, 60 years ago when we were extracting coal. This is 2012, where we have and we benefit from great science, and we know that we have a responsibility to be good stewards of the environment. I appreciate that acknowledgment.

I represent Pennsylvania's Fifth Congressional District. There are 17 counties that I serve, and that's 22 percent of the land mass of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, 15 of my 17 counties have Marcellus shale, and I give thanks for many blessings that God has provided me in my life, and I thank God for the blessings of this natural gas at this time for our country.

I also benefit from having an institution like Pennsylvania State University, Penn State, in my district, and specifically the ag extension part of that land grant university that has experts that are out in the field helping everyday citizens with decisions about leases, leasing their land, and helping them with issues related to making sure that it is done in a way that represents good stewardship by the companies.

And here is the part I am most excited about: They are also helping them with finding the right kind of counsel for wealth management. That's the kind of problem we like to see our citizens have, a need for wealth management, because there were a lot of farmers who were going out of business. But today, they have a new John Deere tractor sitting there, and largely that is thanks to Marcellus shale. So it's going to be good for agriculture, which is good for all of America in terms of food.

Let me talk about some of the benefits because that's what we're here to focus on. And I want to start with a big one, and that's energy security. Marcellus shale is taking that large valve that controls us, all that oil that we buy from the Middle East, and we're going to be able to shut that thing off because of energy security, moving towards energy independence that natural gas is going to allow this country to have. That's something, whether you're in an area that's blessed with natural gas or not, every citizen in this country should hope and pray and give thanks for the fact that we will move ourselves in the direction of being energy secure, and that natural gas is going to contribute to that significantly.

I want to put that out there. It is the first benefit that absolutely every American, I don't care where they live in this country, is benefiting from natural gas.

Secondly, it really is jobs. I know that is localized to where the jobs occur. I happen to live in an area that has benefited significantly. I represent a very rural part of Pennsylvania, and we've had our difficult times. We have lost industries. But where we have natural gas, we are growing jobs.

Let me just give a couple of examples. In Tioga County there is a manufacturer. Actually, it's an international company. And the international company, the parent company, is looking to expand a plant. Guess where they're looking to? They're looking to Pennsylvania. And they're looking to Tioga County. And a big part of that is manufacturing, a key feedstock ingredient, whether used for heating, processing, or an ingredient, is natural gas. And the price of natural gas being delivered domestically, how it is available, so plentiful and so cheap right now, they want to build and expand the plant right there in Tioga County. That's very exciting. That's jobs.

As I wander around Tioga County, I see help wanted signs everywhere. And it's not just in traditional businesses that you would think of when you think of natural gas. It's all businesses, because the economy is good. The income is up. The unemployment is way below both State and national averages in the counties where the natural gas production has really taken off. And it's moving to other counties.

In terms of jobs, there's an entrepreneur in Elk County who I serve. This is a gentleman who's a real smart businessman. He saw something that these natural gas companies need, and he went out and he created a small manufacturing business to provide it. He's creating jobs, really good jobs for people, skilled jobs in order to produce the supplies that the companies need. And you know what, that's good for everybody. That's Elk County.

In Centre County, my home county, there's a road contractor there. We know that we have a lot of problems

with our roads. We're challenged both in the State and Federal budget in terms of money right now. But this road contractor is doing great things, as are a lot of small excavating companies, in terms of pad preparation and paving those roads. You talk about our roads are getting better. The gas companies are investing a significant amount of money early on to build roads, rebuild roads that really have never been built before.

In Pennsylvania we have what's called Pinchot roads, named for a former Governor, that don't have much of a base. So in the spring when the farmers are out there and are running their tractors, they rut up and get muddy. They've never had a firm base. Well, today, those Pinchot roads are being rebuilt really appropriately for the first time. And all of that is driven, that's a secondary benefit of the natural gas opportunity.

If you go to Warren County, we've got a longtime natural gas producer up there. It's a small, independently owned company. They've been in the oil and natural gas business I have to think for decades. Now today, they're partnering with a very large national company, so they're helping to bring outside dollars into the Fifth District of Pennsylvania, and they're creating more jobs.

The growth of the hotels, the hotel industry, is just booming, and those hospitality jobs are great jobs. In Clinton County, closer to my hometown, we have international companies that are relocating to rural Pennsylvania. International companies relocating and creating a significant amount of jobs. It's a very exciting opportunity that we're blessed with today.

I want to talk about heating costs, another benefit. This was two winters ago when the Marcellus was just starting to take off. You know, today, natural gas prices are somewhere in the neighborhood of about \$2.60 for 1,000 cubic feet. Just 3 or 4 years ago, back when we didn't produce domestic natural gas—we imported it all from other countries—natural gas was somewhere from \$12 to \$13 per 1,000 cubic feet, or more. And today, it's like \$2.60 per 1,000 cubic feet.

Two or three winters ago, the utility in Philadelphia, about as far in Pennsylvania as you can get from where we drill natural gas, reported that the communities in Philadelphia, their home heating costs were at an all-time low. I would argue this winter, if we look in New York and Pennsylvania and all of the areas where, because of natural gas prices today, being domestically produced, those citizens who benefit from heating their homes and cooking with natural gas, their costs in a difficult economy are at an all-time low. That's something that everybody can benefit from.

In fact, one of the projects that I'm trying to work on, I think it is very important, I would like to see how we get those distribution lines for natural

gas into more of our communities. My hometown doesn't have natural gas. I would love to be able to heat my home with natural gas, and I would like to at least see what Federal regulations are standing in the way of making that happen. I'm sure there's something out there that's a roadblock that we could work on.

The opportunities that we have today in terms of the benefits from natural gas are significant. They span a lot of different areas. I'm sure there are things that I haven't covered. I just want to take this opportunity to thank you for hosting this forum where we're talking about the benefits. These are really benefits that every American can experience as a result of accessing a resource that God has blessed us with.

Mr. REED. I appreciate my colleague from Pennsylvania for joining us here this evening. If I could continue this conversation with you, I'm sure you've done what I have done on numerous times. When I have traveled home, up state Route 15, right through the heart of your district on the way home to Corning, just over the Pennsylvania border, oftentimes I would take a few moments and get off the road and kind of go into the local communities there as we filled up the car or we got a cup of coffee. Most of the time I drive with a staff member who lives in the district, and I'd say: Let's go off road a couple of miles and see what's going on. I could tell you, every time I have pulled into a gas station there, I have been reminded of the benefits of what this can be to a community in that the parking lots are full. I had to wait in line to fill up the car because there's a lot of trucks. There's a lot of workers. There are a lot of folks coming and going out of those convenient marts.

□ 2150

And some of the most compelling stories I had, I can remember two vividly, coming down the road, pulling off at one of these gas stations and one of these convenience marts and talking to the lady behind the counter. And we did it twice. I can remember vividly saying, what does this mean to you? What's going on here? What's causing all this? Kind of playing dumb, obviously, I had an idea of what was causing it. But in both circumstances, the response was amazing. Yeah, it's not the same community. What they would say is that it wasn't the same community as when I grew up here, but, boy, everyone seems to be doing well. Everybody seems to be happy. And one lady, she expressed the conversation because she was working a side job and her husband was a contractor. And she said, my husband used to get up at 2, 3 o'clock in the morning until this came along, and they were receiving a small check, not a retirement size check as a result of this, but a nice, stable source of additional income coming into their household. And she looked at me and she said, it just kind of takes the edge

off. It just kind of took the edge off at the end of the month having to pick and choose what bill they may be able to pay that month and which one they may have to put off for another 30 days.

We've all been there. I know growing up in that type of family and when we first started in our private sector life, my wife and I putting our family business together and struggling. There's a lot of stress at the end of the month. Probably that's why I lost my hair and maybe why you lost your hair. But it was amazing to look that one lady in the eye who said, I just appreciate the fact that he doesn't have to get up at 2, 3 o'clock in the morning anymore, and we've got a little side income that's going to take care of their kids.

That conversation you're not having in America right now in many places, but we're having it in your district. And not so much in our district in the sense because we don't have the natural gas going right now, but we've seen the positive impacts like that. And I don't know if my colleague has any similar stories to those two young ladies that I refer to.

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. I do. Let me talk about, just out of fairness and equity, two young men, and this was actually published in the local paper. And they were doing a coverage of the Marcellus shale. And I was very impressed with this article because it was two young men who had just graduated from a local high school, actually in Clinton County, not too far off over the line from where I live. And they had decided they were going to go for a little technical training. They were going to go to a community college setting, get a certificate program, basically for driving a truck. And they did that, and then they secured jobs with someone who I assume was hauling sand or hauling water for the Marcellus operations around the area. These young men I have no doubts are today, and fairly fresh out of high school, are earning somewhere in the neighborhood of over \$60,000 a year, and probably with overtime a little more. That's a pretty incredible start for a young person.

Because I have to believe that my district, the 22 percent of the landmass of Pennsylvania that I serve is probably a lot like your district that our number one export for many years has been our young people. We educate them, and I like to think we do a good job of that, and they go to where there's opportunity. And there has not been opportunity in our economies, and our areas have been somewhat depressed economically for some time. And today, opportunity has returned. That is what this has been.

And there are jobs sitting open now of all types. And that's the exciting part. When I hear about people that are unemployed—and we have had folks protesting about not having jobs. Well, come to the Fifth District of Pennsylvania. You don't have to work in the

natural gas industry, because the natural gas industry they've kind of taken, they've been able to recruit some really good folks out of other positions. Some of those have been retail positions, service positions and manufacturing positions, but now those jobs are sitting open. And that's the effect that this kind of an economic opportunity has.

Mr. REED. And I so appreciate my colleague, and it is the sentiment, and I know our time is winding up. But one thing that also touched me. I've done a few tours in the northern tier of Pennsylvania in your district, and I've gone back on my own to go and verify information that has been presented to me. And I came back at the last, over the recess, over the holiday, I came back, and one thing struck me as I was driving home, and that's when talking about having the ability to educate their grandchildren and the children from these family farms, and I know you've had those conversations, I've had those conversations, we down here in Washington have spent billions if not trillions of dollars of public taxpayer money to try to lift people up out of despair; through the welfare society, entitlement society we have invested billions, trillions of dollars here. And look what happened based on private economic opportunity and development in the northern tier of Pennsylvania. You have generations of families that are now lifting themselves out of poverty and out of conditions that we are spending billions down here, they're doing it on their own, and I think it makes them a stronger individual in our society and it unites families for generations, and it empowers families for generations to control their own destiny. That's what the American Dream is all about.

So I appreciate my colleague joining me this evening and having this conversation. And I so appreciate the invite coming to your district and your coming to my district and our continuing the efforts to educate the American people on the benefits of natural gas development in America, the benefits of Marcellus shale and through the Marcellus Shale Caucus getting the best science and information out to the American people.

With that, I thank my colleague, and I yield back the balance of my time.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. CULBERSON (at the request of Mr. CANTOR) for today on account of illness.

Mr. LATOURETTE (at the request of Mr. CANTOR) for today on account of illness.

Mr. CLYBURN (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for today on account of illness.

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for today on account of weather delay.

Mr. DEFAZIO (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for today and the balance of

the week on account of official business in the district.

Mr. FARR (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for today and the balance of the week on account of health reasons.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. REED. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 9 o'clock and 56 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, January 24, 2012, at 10 a.m. for morning-hour debate.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

4630. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Cyhalofop-butyl; Pesticide Tolerances [EPA-HQ-OPP-2011-0283; FRL-9330-1] received December 28, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

4631. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Difenconazole; Pesticide Tolerances [EPA-HQ-OPP-2010-0959; FRL-9328-6] received December 28, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

4632. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Tepraloxym; Pesticide Tolerances [EPA-HQ-OPP-2010-0865; FRL-9330-2] received December 28, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

4633. A letter from the General Counsel, National Credit Union Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Golden Parachute and Indemnification Payments; Technical Correction (RIN: 3133-AD73) received December 29, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Financial Services.

4634. A letter from the General Counsel, National Credit Union Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Community Development Revolving Loan Fund Access for Credit Unions (RIN: 3133-AD91) received December 29, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Financial Services.

4635. A letter from the Acting Assistant General Counsel for Regulatory Services, Department of Education, transmitting the Department's final rule — Family Educational Rights and Privacy [DOCKET ID: ED-2011-OM-0002] (RIN: 1880-AA86) received December 30, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

4636. A letter from the Deputy Assistant Administrator, Office of Diversion Control, Department of Justice, transmitting the Department's final rule — Schedule of Controlled Substances: Placement of Carisoprodol Into Schedule IV [Docket No.: DEA-333] received December 28, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

4637. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agen-

cy's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; California; Determinations of Failure to Attain the One-Hour Ozone Standard [EPA-R09-OAR-2011-0638; FRL-9612-8] received December 28, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

4638. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; State of New Jersey; Regional Haze State Implementation Plan [EPA-R02-OAR-2011-0607; FRL-9611-2] received December 28, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

4639. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Regulation of Fuels and Fuel Additives: 2012 Renewable Fuel Standards [EPA-HQ-OAR-2010-0133; FRL-9614-4] (RIN: 2060-AQ76) received December 28, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

4640. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting Transmittal of D.C. ACT 19-269, "Health Benefit Exchange Authority Establishment Act of 2011"; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

4641. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting Transmittal of D.C. ACT 19-270, "Presidential Primary Ballot Access Temporary Amendment Act of 2012"; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

4642. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting Transmittal of D.C. ACT 19-271, "Unemployment Compensation Federally Funded Extended Benefits Maximization Temporary Amendment Act 2012"; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

4643. A letter from the Chief, Division of Consultation, Recovery, HCP and State Grants, Department of the Interior, transmitting the Department's final rule — Endangered and Threatened Wildlife and Plants; Reinstatement of Listing Protections for the Preble's Meadow Jumping Mouse [Docket ID: FWS-R6-ES-2011-0062] (RIN: 1018-AX93) received December 29, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

4644. A letter from the Chief, Branch of Permits and Regulations, Division of Migratory Bird Management, Department of the Interior, transmitting the Department's final rule — Migratory Bird Permits; States Delegated Falconry Permitting Authority; Technical Corrections to the Regulations [FWS-R9-MB-2011-0088; 91200-1231-9BPP] (RIN: 1018-AX98) received December 29, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

4645. A letter from the Biologist, Branch of Recovery and Delisting, Department of the Interior, transmitting the Department's final rule — Endangered and Threatened Wildlife and Plants; Removal of the Concho Water Snake From the Federal List of Endangered and Threatened Wildlife and Removal of Designated Critical Habitat [FWS-R2-ES-2008-0080; 92220-1113-0000-C6] (RIN: 1018-AU97) received December 29, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

4646. A letter from the Deputy Assistant Administrator for Regulatory Programs, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Fisheries of the Caribbean, Gulf of Mexico, and South Atlantic; Reef Fish Fishery of the Gulf of Mexico; Amendment 26 and Amendment 29 Supplement [Docket No.: 110606316-1652-02] (RIN:

0648-BB15) received December 21, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

4647. A letter from the Deputy Assistant Administrator for Regulatory Programs, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — International Fisheries; Pacific Tuna Fisheries; Fishing Restrictions in the Eastern Pacific Ocean [Docket No.: 110620342-1659-03] (RIN: 0648-B66) received December 21, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

4648. A letter from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Fisheries Off West Coast States; Modifications of the West Coast Commercial and Recreational Salmon Fisheries; Inseason Actions #5 Through #26 [Docket No.: 100223162-1268-01] (RIN: 0648-XA551) received December 21, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

4649. A letter from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Pacific Ocean Perch in the Eastern Aleutian District of the Bering Sea and Aleutian Islands Management Area [Docket No.: 101126521-0640-02] (RIN: 0648-XA782) received December 21, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

4650. A letter from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Pollock in Statistical Area 610 in the Gulf of Alaska [Docket No.: 101126522-0640-02] (RIN: 0648-XA710) received December 21, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

4651. A letter from the Deputy Assistant Administrator for Regulatory Programs, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Fisheries Off West Coast States; Pacific Coast Groundfish Harvest Specifications and Management Measures for the Remainder of the 2011 Fishery [Docket No.: 100804324-1265-02] (RIN: 0648-BA01) received December 29, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

4652. A letter from the Deputy Assistant Administrator for Regulatory Programs, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Fisheries Off West Coast States; Highly Migratory Species Fisheries; Annual Catch Limits and Accountability Measures [Docket No.: 101102552-1319-02] (RIN: 0648-BA35) received December 21, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

4653. A letter from the Deputy Assistant Administrator for Regulatory Programs, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Fisheries of the Caribbean, Gulf of Mexico, and South Atlantic; Reef Fish Fishery of the Gulf of Mexico; Gag Grouper Closure Measures [Docket No.: 110321211-1289-02] (RIN: 0648-BA94) received December 29, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

4654. A letter from the Acting Deputy Assistant Administrator for Operations, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's

final rule — Atlantic Highly Migratory Species; Vessel Monitoring Systems [Docket No.: 110520295-1659-02] (RIN: 0648-BA64) received December 29, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

4655. A letter from the Special Master, September 11th Victim Compensation Fund, Department of Justice, transmitting the Department's final rule — James Zadroga 9/11 Health and Compensation Act of 2010 [Docket No.: CIV 151] (RIN: 1105-AB39) received December 21, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

4656. A letter from the Director, Office of Tribal Justice, Department of Justice, transmitting Department's final rule — Office of the Attorney General; Assumption of Concurrent Federal Criminal Jurisdiction in Certain Areas of Indian Country [Docket No.: OAG 142; AG Order No. 3314-2011] (RIN: 1105-AB38) received December 20, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

4657. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Employment and Training, Department of Labor, transmitting the Department's final rule — Wage Methodology for the Temporary Non-Agricultural Employment H-2B Program; Delay of Effective Date; Impact on Prevailing Wage Determinations (RIN: 1205-AB61) received December 7, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

4658. A letter from the Senior Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Honeywell International Inc. Turbofan Engines [Docket No.: FAA-2011-1261; Directorate Identifier 2011-NE-38-AD; Amendment 39-16875; AD 2011-24-11] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received December 21, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

4659. A letter from the Senior Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Bombardier, Inc. Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2011-1256; Directorate Identifier 2011-NM-036-AD; Amendment 39-16874; AD 2011-24-10] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received December 21, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

4660. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule — Determination of Issue Price in the Case of Certain Debt Instruments Issued for Property (Rev. Rul. 2012-2) received December 21, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. CAMP: Committee on Ways and Means. H.R. 1173. A bill to repeal the CLASS program (Rept. 112-342, Pt. 2). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington: Committee on Natural Resources. H.R. 2606. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to allow the construction and operation of natural gas pipeline facilities in the Gateway National Recreation Area, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. 112-373). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington: Committee on Natural Resources. H.R. 3117. A bill to grant the Secretary of the Interior permanent authority to authorize States to issue electronic duck stamps, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. 112-374). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

TIME LIMITATION OF REFERRED BILL

Pursuant to clause 2 of rule XII the following action was taken by the Speaker:

[The following action occurred on January 20, 2012]

H.R. 901. Referral to the Committee on Energy and Commerce extended for a period ending not later than March 1, 2012.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions of the following titles were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mr. LOBIONDO:

H.R. 3797. A bill to amend chapter 178 of title 28 of the United States Code to permit during a 4-year period States to enact statutes that exempt from the operation of such chapter, lotteries, sweepstakes, and other betting, gambling, or wagering schemes involving professional and amateur sports; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SCHRADER (for himself, Mr. GALLEGLY, Mr. FARR, and Mr. DENHAM):

H.R. 3798. A bill to provide for a uniform national standard for the housing and treatment of egg-laying hens, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. LATHAM (for himself, Mr. COLE, Mr. CHABOT, Ms. JENKINS, Mr. BONNER, and Mr. NUNES):

H.R. 3799. A bill to prohibit the disbursement of funds for salaries and expenses of the offices of Members and committees of Congress and to hold the salaries of Members of Congress in escrow if Congress does not adopt a concurrent resolution on the budget on or before May 15 of each year, and for other purposes; to the Committee on House Administration, and in addition to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. MICA (for himself, Mr. RAHALL, Mr. CAMP, Mr. LEVIN, Mr. PETRI, Mr. COSTELLO, and Mr. LEWIS of Georgia):

H.R. 3800. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to extend the funding and expenditure authority of the Airport and Airway Trust Fund, to amend title 49, United States Code, to extend authorizations for the airport improvement program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Ms. GIFFORDS (for herself and Mr. FLAKE):

H.R. 3801. A bill to amend the Tariff Act of 1930 to clarify the definition of aircraft and the offenses penalized under the aviation smuggling provisions under that Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committee on Armed Services, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each

case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina (for himself, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, and Mr. JORDAN):

H.R. 3802. A bill to require an abortion provider, before performing an abortion, to wait for a period of at least 24 hours; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. FRANKS of Arizona (for himself, Mr. AKIN, Mr. GOHMERT, Mr. FLEMING, Mr. WALBERG, Mr. HUELSKAMP, Mr. PITTS, Mr. LAMBORN, Mr. SMITH of Texas, Mr. KINGSTON, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. SOUTHERLAND, Mrs. SCHMIDT, Mr. ADERHOLT, Mr. HARRIS, Mr. BUCSHON, Mr. PENCE, Mr. HULTGREN, Mr. BOUSTANY, Mr. ROGERS of Alabama, Mr. MANZULLO, Mr. ROSS of Florida, Mrs. HARTZLER, Mr. FORTENBERRY, Mr. HERGER, Mr. CANSECO, Mr. LANKFORD, Mrs. LUMMIS, Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. ROE of Tennessee, Mr. NUNNELEE, Mr. MARCHANT, Mr. HUIZENGA of Michigan, Mr. MURPHY of Pennsylvania, Mr. JONES, Mr. LANDRY, Mr. BACHUS, Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky, Mrs. ROBY, Mr. MCKINLEY, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. KELLY, Mr. GOWDY, Mr. JORDAN, Mrs. BACHMANN, Mrs. ELLMERS, Mr. AMASH, Mr. ISSA, Mr. SCHWEIKERT, and Mr. SCALISE):

H.R. 3803. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to protect pain-capable unborn children in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary, and in addition to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. HUELSKAMP:

H.R. 3804. A bill to permanently extend tax relief and repeal certain tax increases; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committees on Education and the Workforce, and Energy and Commerce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. JORDAN (for himself, Mr. AKIN, Mr. AUSTRIA, Mrs. BACHMANN, Mr. BARTLETT, Mrs. BLACK, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. BOUSTANY, Mr. BRADY of Texas, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. CALVERT, Mr. CANSECO, Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina, Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee, Mr. FLORES, Mr. FORBES, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Mr. GARRETT, Mr. HALL, Mr. HERGER, Mr. HUIZENGA of Michigan, Mr. HULTGREN, Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio, Mr. JONES, Mr. KELLY, Mr. KING of Iowa, Mr. KLINE, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. LONG, Mr. MANZULLO, Mr. MARCHANT, Mr. MCCOTTER, Mr. MURPHY of Pennsylvania, Mr. NEUGEBAUER, Mr. NUNNELEE, Mr. ROE of Tennessee, Mr. ROGERS of Alabama, Mr. ROSS of Florida, Mrs. SCHMIDT, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. SOUTHERLAND, Mr. WESTMORELAND, Mr. HUELSKAMP, Mr. FLEMING, and Mr. MILLER of Florida):

H.R. 3805. A bill to ensure that women seeking an abortion receive an ultrasound and the opportunity to review the ultrasound before giving informed consent to receive an abortion; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. MARINO:

H.R. 3806. A bill to end the practice of including more than one subject in a single bill by requiring that each bill enacted by Congress be limited to only one subject, and for

other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MURPHY of Connecticut:

H.R. 3807. A bill to provide for funding of the Low-Income Home Energy Assistance Program (LIHEAP) with a dedicated revenue source consisting of a tax on offshore oil production; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committees on Energy and Commerce, and Education and the Workforce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mrs. MYRICK (for herself, Mr. COBLE, and Mr. MCINTYRE):

H.R. 3808. A bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act with respect to detention of unlawfully present aliens who are apprehended for driving while intoxicated, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PALLONE:

H.R. 3809. A bill to amend title 28 of the United States Code to exclude the State of New Jersey from the prohibition on professional and amateur sports gambling to the extent approved by the legislature of the State; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PETRI:

H.R. 3810. A bill to amend title 23, United States Code, to modify a provision relating to minimum penalties for repeat offenders for driving while intoxicated or driving under the influence, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Ms. WILSON of Florida (for herself, Ms. BASS of California, Mr. BERMAN, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Ms. BROWN of Florida, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Mr. CAPUANO, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Ms. CASTOR of Florida, Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, Ms. CHU, Mr. CICILLINE, Mr. CLARKE of Michigan, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Mr. CLAY, Mr. CLEAVER, Mr. CLYBURN, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, Ms. EDWARDS, Mr. ELLISON, Mr. FATTAH, Ms. FUDGE, Mr. AL GREEN of Texas, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas, Mr. JACKSON of Illinois, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mr. KEATING, Ms. LEE of California, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. MEEKS, Ms. MOORE, Ms. NORTON, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. RANGEL, Ms. RICHARDSON, Mr. RICHMOND, Mr. RUSH, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Ms. SEWELL, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Mr. TOWNS, Ms. WATERS, and Mr. WATT):

H. Res. 521. A resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives that the United States should work with the Government of Haiti to address gender-based violence against women and children; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

CONSTITUTIONAL AUTHORITY STATEMENT

Pursuant to clause 7 of rule XII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the following statements are submitted regarding the specific powers granted to Congress in the Constitution to enact the accompanying bill or joint resolution.

By Mr. LOBIONDO:

H.R. 3797.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution

By Mr. SCHRADER:

H.R. 3798.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Congress has the authority to act under Article I, § 8, clause 3—the Commerce Clause.

By Mr. LATHAM:

H.R. 3799.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Sections 6 and 9 of the Constitution of the United States.

By Mr. MICA:

H.R. 3800.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution, specifically Clause 1, Clause 3, and Clause 18.

By Ms. GIFFORDS:

H.R. 3801.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution

By Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina:

H.R. 3802.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Amendment V, Section 1—the “Due Process” clause protects any life from being taken without due process of law; this legislation provides unborn citizens a modicum of due process.

By Mr. FRANKS of Arizona:

H.R. 3803.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The District of Columbia Pain-Capable Unborn Child Protection Act is introduced pursuant to Article I, Section 8, clause 17: “The Congress shall have Power . . . to exercise exclusive legislation in all Cases whatsoever, over such District (not exceeding ten miles square) as may, by cession of the particular states, and the Acceptance of Congress, become the seat of government of the United States.”

By Mr. HUELSKAMP:

H.R. 3804.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clause 1 of Section 8 of Article I of the United States Constitution and Amendment XVI of the United States Constitution.

Clause 1 of Section 7 of Article I of the United States Constitution, all bills for raising revenue shall originate in the House of Representatives.

By Mr. JORDAN:

H.R. 3805.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clause 3 of section 8 of article 1: To regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian tribes

Section 1 of the Fourteenth Amendment: No State shall make or enforce any law which shall abridge the privileges or immunities of citizens of the United States; nor shall any State deprive any person of life, liberty, or property, without due process of law; nor deny to any person within its jurisdiction the equal protection of the laws.

By Mr. MARINO:

H.R. 3806.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 5, Clause 2

Article I, Section 7, Clause 2

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18

By Mr. MURPHY of Connecticut:

H.R. 3807.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8.

By Mrs. MYRICK:

H.R. 3808.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clause 4 of Section 8 of Article I of the United States Constitution, which gives Congress the power to establish a uniform Rule of Naturalization.

By Mr. PALLONE:

H.R. 3809.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following: section 8 of article I of the Constitution.

By Mr. PETRI:

H.R. 3810.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clause 3 of Section 8 of Article I of the Constitution.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 32: Mr. DOLD and Mr. STIVERS.
 H.R. 83: Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, Mr. CLAY, Ms. RICHARDSON, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Ms. HAHN, Mr. MICHAUD, Mrs. CAPPS, Mr. JACKSON of Illinois, and Mr. SABLAN.
 H.R. 104: Mr. HINCHEY and Mr. GUTIERREZ.
 H.R. 110: Mr. SCHILLING.
 H.R. 140: Mr. SCOTT of South Carolina.
 H.R. 191: Mr. McDERMOTT.
 H.R. 196: Mr. TOWNS.
 H.R. 217: Mr. FARENTHOLD and Mr. STIVERS.
 H.R. 265: Mr. BLUMENAUER.
 H.R. 266: Mr. BLUMENAUER.
 H.R. 267: Mr. BLUMENAUER.
 H.R. 300: Mr. HINOJOSA and Mrs. MALONEY.
 H.R. 365: Ms. RICHARDSON and Mr. RUNYAN.
 H.R. 436: Mr. MURPHY of Pennsylvania.
 H.R. 451: Mr. GRAVES of Georgia.
 H.R. 469: Mr. NADLER.
 H.R. 511: Mr. MILLER of Florida, Mr. WEST, and Mr. CRENSHAW.
 H.R. 605: Mrs. CAPITO.
 H.R. 668: Mrs. BACHMANN and Mr. GRIFFIN of Arkansas.
 H.R. 733: Ms. HIRONO.
 H.R. 735: Mr. ROKITA and Mr. HENSARLING.
 H.R. 763: Mrs. ELLMERS.
 H.R. 835: Mr. SMITH of Washington.
 H.R. 854: Mr. RIVERA.
 H.R. 905: Mr. FITZPATRICK.
 H.R. 931: Mrs. MYRICK and Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina.
 H.R. 938: Mr. LONG.
 H.R. 965: Mr. SIRES.
 H.R. 973: Mr. ROYCE.
 H.R. 998: Ms. BORDALLO and Mr. CONYERS.
 H.R. 1063: Mr. DOLD, Mr. CLARKE of Michigan, Ms. BROWN of Florida, and Mr. GRIFFIN of Arkansas.
 H.R. 1093: Mr. MURPHY of Pennsylvania.
 H.R. 1148: Mr. PASCRELL and Mr. FORBES.
 H.R. 1173: Mr. CRAVAACK and Mr. FLAKE.
 H.R. 1179: Mr. TURNER of Ohio, Mr. OLSON, Mr. BENISHEK, and Ms. FOXF.
 H.R. 1182: Mr. RIBBLE.
 H.R. 1195: Mrs. SCHMIDT and Mr. CONNOLLY of Virginia.
 H.R. 1236: Mrs. MYRICK, Mr. WATT, and Mr. MCHENRY.
 H.R. 1265: Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Mr. JOHNSON of Illinois, Mr. ALTMIRE, and Mr. GOSAR.
 H.R. 1327: Ms. BROWN of Florida.
 H.R. 1332: Mr. NADLER and Mr. NEAL.
 H.R. 1348: Mr. CRITZ.
 H.R. 1370: Mr. SHUSTER.
 H.R. 1381: Mr. STARK.
 H.R. 1385: Mrs. BLACKBURN.
 H.R. 1386: Mr. NADLER, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Mr. REYES, and Mr. HASTINGS of Washington.

H.R. 1418: Mr. AMODEI.
 H.R. 1433: Mr. AMODEI.
 H.R. 1523: Mr. CONNOLLY of Virginia.
 H.R. 1546: Ms. MATSUI, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, and Ms. SUTTON.
 H.R. 1564: Mr. JACKSON of Illinois.
 H.R. 1591: Mr. AUSTRIA.
 H.R. 1606: Mr. LOEBSACK.
 H.R. 1684: Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi.
 H.R. 1733: Mr. FILNER.
 H.R. 1738: Mr. SCHILLING and Ms. PINGREE of Maine.
 H.R. 1744: Mrs. ADAMS.
 H.R. 1755: Mr. PASCRELL.
 H.R. 1756: Mr. OLVER and Mr. GUINTA.
 H.R. 1780: Mr. LOBIONDO.
 H.R. 1842: Mr. PASCRELL and Mr. CICILLINE.
 H.R. 1867: Mr. FITZPATRICK.
 H.R. 1895: Mr. COSTELLO, Mr. COHEN, Mr. JACKSON of Illinois, and Mr. RUSH.
 H.R. 1964: Mr. DESJARLAIS and Mr. WOMACK.
 H.R. 1971: Mr. FITZPATRICK.
 H.R. 2010: Mr. McCOTTER.
 H.R. 2016: Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, and Mr. MILLER of North Carolina.
 H.R. 2033: Mr. NADLER.
 H.R. 2053: Mr. MCINTYRE.
 H.R. 2139: Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mr. SCOTT of South Carolina, and Ms. SCHAKOWSKY.
 H.R. 2179: Mr. WESTMORELAND.
 H.R. 2194: Ms. LINDA T. SANCHEZ of California.
 H.R. 2195: Mr. GONZALEZ.
 H.R. 2269: Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia.
 H.R. 2313: Mr. ROSS of Florida.
 H.R. 2414: Mr. PITTS and Mr. JONES.
 H.R. 2487: Mr. JACKSON of Illinois and Mr. MURPHY of Pennsylvania.
 H.R. 2499: Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas and Mr. KILDEE.
 H.R. 2505: Mr. STARK and Mr. WALZ of Minnesota.
 H.R. 2514: Mr. RIBBLE.
 H.R. 2529: Mr. MCCAUL.
 H.R. 2679: Ms. HIRONO and Mr. ROSS of Arkansas.
 H.R. 2779: Mr. GIBSON.
 H.R. 2787: Mr. GUTHRIE.
 H.R. 2834: Mrs. ADAMS, Mr. HANNA, and Mr. BROUN of Georgia.
 H.R. 2885: Mr. MATHESON.
 H.R. 2955: Mr. RYAN of Ohio.
 H.R. 3000: Mr. LANKFORD.
 H.R. 3013: Mr. WALSH of Illinois.
 H.R. 3059: Mr. TERRY.
 H.R. 3066: Mr. ROKITA.
 H.R. 3138: Ms. BROWN of Florida.
 H.R. 3187: Mr. GINGREY of Georgia, Mr. ROSS of Arkansas, and Mr. QUIGLEY.
 H.R. 3200: Mr. TURNER of New York.
 H.R. 3203: Mr. ROKITA.
 H.R. 3205: Mr. ROKITA.
 H.R. 3209: Mrs. McMORRIS RODGERS.
 H.R. 3213: Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas.
 H.R. 3214: Mr. ROKITA.
 H.R. 3216: Mr. TONKO.
 H.R. 3242: Ms. WOOLSEY.
 H.R. 3269: Mr. KEATING, Mr. FARENTHOLD, Mr. ENGEL, and Ms. DELAURO.
 H.R. 3276: Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN and Mr. WEBSTER.
 H.R. 3300: Mr. POLIS.
 H.R. 3307: Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. GUTIERREZ, Ms. NORTON, Mr. KEATING, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. MORAN, Mr. TIERNEY, and Ms. CHU.
 H.R. 3308: Mr. AMASH.
 H.R. 3316: Mr. AL GREEN of Texas.
 H.R. 3317: Mr. AL GREEN of Texas.
 H.R. 3364: Mr. MILLER of North Carolina, Ms. WATERS, Mr. GONZALEZ, Mr. BACA, and Mr. BOREN.
 H.R. 3368: Mr. HINCHEY, Mr. MICHAUD, and Mr. BLUMENAUER.
 H.R. 3380: Mr. JOHNSON of Illinois.
 H.R. 3400: Mr. AMODEI, Mr. NEUGEBAUER, Mr. FLEMING, and Mr. QUAYLE.

H.R. 3423: Mr. CASSIDY, Mr. WALBERG, Mr. AUSTRIA, Mr. TURNER of Ohio, Mr. ROONEY, and Ms. HIRONO.
 H.R. 3442: Mr. ISRAEL.
 H.R. 3461: Mr. GARRETT, Mr. CANSECO, Mr. THORNBERRY, Mr. HECK, Mr. ROSKAM, Mr. POMPEO, Mr. CRAWFORD, Mr. OWENS, Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee, Mrs. BLACKBURN, and Mr. CONNOLLY of Virginia.
 H.R. 3473: Mr. COSTELLO, Ms. BROWN of Florida, Mr. FILNER, Mr. HOLDEN, and Mr. MICHAUD.
 H.R. 3510: Ms. LEE of California, Mr. QUIGLEY, Mr. CICILLINE, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. CLARKE of Michigan, Ms. RICHARDSON, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Ms. LINDA T. SANCHEZ of California, and Mr. HECK.
 H.R. 3527: Mr. ROSS of Arkansas.
 H.R. 3528: Ms. NORTON.
 H.R. 3533: Mr. LATOURETTE, Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. HIGGINS, and Ms. SCHAKOWSKY.
 H.R. 3541: Mr. GOWDY, Mr. HALL, Mr. ROKITA, and Mr. LUETKEMEYER.
 H.R. 3548: Mr. DESJARLAIS, Mr. HULTGREN, Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. GINGREY of Georgia, Mr. PALAZZO, Mr. McCLINTOCK, Mr. FINCHER, and Mr. COLE.
 H.R. 3575: Mr. McCLINTOCK and Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee.
 H.R. 3577: Mr. BERG and Mr. SCOTT of South Carolina.
 H.R. 3579: Mr. RIBBLE.
 H.R. 3581: Mr. AMASH, Mr. WALSH of Illinois, Mr. MULVANEY, Mr. McCLINTOCK, and Mr. WOODALL.
 H.R. 3582: Mr. AMASH, Mr. McCLINTOCK, and Mr. SCALISE.
 H.R. 3583: Mr. AMASH.
 H.R. 3590: Mr. HOLT.
 H.R. 3596: Mr. ACKERMAN, Ms. LINDA T. SANCHEZ of California, and Mr. NADLER.
 H.R. 3599: Mr. DEFazio and Mr. SCHRADER.
 H.R. 3606: Mr. MEEHAN.
 H.R. 3609: Ms. FOXF and Mr. CANSECO.
 H.R. 3612: Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mr. JACKSON of Illinois, Mr. YOUNG of Florida, Mr. RIVERA, and Mr. McDERMOTT.
 H.R. 3615: Mr. PITTS.
 H.R. 3627: Mr. LOEBSACK and Mr. MCKINLEY.
 H.R. 3636: Mr. LARSON of Connecticut.
 H.R. 3667: Mr. BENISHEK.
 H.R. 3670: Mrs. BLACKBURN and Mr. COFFMAN of Colorado.
 H.R. 3676: Mrs. MILLER of Michigan and Mr. YARMUTH.
 H.R. 3679: Mr. CONNOLLY of Virginia, Ms. BERKLEY, Mr. KILDEE, Ms. SLAUGHTER, and Mr. YOUNG of Alaska.
 H.R. 3702: Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. YARMUTH, Ms. PINGREE of Maine, Mr. JONES, Mr. CROWLEY, and Ms. CHU.
 H.R. 3770: Mr. HALL, Mr. ROKITA, Mr. BROUN of Georgia, Mr. LABRADOR, Mr. CANSECO, Mr. FORBES, and Mr. BURGESS.
 H.R. 3778: Mr. GINGREY of Georgia, Mr. POSEY, Mr. FLEMING, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Mr. CULBERSON, Mr. McCLINTOCK, and Mr. BURGESS.
 H.R. 3785: Mr. AMASH.
 H.J. Res. 78: Mrs. NAPOLITANO and Mr. VAN HOLLEN.
 H. Res. 16: Mr. SCHIFF and Mr. SHERMAN.
 H. Res. 253: Mr. ALEXANDER.
 H. Res. 271: Mr. FORBES.
 H. Res. 407: Mr. BRALEY of Iowa.
 H. Res. 475: Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina.
 H. Res. 490: Mr. KLINE, Mr. LOBIONDO, Mr. FORBES, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. BURGESS, and Mr. YODER.
 H. Res. 507: Ms. GRANGER.
 H. Res. 509: Mr. LATTI, Mr. SCOTT of South Carolina, Mr. MARCHANT, Mr. WHITFIELD, Mr. MACK, and Mr. GUINTA.
 H. Res. 516: Mrs. LUMMIS, Mr. HASTINGS of Washington, Mr. WESTMORELAND, Mrs.

BLACKBURN, Mr. LATHAM, Mr. FLORES, Mr. BONNER, Mr. LUETKEMEYER, Mr. MACK, Mr. LANKFORD, Mr. LAMBORN, Mr. MILLER of Florida, Mr. HULTGREN, Mr. FORBES, and Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia.
H. Res. 517: Mr. WHITFIELD.

DELETIONS OF SPONSORS FROM PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS
Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were deleted from public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 3261: Mr. SCALISE, Mr. LUJÁN, Mr. GRIFFIN of Arkansas, and Mr. ROSS of Florida.
H.R. 3609: Mr. AMASH.